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В учебном пособии рассматриваются основные проблемы лингвоконтактологии, известной за рубежом как теория World Englishes. Обсуждаются различные взгляды лингвистов на роль английского языка в современном мире, прогнозы, делаемые в отношении дальнейшего развития английского языка, дискутируются проблемы нормы, языкового стандарта, региональной вариантовности английского языка, последствий его контактов с другими языками и культурами, описываются девиации, характерные для тех региональных вариантов, с которыми нашим студентам, возможно, придется иметь дело, ставится вопрос об опосредованном переводе. Книга написана в полемической манере, обрисовывая проблемы и давая студентам сформировать свое собственное мнение на дискутируемые вопросы. Предлагаемые к обсуждению вопросы и задания дадут возможность использовать книгу на семинарах и практических занятиях, посвященных судьбе и роли английского языка в современном мире.

Предназначена для студентов гуманитарных специальностей, аспирантов, научных работников.
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This book by Professor Zoya Proshina is a milestone in the development and understanding of World Englishes (WE). She is not only familiar with the literature in this field but has also made a significant contribution to it. In this very significant book she writes of the fundamentals (the ABCs) of the WE paradigm and in an objective manner discusses the controversies involved with it.

There is no claim here that EVERYONE in the world speaks English for that is clearly NOT the case. It is clear however that English is the language most frequently used when people communicate across national/cultural borders. To be more accurate, it is recognized that there are multiple Englishes being used to communicate across these boundaries. That being the case, it is also acknowledged that information about these varieties as well as exposure to them is needed if we are to enhance our chances of success when attempting to communicate across cultures in English.

When tracing the roots of WE, most go back to two international, scholarly conferences which took place in 1978; one at the East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA (1-15 April), and the other at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA (30 June-2 July). These two conferences resulted in two publications: English for Cross-cultural Communication (Macmillan, London, 1981) edited by Larry E. Smith and The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures (University of Illinois Press 1982) edited by Braj B. Kachru.

These conferences and the two volumes marked a genuinely new phase in the study of English in the international context. In part, they raised issues which had earlier perhaps been glossed-over if not entirely ignored. In part, the reorientation in international and intranational terms provided new insights. Not least, problems previously suppressed were brought into the open through the growing confidence of the rapidly increasing numbers of non mother-tongue users of English. These conferences provided the impetus for a more realistic approach
and a new framework for looking at English in the global context, and for relating concepts such as appropriateness, acceptability, and intelligibility to the pragmatic factors which determine the users of English as an international and intranational language. That these conferences had a dynamic effect is evident from the many activities that have resulted during the last 30 years all over the world.

These conferences were milestones at the beginning of World Englishes. This book is a similar milestone in the development of the understanding of World Englishes in Russia. I predict similar effects.

World Englishes (WE) represents a new international perspective for what has been traditionally called ‘English Studies.’ This new perspective entails questioning the reverent dichotomies and reevaluating the ‘sacred cows’ in literature, language, and language teaching methodology. One might, for example ask how meaningful is the use of the term ‘English’ literature? Would it not be more appropriate to accept the notion of ‘literatures in English’ as a means of providing an identity for the Asian and African writers whose principal medium of creativity is English?

World Englishes is integrative in another sense too. Mother-tongue and non mother-tongue users of English are equal partners in deliberations on uses of English and its teaching internationally. English is thus a vehicle which may be used to share the vast Western and non-Western expertise and experience for the benefit of all users of English. This mutual sharing of ideas research and resources is reflected in the acronym WE. There is never meant to be an US vs. THEM.

This book by Prof. Proshina explains all of this clearly to everyone, but especially to Russian scholars and students for whom she has the utmost respect. There is nothing here to diminish the great Russian language and culture or to imply that they are somehow deficient. In fact, it is because of their immense value and importance that all means must be used to tell the world about them. It is obvious that by using the medium of English(es) information about Russia and Russians’ perspectives on world issues can be provided to internationals around the world. We will all benefit from such information.
Prof. Zoya Proshina deserves our admiration for the way she has presented these important issues about world Englishes. She deserves our gratitude for this volume which will stimulate the thinking of linguists, specialists in literature, English language teaching, curriculum planners and futurists.

Larry E. Smith, Executive Director
International Association for World Englishes
Honolulu, Hawaii November, 2007
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We are entering a phase of global English which is less glamorous, less news-worthy, and further from the leading edge of exciting ideas. It is the ‘implementation stage’, which will shape future identities, economies and cultures. The way this stage is managed could determine the futures of several generations.

