

## THE CONCEPTS OF LANGUAGE, COMPETENCE AND LITERATURE IN ELT CLASSES \*

Mehmet ŞAHİN\*\*

### ÖZET

Edebiyat metinlerinin dil öğretiminde materyal olarak kullanımı konusu ile edebiyat öğretimi konusu karıştırılmaktadır. Edebiyat öğreniminin yapılması için öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin dil, yeterlik ve edebiyat terimlerinin neyi içerdiğini bilmeleri gerekmektedir. Edebiyatın ham maddesi dil olduğu için dilde yeterlik edebiyat öğreniminde temeldir. Dilin hem iç yapısı hem de tezahürü, dilin tarihsel ve doğrusal gelişimi, dilin gramatik, sosyolinguistik, stratejik ve iletişimsel yanı da edebiyat öğreniminde bilinmesi gerekmektedir. Edebi metnin anlamlandırılmasında kelimelerin edebiyat dilindeki anlamları, eserin edebiyat geleneği ve edebiyat tarihi içerisindeki yeri bilindiği zaman doğru analiz yapılabilir.

**Keywords:** Language, Competence, Literature, Linguistic Competence

It should be noticed that this paper is not devoted to the steps that should be followed in ELT classes. In addition, this is not a study to present teachers how they should teach literature in the elementary classes. This study aims to present

---

\* This article is based on the MA Dissertation "Teaching Literature with Emphasis on Poetry"

\*\* English Language Lecturer at FLHS, Selçuk University.

the teaching points that a teacher should know while teaching in, at least, intermediate and advanced classes.

This study aims to give a line to guide teachers of English in their attempt to teach literature in general. The teacher to teach literature should be aware of the fact that the first condition of teaching literature is the acquisition of linguistic competence. Without linguistic competence, students cannot build their other competences. Students should first gain the competence of the foreign language whose literature they are going to study. This linguistic competence should be supported by communicative competence, which is the competence of using language appropriately in social contexts. Both these concepts will lead students to have stylistic competence, which leads them to literary competence. Stylistic study of text helps students to understand that text even if it is too difficult. The procedure of these competences should take pupils to being students, and finally, to being academicians.

The teaching of literary terms such as literary theory, literary history or literary criticism can be included in this procedure, because, without discriminating these concepts, students may fall into confusion in evaluating any literary text or a work of literature. Since language is the raw material of literature, the definitions made by linguists should be regarded, as well as linguistic competence, communicative competence and other sub-competences. The nature of literature, a work of art and tradition, too, can be included into this list. Besides, since literary meaning lies under the literary use of language, each work of art is the 'parole' of a writer, but it is in one way peculiar to the writer and on the other it contains universal aspects through literary conventions. Pedagogically, the stylistic study of a work of art is the manifestation of the linguistic competence applied into that work. Stylistic study of poetry as literature demands linguistic study, but it is not enough to understand a poem. Therefore, teaching poetry as subject demands linguistic competence but for teaching poetry as discipline, linguistic competence is not sufficient.

### **1. Language**

When we have a look around us, we become aware of the fact that there is the variety of several thousands of languages and dialects reflecting the variety of worldviews and of the ways of life. When we look back, we can see only as far as our language lets us see. When we look forward in time, we can plan our future only by means of our language. Therefore, most importance has been attached to the language in a society to understand one another and to resolve the problems.

Although dictionaries define 'language' in similar ways, there has not been a certain and pure definition for it. However, all dictionaries agree that language

is a device for communication. This is the commonly accepted definition of language. While defining 'language' in this paper, contrary to what dictionaries do, I will take what the linguists have said into consideration. I will try to give the ideas of leading linguists such as Ferdinand de Saussure (1875-1913), Leonard Bloomfield (1887-1949) and Avram Noam Chomsky (1928- ).