(David Graddol)

Introduction

We happen to live in the era of “lingual revolution” (Кабакчи 2002) when one language has overcome all possible national borders and penetrated various domains of our life: business, media, education, culture, research and science, and many others. This language is English. It can be found in all continents and many countries. With this spread of English, we have realized that we live in a small world as this language linked so many ethnic cultures and made it possible for all peoples to know each other. That is why today’s English is labeled global, international, multi-ethnic, multicultural, language of wider communication, or world English. At the same time it is clear now that due to this plurality of actualizations, English has changed and has become diverse – so there appeared world Englishes.

A new linguistic paradigm, called World Englishes, came forward in the late 20th – early 21st centuries. While being established, it has caused so many disputes and debates among linguists all over the world. However, in Russia rather few scholars and educators have been engaged in these disputes, which might have had several reasons: on the one hand, this period almost coincided with the turning point in the history of Russia (perestroika) when scholars and teachers had to solve survival problems; on the other hand, shortage and even in many places lack of
sources resulted in the fact that this paradigm has not received adequate attention from Russian linguists and is even less known to students of English in Russia.

Meanwhile, independently from the mainstream of the WE paradigm, there have been some achievements, though not numerous, in this field of Russian linguistics. Linguistic interest of Soviet (at that time) researchers focused basically on the countries of the Inner Circle: Canadian English lexis was studied synchronically and diachronically (Попова 1978; Быховец 1988), Australian English was described in (Орлов 1978), and the comparison of British, American, Australian and Canadian phonetics (Шахбагова 1980, 1982, 1992) and semantics (Ощепкова 1989) was made. The New Zealand variety of English was also included in the research (Ощепкова 1989). Later V.V.Oschepkova devoted her energy to collecting culture-loaded words related to Australia and New Zealand. Her effort resulted in the Dictionary of Australia and New Zealand, a dictionary of the linguocultural series (Австралия и Новая Зеландия 1998). In 1999, at Moscow State Pedagogical University S.Pryadko defended his Candidate dissertation on the cultural component of Australian English lexicon (Прядко 1999).

Until recently next to nothing has been known about “new” Englishes of the Outer Circle, i.e. institutionalized Englishes functioning as second, official languages or, the more so, about Englishes used as performative varieties, or EFL in countries of the Expanding Circle. One of the first significant works – “English in Developing Countries: Problems of Sociocultural Varying” – was a Doctoral dissertation by O. Semenets defended in Kiev in 1985 (Семенец 1985). Another dissertation of Candidate of Philology was defended also in Kiev in 1990 by Yu. Knurov (Кнуров 1990). This work presented the research on English functioning in Ethiopia. In 2000, a book on divergence and convergence of regional varieties of modern English was written by R. Kritsberg and published at Kiev Linguistic University (Крицберг 2000). The traditions of studying African Englishes are continued at Pyatigorsk Linguistic University where in 2002 E.Krainyuchenko (Крайнюченко 2002) defended her Candidate dissertation on
contrastive analysis of the English language transformation in South Africa. In 2004 at St.Petersburg Pedagogical University, another Candidate dissertation - on Ghanaian English - was defended by N.Siaka (Сиака 2004).

Moscow linguists also lay emphasis on the idea of diversity of Englishes. In 1998, the disciples of Professor O. Akhmanova, supported by David Crystal, published a collection of articles on Word Englishes (World Englishes 1998). In May 2001, Moscow State University hosted the international conference “Global English for Global Understanding” which proved to be a landmark in Russian linguistics. That conference highlighted very important issues of World Englishes, interaction of cultures and global understanding, glocalization of Business English teaching, raise of cross-cultural awareness, cultural aspects of the language; varieties of English and English teaching materials and many others. The conference had a great impact on English language teaching in Russia. It stressed the problem of World Englishes as a key issue. The Moscow conference was followed by the Saratov international conference “English Unites the World: Diversity within Unity” held by the Russian National Association of Teachers of English in January 2002, and in 2004 the Pan-Asian Consortium and Far Eastern English Language Teachers’ Association (FEELTA) held the 5th international conference in Vladivostok where Larry Smith drew attention of Russian educators to the topical issue of Asian Englishes and intercultural intelligibility in the region.

Four years earlier, in 2000, FEELTA held the conference “People, Languages and Cultures in the Third Millenium”. At this conference the concept of Far Eastern English was substantiated, meaning use of English in the Asian setting (Proshina 2000). That conference was a turn of Russian linguists to the interaction of Asian languages and English and the role of this interaction for Russian communicators in English Several dissertations on localized Englishes (Завьялова 2001; Прошина 2001; Богаченко 2003; Колывчева 2004; Крыкова 2004; Уютова 2004; Ильина 2005; Лупачева 2005; Пивоварова 2005; Сычева 2005; Ревенко 2006) have been defended, with many more still in progress. The defended dissertations were dedicated to the role of English in communication between East Asian and
Russian people; Asian accents in English, role of English in Russia, and history of Asian borrowed words in English.


The question of Russian English as a variety of world Englishes was not raised until 1987 when V.V. Kabakchi defended his Doctoral dissertation “The English Language for Intercultural Communication” in Saint Petersburg (Кабакчи 1987). In his dissertation and later in his books Prof. Kabakchi argues that translating Russian culture into English is a serious field of linguistics and Foreign Language pedagogy. It should be specially investigated and taught. Luckily, Prof. Kabakchi is not alone in his theory and practice. School of Foreign Languages at Moscow State University recently offered a new major to their students – Russian Studies in English. This can be considered as a great step forward in theory and practice – English as a global language will become a vehicle of our ethnic identity abroad, and we must work hard to facilitate this mission.
This textbook is aimed to raise awareness among students regarding this tool of communication, to foster the appreciation for world Englishes, to prepare future interlocutors to speaking with non-native speakers who come from countries neighboring with Russia. I deliberately restricted the target area of Englishes described in this book (excluding, for instance, African Englishes because Russian speakers in English do not have to deal with these varieties often). So the object of this textbook is the fundamental ideas and controversies, debatable a lot, about the main theoretical issues and their application to the practice of teaching and translating, as well as the description of the Englishes a Russian person faces frequently.

1. **Triumph vs Scepticism**

   Ключевые слова: распространение английского языка, язык и культура, глобальный английский язык, власть; колониальная история; информация; господствующий язык; гегемония; лингвистический империализм; лингвицизм; фрагментация; денационализация языка; культурное обогащение; межкультурная коммуникация; гибридность, реалии, заимствование, суперстрат, субстрат, этимология

   In the early 1960s, the world community, all of a sudden, realized that the worldwide spread of English, in its various functions, has become unprecedented. Now English is heard and read on all the seven continents. It is spoken approximately by 1.5 billion people (Crystal 1997: 5) and in the next 10-15 years is expected to be used by around 2 billion (Graddol 2006: 14). It is one of the official
languages of the United Nations Organization, UNESCO, World Health Organization (WHO), Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), European Council, NATO, Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC), European Free Trade Association (EFTA), and many other international bodies. By the end of the 20th century, 85% of the international organizations in the world made official use of English (Crystal 1997: 79). English is the language of sea navigation and air control. In order to conduct transnational deals and negotiations, businesses use English as a global language.

“Globalization means that more and more activities which used to be carried on at a national or local level (business, academic publishing, politics, military cooperation, and many others) are now carried on at an international level and require the use of link languages” (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 194).

English is also preferred in commerce and advertising. In the most fashionable street of Stockholm, for example, well over 80% of the shops have English names (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 6).

English has become a language of science and information. Over 2/3 of scholars present their findings in English. In Germany, 98% of scientists write their works in English (Lockwood 1998: 16). As the global academic language English facilitates the international mobility of researchers.

“Higher education is becoming globalized alongside the economy, and English is proving to be a key ingredient – partly because universities in the English-speaking world dominate the global league tables, and partly because English is proving popular as a means of internationalizing both the student community and teaching staff” (Graddol 2006: 73)
In 2003-04, 1500 Master’s programs were offered in English in countries where English is not the first language (e.g., Germany, Rumania). There are joint programs (like Russian-American Department at Far Eastern National University) in a number of universities providing their courses in English. E-Learning is becoming more and more popular facilitating the growth of transnational English-language students.

More than 80% of the web information can be found in English\(^1\) (Crystal 2001: 217) though the dominance of the language on the internet is now declining and in 2005 the percentage of English on the Internet was only 32% (Graddol 2006: 44).

According to the UNESCO, 28% of the world books are published in English (Lockwood 1998: 17-18). 60% of translations that come out of press in Europe are of works originally written in British or American English (Hale 1998: 190) and if we add to this the so called “contact literature,” i.e. literature written in English in other countries (Singapore, South Africa, India, a.o.), to say nothing of Australian, New Zealand, and Canadian Englishes, the percentage will increase considerably.