De Saussure, the Swiss linguist, is broadly accepted as the founder of Modern Linguistics. His work Cours de Linguistique Generale was published in Paris, after his death, in 1915. While studying language in this work, de Saussure contributed linguistics by examining the terms below (Dinneen:1967):

... (1) the distinctions among la langue, la parole and le langage; (2) the distinction between diachronic and synchronic language study; (3) his definition of the linguistic sign; (4) the distinction between associative and syntagmatic relations in language; ... (p. 196).

According to de Saussure, language is the faculty of speech that is present in all human beings due to the ability to talk. This ability is composed of la langue, which is the language system, and La parole, which is the act of speaking. La langue is the sum of word-images stored in the minds of individuals. La parole is the actual speaking of a person, which is a social and non-static activity. Dinneen (1967) says:

La langue, on the other hand, obviously can be and has been studied. ... La langue is, therefore, concrete from this point of view; it is a set of linguistic signs that bear the stamp of collective approval. ... (p. 199).

De Saussure distinguished diachronic (historical) and Synchronic (non-historical) approaches to language study. Diachronic approach sees language as a continually changing medium. Synchronic approach sees language as a living whole, existing as a 'state' at a particular moment in time. Dinneen (1967:201) states that, for de Saussure, scientific linguistics must study the patterns that make individual utterance, and diachronic linguistics is far from being the only scientific study of language; it can be considered scientific only in a derivative sense. While defining la langue, de Saussure states that la langue is a deposit of signs. According to Dinneen (1967:201), in the de Saussure's view, the linguistic sign "unites, not a thing and a name, but a concept and an acoustic image ... a psychic entity with two sides". For de Saussure, a sentence is a sequence of signs, and each sign contributes something to the meaning of the whole. When the signs are seen in a linear sequence, the relationship between them is called syntagmatic, and when a sign that is present is seen as contrasting with other signs in the language; this is called associative. "De Saussure saw that it is in

terms of the associative (or paradigmatic) and syntagmatic relations that the forms of a language can be accurately described", says Dinneen (1967:206).

In 1933, Leonard Bloomfield's Language appeared, and this book dominated linguistic thinking over twenty years. It included many descriptive studies of grammar and phonology. Bloomfield studied on sentence structure, analysing sentences into their constituent parts; because of this, he was called 'structuralist'. He described language as a set of signals and the structure of the set can be studied by the linguist. Bloomfield's structural linguistics had behaviouristic principles for the study of meaning, but he agreed with de Saussure "that the linguist should study language as it is actually spoken at the time of the study, ... the form of language have constant and definable meanings" (Dinneen:1967:263).

In 1957, A. Noam Chomsky published Syntactic Structures, which has been accepted as a turning point in linguistic understanding of the twentieth century. In this work, he developed the conception of a 'generative grammar', which was different from the structuralism and behaviourism of the previous decades, because these approaches did not take the difference between 'deep' and 'surface' levels of structure into account. Chomsky (1928:13) disputes the structuralist ideas about language and language development and he defines language as "a set of finite or infinite sentences", each is finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements. Similar to de Saussure's "langue" and "parole", Chomsky drew a fundamental distinction between a person's knowledge of the rules of a language and the actual use of that language in real situations. He referred to the first as "competence", and to the second as "performance". According to Chomsky, linguists should study not only performance but also competence as well, for "speakers use their competence to go far beyond the limitations of any corpus, by being able to create and recognise novel sentences, and to identify performance errors" (Crystal:1987:409). To Chomsky's generative grammar, the earlier analyses of sentences are inadequate, because they only analyse the surface structure. Deep structure underlies "the structural organisation which specifies all the factors governing the way the sentence should be interpreted (Crystal:1980:107). Surface structure underlies the structure of the sentence we articulate and hear.