Mass media has a great role in diffusing English all over the world. English language news providers such as Associated Press (AP), Reuters, the BBC, and CNN can be reached in any part of the world. Al Jazeera has established its regional headquarters in London, Washington, and Kuala Lumpur to become one of the major Arab English-broadcasting news agencies. In 2005 Russia launched 24-hour English-language TV channel funded by the government. Germany’s Deutsche Welle broadcasts both in German and English and France also launched a new global bilingual channel following the model of Germany. (Graddol 2006: 47) \(\frac{3}{4}\) of the international correspondence is carried on in English (Alatis & Straehle 1997: 3).

An astounding number of English users can be found in Asia. Just one very impressive fact: English-speaking people in China overwhelmingly outnumber

---

\(^1\) David Crystal echoes Jim Erickson’s story (1998), heard from Al Gore, about the eight-year-old son of Kyrgyzstan’s President Akayev, who told his father that he had to learn English. When asked why, the boy replied: “Because the computer speaks English.” (Crystal 2001: 216) Indeed, out of the mouths of babes comes truth.
English speakers in the U.S.A. Today, much more people speak English for various purposes in Asia than the combined population of the United States, Britain, Canada, and Australia where English is a native tongue for many citizens (Honna 2005: 107). In Asia and the Pacific, about 90% of international bodies carry on their proceedings entirely in English (Crystal 1997: 80). No wonder that in 1996 at a conference held in the Philippines, English was proclaimed as an Asian language (English Is an Asian Language 1997), i.e. not only the language that is used in Asia, but the language of Asia (Kachru B. 1997a: 1).

“I have chosen the title ‘English as an Asian language’ to alter the focus of our ongoing debate on this linguistic icon. The English language is generally discussed as a language that is in Asia, but not of Asia. And this perception raises challenging questions about the immigrant status of a language and the rights of a language naturalization. I believe that answers to these questions are important, particularly for linguistically and culturally pluralistic Asian societies. And so far as English is considered, these questions are not less important for societies that have traditionally considered themselves, linguistically and culturally, homogeneous.” (Kachru B. 1997a: 1)

Speaking on the key trends of language development, Graddol (2006: 15) highlights the fact that Asia, especially China and India, will determine the future of global English.

The global expansion of English is not at all unexpected as it might seem. There are certain reasons for that, which can be categorized as:

1. historical;
2. political and economic;
3. informational;
4. cultural;
5. linguistic.
Historical reasons relate to the British Empire’s colonial past. The language of the metropolis was transferred to and accepted by its colonies. In the late 15\textsuperscript{th} century (1496-1497) the English language was established in Newfoundland. In the mid-16\textsuperscript{th} century (1541) Ireland was conquered. In the 16-17\textsuperscript{th} centuries America started speaking English, followed in the 17-18\textsuperscript{th} centuries by Canada, Australia, India, the Caribbean, Bahamas, Barbados. In the 17-19\textsuperscript{th} centuries English went to Asia: India, Hong Kong, Singapore, Ceylon, Malay, Afghanistan. In the 18-19\textsuperscript{th} centuries it settled down in New Zealand, and in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century it expanded in Egypt, Sudan, South Africa, Rhodesia (Zambia and Zimbabwe), Lesotho, Botswana, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Malawi, Sierra-Leone, Swaziland, Tanzania, Libya, Uganda, Namibia, and Tanzania. The 20\textsuperscript{th} century saw arrival of English in Iraq. As a result, in the 1920s, $\frac{1}{4}$ of the world map was English-speaking.

![The spread of English as L1 and L2.](image)

The colonial English was not the Queen’s English, since those who were mainly responsible for the English language spread were mostly people who did not use Standard English. They were not well educated sailors, traders, people of working-class origins, Scottish schoolteachers in colonies, missionaries from continental Europe, craftsmen looking for a better life overseas, soldiers, even convicts (Mesthrie 2006: 278-286). Given the influence of local languages that were in contact with English and the specificity of English that was brought to former colonies, features of the varieties of English that were raised outside Great Britain are different from the characteristics of British English.
Today, as ever, policy and economy of powerful English-speaking countries have a significant impact on the spread of the language.

“A language becomes an international language for one chief reason: the political power of its people – especially their military power. ... By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Britain had become the world’s leading industrial and trading country. By the end of the century, the population of the USA (then approaching 100 million) was larger than that of any of the countries of western Europe, and its economy was the most productive and the fastest growing in the world. British political imperialism had sent English around the globe, during the nineteenth century, so that it was a language ‘on which the sun never sets’. During the twentieth century, this world presence was maintained and promoted, almost single-handedly, through the economic supremacy of the new American superpower. And the language behind the US dollar was English.” (Crystal 1997: 7-8)

Economic support of the powerful countries is accompanied by the language promotion. Growth of transnational business results in establishing English as a language for international communication. The USA and Great Britain promote learning and teaching English through ELT materials, which proves to be a huge market industry in the contemporary world; through grants stimulating studies in their countries, through mass media, movies, computer games, and pop culture music. There are government agencies (e.g., United States Information Agency, or USIA, the Peace Corps, and the British Council), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), like TESOL and IATEFL, various private foundations (Fulbright, Kennan, Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, a.o) that by providing aid to other countries, their institutions, and citizens, diffuse the English language as it is the working language of these organizations.
In many countries, including Russia, knowing English is generally of great advantage for job applicants who can fill prestigious, well-paid vacancies. Sometimes the requirement for candidates to know English is ridiculous (as can be seen in the job ad in Fig. 2, for neither a manager responsible for selling diesel engines nor a head of department for training crane operators are likely to use English in their professional activities). However, to emphasize prestigiousness of the company, its directors include “excellent command” of English in a set of requirements.

The onrush of scientific and technological revolution, with its computerization, development of the Internet global village, academic exchanges, and research publications, requires a single language that will be able to disseminate and exchange information over the globe and will be understood in every part of the world. It is the English language that has become the language of information management (Kaplan 1987) and the “communications revolution” (Graddol 2006: 42).

English is the language of international air traffic and maritime control and is currently developing its role in international emergency services and policing. It is the leading language of international tourism (Crystal 1995: 106).

From the very beginning, the spread of English implied the spread of Anglophone (metropolis) cultures. Colonizers imposed their culture on new territories changing people’s tastes and habits. Even now via commercials, movies, TV programs, and recordings, English has been transplanting Anglo-,
American values in various cultures facilitating “homogenization of world culture” (Pennycook 2003: 516).

“The impact of the hegemony of English is not limited only to languages and communication, but its influence extends to cultural domains. As symbolized by expressions such as ‘Coca Colanization’ and ‘McDonaldization’, Americanization of global culture is happening today. There is no doubt that the United States is in a position to create, change, and control culture, information, and communication of the world to their own liking, because they are the exporter of American-made cultural commodities, such as Hollywood movies, rock and roll music, videos, McDonald’s hamburgers, Coca Cola, and so on and so forth, all of which are increasingly becoming the major components of contemporary everyday life, especially of young generation.” (Tsuda 1997: 23-24)

These culture changes would have been impossible had the people from non-English-speaking countries not perceived them as innovative, modern, and prestigious. Today, for example, movies filmed in English get more recognition internationally than those in the original languages (Martin 2006: 586). Taking into consideration a fact that today’s youth can be characterized as a ‘video’ generation, we should not be surprised that they are attracted to a huge variety of music and video production bringing English in their rooms and having impact on their own pop-culture (see, for example, Stanlaw 2004: 101-126).

But there is the other side of the coin. Today the spread of English is motivated by the desire of various ethnicities to expose their own culture to a language that will reach an international audience. Since a language of global use is English, it is chosen for promoting national cultures. In fact, without knowing Chinese or Korean, we are able to read about the Chinese and Korean cultures in English. A minority ethnicity of Tuwa hopes to make the unique Tuwa culture
known in the world with the help of an English dictionary of Tuwa culture being compiled by a young Tuwa scholar Ulana Kuznetsova (2005).

Linguistically, English is prepared to express other cultures by borrowing culture-loaded words. With a considerable Romance superstratum on Germanic substratum, English is etymologically predispositioned to borrowing from foreign languages – the feature called “hybridity and permeability” (Yano 2001: 120). “English has done substantial pick-pocketing from other languages…” (Kachru B. 1986: 91, 131). On having an option of a foreign language, many learners choose English believing that its morphology is much easier as it has few inflectional endings. The truth of the latter reason is doubtful, for any language compensates simplicity in one level by complexity in another level (in this regard, English has very intricate prepositional syntactical complexes, which present serious difficulties for English learners).

The attitude to the spread of English is not simple. Global English is considered to be detrimental on the one hand and beneficial on the other. Scholars appear to be split into two opposing groups that might be labeled as “skeptics” and “triumphalists”.