## 2. Competence

Drawing a distinction between competence and performance, Chomsky has defined and, in doing so, confined linguistic competence. According to Chomsky, linguistic competence is a person's knowledge of the rules of a language. Linguist should study linguistic competence as well as performance. Hymes (1972:277) defines communicative competence as the competence

"when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner". According to Stern, communicative competence is wider than linguistic competence, because Chomsky's concept does not cover social and cultural rules and meanings of language. Stern (1983) writes:

This concept constituted a definite challenge to Chomsky's 'linguistic competence' which is confined to internalised rules of syntax and abstracts from the social rules of language use. Communicative competence no doubt implies linguistic competence but its main focus is the intuitive grasp of social and cultural rules and meanings that are carried by any utterance (p. 229).

Communicative competence includes four areas of knowledge and skill: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. According to Collie and Slaler (1988:7) grammatical competence includes the mastery of the rules of language, vocabulary, the formation of words and sentences, spelling and phonology. This competence only deals with the knowledge and skills necessary to understand and express literal meanings of utterances. Collie and Slaler write:

This type of competence remains concerned with mastery of the language code (verbal or non-verbal) itself. Thus included here are features and rules of the language such as vocabulary and formation, pronunciation, spelling and linguistic semantics. Such competence focuses directly on the knowledge and skill required to understand and express accurately the literal meaning of utterance; as such, grammatical competence will be an important concern of any second language programme ... (p.7).

Sociolinguistic competence includes the sociocultural use and the rules of discourse. Here, the important thing is producing and understanding language appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts. In this respect, Collie and Slaler (1988) write:

Sociolinguistic competence thus addresses the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors such as status of participants, purposes of the interaction, and norms or conventions of interaction ... (p. 7).

Discourse competence is concerned with the mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text. This text may be an oral or written narrative, a scientific report, a business letter

or an argumentative essay. The unity of one of the texts above is achieved through 'cohesion' in form and 'coherence' in meaning. Collie and Slaler (1988) explain these two terms as follows:

Cohesion deals with how utterances are linked structurally and facilitates interpretation of a text. For example, the use of cohesion devices such as pronouns, synonyms, ellipsis, conjunctions and parallel structure serves to relate individual utterances and to indicate how a group of utterances is to be understood (e.g. logically or chronologically) as a text (p. 9).

Strategic type of competence includes the mastery of verbal or non-verbal communication strategies. These strategies are necessary to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting conditions in actual communication, and to increase the effectiveness of communication. When we do not remember a given grammatical form, we paraphrase it, and when we do not remember 'train station', we might paraphrase it such as 'the place where trains go' or 'the place for trains.' In this respect, Collie and Slaler (1988) say:

This component is composed of mastery of verbal or non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action for two main reasons: (a) to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting conditions in actual communication (e.g. momentary inability to recall an idea or grammatical form) or to insufficient competence in one or more of the other areas of communicative competence; and (b) to enhance the effectiveness of communication (e.g. deliberately slow and soft speech for rhetorical effect ... (pp. 10-11).

To introduce literature to ELT classes is only possible after these students have had communicative competence in a foreign language. According to Alex Rodger (1983), teaching language through literature is absurd. Teaching of literature must not be in the student's mother tongue. To understand and get something from the marks of literature, students should require communicative competence. It should be as close as possible to that of a native speaker's. Alex Rodger (1983) says:

From all I have said up to this point, it must be obvious that wherever the literature to be studied is not in the student's mother tongue, they must already have a thoroughgoing proficiency in the use of that language. To get anything at all from serious works of literature by major authors they require a communicative competence in the

foreign or second language which is as close as possible to that of a highly educated native user of it ... (p. 44).

The most important purpose of teaching literature in ELT classes is to help students acquire literary competence. Comparing literature to language, Johnathan Culler observes literary competence as to know the grammar of a literature intuitively. According to Johnathan Culler, to know the grammar of literature is to know the moulds of human experience, a set of empty meanings, just like the structural patterns of a language. To know the grammar of literature is to know the conventional language by the literary conventions. "The semiological approach suggests, rather, that the poem be thought of as an utterance that has meaning only with respect to a system of conventions which the reader has assimilated", Culler (1975:6) says. A true literature syllabus will not be simply the use of literary texts for advanced language purposes, but it must also attempt to develop and extend literary competence. According to Culler (1975), the reader's implicit knowledge of the rules of the language is not enough to understand the literary meaning of the text. Without having any knowledge of structure, the interplay of event with event, exploitation of ideas and values, systems, literary conventions, the world outside literature itself and the relationships between any of these, the reader can not approach literary texts in an appropriate way. Culler calls all these 'literary competence' and goes on as follows:

Anyone lacking this knowledge, anyone wholly unacquainted with literature and unfamiliar with the conventions by which fictions are read, would, for example, be quite baffled if presented with a poem. His knowledge of the language would enable him to understand phrases and sentences, but he would not know, quite literally, what to make of this strange concatenation of phrases: He would be unable to read it as literature ... (p. 114) .

According to Rodger, literary competence includes personal communication awareness, language consciousness and implicit understanding as to how literary discourse works. Rodger (Brumfit:1983) reads:

Mother-tongue students of English literature who have been made aware of the principle of foregrounding and have been taught in such a way as to develop personal communication-awareness and language consciousness might be said to have acquired some measures of literary competence; the ability to read a work of literature by bringing into play the necessary presuppositions and

implicit understanding of how literary discourse works that tell them how to read and what to look for (p. 43).

From all we have seen, we can make out, in short, that literary competence is like communicative competence and it is based upon communicative competence, and that students can acquire literary competence.

### 3. Literature

'littera' is the root of 'literature' and it is a letter in Latin alphabet. Simply speaking, 'literature' means anything written, and in a more limited sense, it denotes literary productions of value as a whole because of their artistic qualities. However, literature, as an art, is the organization of words, oral or written, to give pleasure and instructions. It has two types: Imaginative and non-imaginative literature. Imaginative literature contains poems, plays, short stories and novels. Non-imaginative literature contains biographies, autobiographies, works of history, etc. In ELT classes, students are expected to have a good command of the target language, that is, a mastery of the four main skills and knowledge of culture, literature and history of the countries in which the native language is spoken natively. The first part deals with skills and the second deals with content. In ELT classes, literature has a role to play as reinforcement devices, because language is not separable from literature. Literature demonstrates language in use at its best. In this respect, Eagleson and Kramer (1976) state:

Since language is the medium of literature, then literature by its very nature is going to furnish us with evidence on the operation of language. If we are interested in grammatical structure, then we can find abundant data in literature, and not only of regular but also irregular patterns; ... Light can be thrown on meaning, on the extension of vocabulary and the structure of the vocabulary, on the processes of word formation, on changing attitudes to language forms and on the relation between the written and the spoken word (p. 40).

The etymology of "literature" suggests that it is derived from the Latin word "litera", which means "letter". Letters are to make words. Depending on this definition, Roger Rollin (1989) defines literature as "words, words, words". He in fact suggests that words are the essentials of literature. He goes on as follows:

To begin with, my basic assumption is that anything which may be termed "litera-*ture*" must of necessity be involved in some fundamental, some essential way, words for certain. Words are the "sine quo



non” of my ration of what literature is. And more precisely, words grammatically stung together into something like an oral narrative, a manuscript, a scenario, or a playscript, which means that the World Series, cannot be read as "literature" even though it is the subject of words and words are used to structure it (baseball regulations, the manager's daily line-ups etc.). For what is at the heart of the world series as a cultural phenomenon, the athletic contest itself, of necessity can only be a "script" that writes itself. "Text" it surely is, "literature" it can never be -until baseball's boards begin to sweep their melodious lyres. (p.3).

However, there have never been an exact and clear definition of literature. As a result of this, how to distinguish literature from non-literature has always been a problem, and thus, the meaning of 'literature' has varied from culture to culture and from period to period. In Unlacking the Text (1987) Jeremy Hawthorn shows how difficult it is to define literature in Johnson's reply to James Boswell:

Asked by James Boswell, "what is poetry?". Samuel Johnson replied, "why sir, it is much easier to say what it is not, we all know what light is; but it is not easy to tell what light is." (p.4).