“Skeptics” argue that the increased dominance of English threatens other languages and cultures. Global English kills minority languages, which die out with the rate of one language per two weeks (Cunningham 2001: 4). Taking this into account, linguists suggest that about 80 % of the world’s 6,000 or so living languages will disappear within the next century (Crystal 1997: 17). Some critics claim that the hegemony of English leads to “inequality between the speakers of other languages, the use of World Englishes may generate the hierarchical structure among different varieties of English, probably with American or British variety at the top of that hierarchy” (Tsuda 1997: 25-26). The dominance of English is believed to lead to “communicative inequality in international communication,” “cultural domination,” and “the colonization of the mind” (Tsuda 1997: 23). Communicative inequality means “repressing the speakers other than English from articulating their voices. Whenever English is used as a common
language in international communication, the non-English speakers become deaf and mute, unless they master English or interpreters translate for them” (Tsuda 1997: 23). Cultural domination is seen in Americanization of cultures, which brings about not only changes in everyday life, but also changes in people’s tastes and consciousness, gravitating toward the Western consumption-centered way of life. The colonization of the mind implicates a speaker’s identifying with English, dissociating from one’s own language, stigmatizing and devaluing one’s own culture (Tsuda 1997: 24-25). Anglophone cultures have promoted English throughout the world to protect their economic and political interests (Pennycook 1994: 22). Besides, English stimulates social inequality. It has become the language of the elite and power. Access to English education has become a means for distributing wealth and social benefits. English is compared with a doorman regulating the immigration flow to well-developed countries. Given all these considerations, Robert Phillipson (1992) accused English of “linguistic imperialism” and ‘linguicism’.

“A working definition of English linguistic imperialism is that the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages. Here structural refers broadly to material properties (for example, attitudes, pedagogic principles). English linguistic imperialism is one example of linguicism, which is defined as ‘ideologies, structures, and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language’... The structural and cultural inequalities ensure the continued allocation of more material resources to English than to other languages and benefit those who are proficient in English.” (Phillipson 1997: 47)
Expansion can be dreadful to the English language itself. There is a prognostication that English will follow the fate of Latin – it will fragment into separate languages and thus will disappear (Graddol 1999). As we all know, predictions can be so unreliable and inaccurate. Only history gives a definite answer. Anyway, there are serious contradictions to this prognostic theory (Crystal 1997: 134-139), one of which is that there will certainly arise a new form of English, World Standard Spoken English, along with written standard English, that will be mutually intelligible. People will become multidialectal, or multilingual, using one variety of English within their own country, and standard English in international communication. (Crystal 1997: 137)

The position of triumphalism is shared by many linguists who support the idea of pluricentricity of Englishes (Kachru B. 1981, 1986, 2006; Smith L. 1983, 2007; Crystal 1997; Kirkpatrick 1998/2006; McArthur 2002; Bolton 2003; Jenkins 2003; Melchers & Shaw 2003; Honna 2005; Kachru Y. & Nelson C. 2006; McKay 2002). These linguists believe that the spread of English is “natural, neutral, and beneficial” (Pennycook 1994). It is natural since the increased international communication is easier when one and the same language is used by speakers from various countries.

“When the amount of information needing to be processed came to exceed human capabilities, the computer appeared on the scene, transforming the process of planning and calculation. When the need for global communication came to exceed the limits set by language barriers, the spread of English accelerated, transforming existing patterns of international communication.” (Ferguson 1982: xv-xvi)

Due to a number of reasons, English happens to be this very language of international communication. Its spread “is inevitable in the age of cross-cultural contact” (Kirkpatrick 1998/2006: 344). It is a neutral language in the context of
multi-ethnic hostility. It is able to make relative peace in a multilingual country with struggling national languages, as it happened, for example, in India.

“Thus, one important aspect of English in South Asia is its capacity to provide neutralization. Choosing a given code in a multilingual context asserts one or more identities, for example, of religion, caste, and educational attainment, in addition to signaling the message. Since English is outside the traditional array of codes, it is released from these responsibilities.” (Kachru Y. & Nelson C. 2006: 156)

In 1956 in Sri Lanka, English was replaced by Sinhalese and Tamil as official languages. After the years of civil war, the Sri Lankan government concluded that the loss of English as a neutral language common to both Sinhalese and Tamils, contributed to worsening relations between them. Therefore, the government reintroduced English as an official language. (Alatis, Straehle 1997: 5-6)