While discussing semiotics in his book Semiotics and Interpretation, Robert Scholes (1982) cites literature as a word, not a thing. He points out that literature is a system of "repeatable and recoverable". He means that the thing called literature should be durable, that is, it should take the form of a written text, a recorded utterance, a roll of film or something transmitted orally like a saying, joke, myth, or epic poem. An epic poem or a joke does not have an identical text but a recognizable structure in different words. He points out this as follows:

The word "literature", I wish to argue, should be used to designate a certain body of repeatable or recoverable act of communication. Later on I shall elaborate on the "certain" part of the definition, which requires the exclusion of some repeatable or recoverable communicative acts from the literary category ... (pp. 17-18).

To understand what literature is we should know what its difference is from non-literature, and what properties distinguish it from non-literature. When we limit the term "literature" to the art of literature or the imaginative literature, we see that language is the material of literature. In other words, literature uses language in a particular way, but not in an ordinary way. So the answer to the

question "what is literary and what is not" lies mainly in the use of language, and in the fictionality and referential aspect of literary language. Since literature mainly uses the creative aspect of language, literary language generally deviates from the generally observed rules of language and language formation in different ways. The use of figures of speech, like paradox, ambiguity, the contextual change of meaning, the irrational association of grammatical categories usually distinguish literary use of language. Warren and Wellek (1977) point out the literary language and ordinary language as follows:

It is thus quantitatively that literary language is first of all to be differentiated from the varied uses of everyday. The resources of languages are exploited much more deliberately and systematically. In the work of a subjective poet; we have manifest a "personality" for more coherent and all-pervasive than that of persons as we see them in everyday situations. Certain types of poetry will use paradox, ambiguity, the contextual charge of meaning, even the irrational association of grammatical categories such as gender or tense, quite deliberately. Poetic language organizes, tightens, the resources of everyday language and sometimes even does violence to them in an effort to force us into awareness and attention (p. 24).

Warren and Wellek (1977) give some differences between Scientific Language and Literary Language. First of all, scientific language includes only thought but literary language contains emotion as well as thought. In scientific language, there is one-to-one correspondence; so it stays denotative while literary language tends to be connotative. In a scientific text, language is transparent, the sign directs the attention only to one referent. However, in literature, language is opaque, it becomes ambiguous because it may refer to several referents. Warren and Wellek (1977) go as follows:

Compared to scientific language, literary language will appear in some ways deficient. It abounds in ambiguities; like every other historical language, full of homonyms, arbitrary and emotional categories such as grammatical gender; it is permeated with historical accidents, memories, associations. In a word, it is highly "connotative". Moreover, literary language is far from merely referential. It has its expressive side; it conveys the tone and attitude of the speaker or writer. And it does not merely state and express what it says; it also wants to influence the attitude of the reader, persuade him, and ultimately change him. There is a further important distinction between literary

and scientific language; in the former, the sign itself, the sound symbolism of the word, is stressed. All kinds of techniques have been invented to draw attention to it, such as metre, alliteration, and patterns of sounds (p. 23).

Literary art is obviously found in the traditional genres of the lyric, the epic, the drama. In all these genres, the reference is to a world of imagination, of fiction. The expressions in a literary genre are not true, and they are not logical propositions. The statement to convey information about an actual happening in a literary genre is different from the statement to convey the same information in a history or sociology book. A character in a novel or in a play differs from a figure in real life. The character in a literary genre has no past, no future, and usually no continuity of life. The author creates the fictional character, the fictional actions and the fictional events. However, all these refer to a world of fiction and imagination. In this respect, Warren and Wellek (1977) say:

But the nature of literature emerges most clearly under the referential aspects. The centre of literary art is obviously to be found in the traditional genres of lyric, the epic, the drama. In all of them the reference is to a world of fiction, of imagination. The statements in a novel, in a poem, or in a drama are not literally true; they are not logical propositions, (p. 25)