Sometimes, when speaking about the neutrality of English, scholars suggest that it can keep away from its native culture and become a neutral, “deculturized” means of communication. The Japanese linguist Suzuki suggested a new name for this type of linguistic formation – Englic – not relating to the culture and language of native speakers (Kubota 1998: 300). Based on the principle of ethnic neutrality, English is considered to be denationalized, void of ethnical culture specifics (Грейдина 2001: 127). However, this thesis is questionable. Language is a vehicle for culture. They are inextricable. Transplanted to other cultures, English has broadened its cultural framework – today it can express not only its primary (British) culture but also practically any culture of the world. It has become a transcultural language, or a language of intercultural communication (Кабакчи 1993, 1998) that disseminates various cultures all over the world.

The spread of English is beneficial for all peoples because it is based on a mutually equal and cooperative principle. English is less and less regarded as a Western language, and “its development is less and less determined by the usage of
its native speakers” (Ferguson 1982: xvi). By spreading various cultures, English enriches people who get to know more and more about other communities and countries. At the same time, knowing and understanding other cultures results in greater tolerance among ethnicities. Global English facilitates people’s mobility, provides for international business and tourism. As S.G.Ter-Minasova points out, lack of a global language impedes the humanity integration to solve problems common to all mankind (Тер-Минасова 2007: 242). In this respect, English is seen a deliverance from the Babylonian curse.

Questions to discuss:

1. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.

2. What is the role of English in your city? In what spheres can we find it?

3. Comment on the factors that influenced the spread of English. Which of the factors seems most prominent to you? Why?

4. Do you agree with the linguist Max Weintreich’s words that “a language is a dialect with an army and a navy”? Give your grounds.

5. What are the “benefits” and “costs” (Graddol 2006: 109) of the spread of English?

6. What is the reason to say that English hastens death of minority languages? What minority languages in your region do you know? What is their situation now?

7. Do you believe that English as a worldwide language can help to preserve ethnic cultures? Give your reasons.

8. Suggest arguments to substantiate two controversial opinions:
   a) English is denationalized.
   b) English is culturally enriched.

9. Discuss the following table of the estimated ranking of languages (Graddol 2006: 62). What forecast can be made based on the data presented in the table?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Native speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Looking at the map (Fig.1) what can you say about the areas and countries English is spread as L1 and L2?

2. Monocentrism vs. Pluricentrism

Ключевые слова: вариант; три концентрических круга, Внутренний круг, Внешний круг, Расширяющийся круг; английский как родной язык, английский как второй язык, английский как иностранный язык, английский как язык-посредник, английский как международный язык, трансплантированный английский язык, новые варианты английского языка, мировые варианты английского языка, вспомогательный язык, дополнительный язык, официальный язык, институционализированный вариант, деятельностный вариант, родной язык, связывающий язык, моноцентрический, плuriцентрический, разнообразие, англоязычные страны, интерперсональная функция, инструментальная функция, регуляторная функция, творческая функция, двузычный, широта распространения английского языка, глубина распространения английского
The spread of the English language in the world and the rise of its diverse varieties required some categorization of these varieties. The best-cited categorization was done by Braj Kachru and is known as the Theory of Three Concentric Circles of World Englishes, or simply the Three Circles (Kachru B. 1985: 11-30).

The ideas of world Englishes were prompted to B.Kachru by his teacher, J.R.Firth. In one of his lectures in the 1950s, Firth pointed out that

“...English is an international language in the Commonwealth, the Colonies and in America. International in the sense that English serves the American way of life and might be called American, it serves the Indian way of life and has recently been declared an Indian language within the framework of the federal constitution. In another sense, it is international not only in Europe but in Asia and Africa, and serves various African ways of life and is increasingly the all-Asian language of politics.” (Firth 1956 / 2006: 204)

It was brave of Firth to reject the monocentric idea of English at that time. But though the idea was formulated in the 1950s, it took a long time and great courage of Braj Kachru to insist on equality of diverse Englishes, and his native Indian English in particular.

Kachru visualized diversity of Englishes as three concentric circles and classified all the varieties into three groups, each group pertaining to a certain circle.
“The spread of English may be viewed in terms of three concentric circles representing the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages. I have tentatively labeled these: the inner circle, the outer circle (or extended circle), and the expanding circle.” (Kachru B. 1985/2006: 242)

Schematically, the three circles look in the following way (Kachru B. 1997: 213)

![Three Concentric Circles of Englishes](image)

Fig. 3. Kachru’s Three Circle Model of English Spread

The Inner Circle is represented by the countries where English is a native language (ENL) – Great Britain, the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Sometimes these countries are labeled as BANA countries (Britain, Australia with New Zealand, and North America) (Hollliday 2005: 2-3). In terms of functions, English is the domineering, if not the only official, language implementing all sorts of functions in these countries.