While teaching literature in ELT classes, it is not enough to know the meaning of a work of art or the intention of its author. Without being aware of the literary tradition where that work is created, we can not fully analyse and understand it. The study of a work of art requires an awareness of the literary tradition in which it is created. In a work of art, tradition is a defining factor, and it is only through tradition that a work of art is similar to or different from another work of art. T.S. Eliot (1975) expresses his ideas in this respect as follows:

No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among dead, I mean this as a principle of aesthetic, not merely historical criticism. The necessity that he shall conform that he shall cohere, is not one sided; what happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all the works of art which preceded it. The existing monuments form an

ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them. The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the supervention of novelty, the whole existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered (pp. 38-39).

With regard to the literary tradition, Johnathan Culler (1975) stresses the importance of continuity between the present and the past. In this way he objects to the romantic definition of a work of art as an organic whole independent of the tradition. According to Culler, literature is a medium of communication formed of structural patterns, a set of empty meaning to be filled in during the creation and to be interpreted by the reader in terms of the set of empty meanings as well as in terms of the particular language used. Culler (1975) says:

To write a poem or a novel is immediately to engage with a literary tradition or at the very least with a certain idea of the poem or the novel. The activity is made possible by the existence of the genre, which the author can write against, certainly, whose conventions he may attempt to subvert, but 'every work' wrote Valery 'is the work of many things besides an author'; and he proposed that literary history be replaced by a poetics which would study 'the conditions of the existence and development of literature'. Among all the arts, it is 'the one in which convention plays the greatest role' (pp. 116-117).

T.S. Eliot, Wellek and Warren stress the importance of tradition and they define literary history as "a simultaneous order" of all the works of art which have been created up to now, rather than as "a series of works arranged in a chronological order" (Warren and Wellek: 1977:39). According to the perspectivist theory, a work of art is a perspective, and it is a new synthesis of values of the past and the present. It is an integral part of the literary tradition in which it is created. That's why it is similar to and different from the works of art of the same tradition. This theory of literary history has its basis in Bergson's Theory of Creative Evolutionism. According to this theory, life is in a state of flux and change, and it is in an increasing process of evolution. Any new epoch in the history of culture is the product of a privileged moment in an eternal present at which the past exists, directs the present, modifies the present and flows into a creative future. Bergson calls this process "a duree".

As regards literary history we have two approaches: Historicism or Relativism; and perspectivism. According to the theory of Historicism, any literary

phenomena can be explained in relation to their own context and antecedents. To understand and appreciate a work of art, we must go back to the time in which it was created. Since ideas, systems of values and views of life change in the course of time, each period has different critical standards. A writer writes according to the demands of his age. We can understand a literary work of the past age only when we are aware of the intention of the writer. This is the relativist theory, which claims that different historical periods have different values, and these values are disconnected. Warren and Wellek (1977) emphasize this view as follows:

At its finest, this conception of 'literary history' requires an effort of imagination, of empathy; of deep congeniality with a past age or a vanished taste. Successful efforts have been made to reconstruct the general outlook on life, the attitudes, conceptions, prejudices, and underlying assumptions of many civilizations. ... all supposed to be sharply set off from our time, living in a world of their own ( p. 41).

According to perspectivism, there is only a poetry and one literature, and they are comparable in all ages. A work of art is both eternal and 'historical'. While distinguishing Perspectivism from Relativism, Warren and Wellek (1977) observe that Relativism reduces the history of literature to a series of discrete and, hence, discontinuous fragments. They go on as follows:

We must rather adopt a view for which the term 'perspectivism' seems suitable. We must be able to refer a work of art to the values of its own time and of all the periods subsequent to its own. A work of art is both 'eternal' (i.e. preserves a certain identity) and 'historical' (i.e. passes through a process of traceable development). According to perspectivism, we recognize that there is one poetry, one literature, comparable in all ages, developing, changing, full of possibilities (p.43).

#### 4. Conclusion

Reading literary texts or any reading material written in English for only vocabulary acquisition or any other specific purpose is not the same as learning literary texts as literature. Reading comprehension in ELT classes is usually carried out through literature. Such a study, only conducted for reading comprehension or for enriching vocabulary, is confused with reading literature or evaluating literature as literature. A literary text goes beyond what it says literally. Thus, linguistic or grammatical structure should not be confused with literary structure.

In general, literary texts are used for **communicative skills**. Since language is the raw material of literature, some see literature as a documentary of linguistic elements to be studied in ELT classes. The uncertainty of using literature for developing the students' non-literary language consciousness of using literature for developing students' literary competence is still valid. Whether literature should be introduced to ELT classes after linguistic competence, after stylistic competence or after communicative competence is uncertain. According to Alex Rodger (1983), to introduce literature to ELT classes is only possible after students have communicative competence. Alex Rodger (1983) says:

To teach a language through literature is an absurd delusion. From all I have said up to this point, it must be obvious that wherever the literature to be studied is not in the student's mother tongue, they must already have a through-going proficiency in the use of that language (p. 43).

William Littlewood (Brumfit:1986) says that literature provides instances of language structures in use, but it can be misleading as a basis for instruction and practice in the language skills. It is certain that the students who have gained all the skills in non-literary language can not analyse literary language, and the language in a literary text does not always present so many instances of grammatical structures, and it can not be so suitable for exercises or drills.

In conclusion, it should be regarded that teaching non-literary texts or materials does not demand a special competence in literature. Linguistic competence should not be confused with literary competence. However, it should be known that the way to go to literary competence passes through linguistic competence. In the light of those discriminations, teaching literature in ELT classes will be more meaningful and productive.

## References

- Brumfit, Christopher J. (ed). 1983. *Teaching Literature Overseas: Language-Based Approaches*, ELT Document 115, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Brumfit, Christopher J. 1985. *Language And Literature Teaching: From Practice to Principle*, Pergamon Inst. of English, London.
- Brumfit, Christopher J. and Roland Carter. 1986. *Literature And Language Teaching*, Oxford: OUP

- Chomsky, Avram Noam. 1928. *Syntactic Structure*, The Hague:Mouton Company.
- Collie, Joanne and Stephen Slaler. 1988. *Literature In The anguage Classroom*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Crystal, David. 1980. *A First Dictionary of Linguistics And Phonetics*, London: Andre Deutch Limited.
- Crystal, David. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Culler, Jonathan. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics; Structuraliam, Linguistics And The Study of Literature*, London: Routhedge and Keagan Paul.
- Culler, Jonathan. 1982. *Literature And Linguistics In Interrelations of Literature*, eds: J. P. Barricelli and J. Gibaldi, New York: New York UP.
- Dinneen, Francis P. 1967. *An Introduction to General Linguistics*, USA: Holt, Rinehart And Wiston Inc.
- Eagleson, Robert and Leonie Kramer. 1976. *Language And Literature: A Synthesis*, London: Nelson.
- Eliot, Thomas Stearns. 1975. "Tradition And Individual Talent", *Selected Prose*, ed. Frank Kermode, London: Faber and Faber.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. 1987. *Unlocking The Text -Fundamental Issues In Literary Theory*, Suffolk: Richard Clay.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972. "Models of Interaction of Language and Social Life" In *Directions In Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Cummunication*, ed. J. J. Gumferz and D. Hymes, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Richards, A. 1950. *Practical Criticism*, New York.
- Roger, Alex. 1983. "Language For Literature" In *Teaching Literature Overseas: Language-Based Approaches*, ed. C. J. Brumfit, Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Rollin, Roger. 1989. "Words, Words, Words ..." On Redefining 'Literature' In *Journal of Popular Culture*, ed. Ray Browne.
- Scholes, Robert. 1982. *Semiotics And Interpretation*, New York: The Vail-Ballou Press.
- Wellek, Rene and Austin Warren. 1956, 1977. *Theory of Literature*, USA. Harcourt, Brace and World Inc.