The Outer Circle countries include former colonies where English was transplanted in non-native cultural contexts. These are New Englishes (Platt, Weber, Lian 1984), contrasted to Old Englishes of the Inner Circle. In their countries they function as an official language together with one or more vernacular languages, so the speakers of English are mostly bilingual in these
countries. Since English as an official language plays a very important role in the language policy of these countries, it is institutionalized, i.e. supported by the state institutions. It functions in government, legal system (regulative function), religion, trade and commerce, business, and is a medium of education. It also has an interpersonal function within the country. It has developed nativized literary traditions in different genres (novels, short stories, drama, and poetry), which is termed a creative, or imaginative, or innovative function. “In other words, English has an extended functional range in a variety of social, educational, administrative, and literary domains. It also has acquired great depth in terms of users at different levels of society” (Kachru B. 1985/2006: 243). In educational terms, Outer Circle schools have English as a second language (ESL). The universities offer practically all classes in English. A distinctive feature of the Englishes of the Outer Circle is that they are used as auxiliary languages, i.e. languages, other than the first language, which are used for internal communication by nationals of the country (Smith L. 1983a: 1).

The Expanding Circle includes countries with restricted range of English functions. Primarily, here English is used for international communication rather than in domestic context. However, the impact of Englishes is increasing and is seen in advertising, media, pop culture, science and education where it is more often just a discipline, English as a Foreign Language (EFL), rather than an instrument or tool of education. Since it is the language for international purposes mostly, it is now labeled as English as a Lingua Franca\(^2\), or ELF (Jenkins 2003, 2004) meaning that it serves as a link language (lingua franca in a broad meaning of the word)\(^3\). English as an International Language (EIL) is another term that is currently in use for English in the Expanding Circle (Smith L. 1983b; Jenkins 2000, 2003). Unlike the institutionalized varieties of the Outer Circle, the Englishes of the Expanding Circle are termed performance varieties (Kachru B. 1983).

---

\(^2\) The term ‘foreign’ is currently avoided in linguistics and intercultural studies due to its negative connotation (‘alien,’ ‘odd’, ‘frightening’)

\(^3\) In its original sense, the term *lingua franca* referred to the jargon of the maritime contacts of Arabs with Europeans. Then it meant the language of commerce in the Adriatic sea. It was a primitive language without much individual variation. Today the term is redefined and it lacks its original connotations (Kachru 1996: 906-907)
1983: 75) because in this case we are dealing with the performance level of educated speakers (Smith L. 1983c: 15). As this language is acquired by speakers additionally to their native one, it is called an additional language (Honna 2005: 105; Hilgendorf 2007: 144).

There are no clear demarcation lines between the circles as “the status of English in the language policies of such countries changes from time to time” (Kachru B. 1985/2006: 243). For example, Irish and South African Englishes are sometimes claimed to refer to the Inner Circle, rather than the Outer Circle. Scandinavian countries are said to be “moving into the ESL territory by internalizing and nativizing English” (Yano 2001: 124). In 2002, Japan attempted to legalize English as an official language but failed. There is a prediction that the 21st century will find the greatest numbers of speakers in the Outer Circle (Pakir 1999: 108)

All the circles are united by world Englishes, “an umbrella label” (Bolton 2006b: 240) relating to all varieties of the language, national and local. When functioning in a local, non-native context, English and a native language interact. This interaction is a two-way street: English influences a vernacular by Englishizing it (cf. a lot of English words in Russian), while a local language provides culture-loaded words and other innovations that are borrowed by English, the process called nativization of English. “The degrees of nativization of a variety of English are related to two factors: the range and depth of the functions of English in a non-native context, and the period for which the society has been exposed to bilingualism in English. The greater the number of functions and the longer the period, the more nativized is the variety. The nativization has two manifestations, cultural and linguistic, with ‘cultural’ here referring to the acculturation of English. The result is that, both culturally and formally, the English language comes closer to the sociocultural context of what may be termed the adopted ‘context of situation’. This new,
changed ‘context of situation’ contributes to the deviations from what originally might have been a linguistic ‘norm’ or ‘model’. (Kachru B. 1983: 78)

Since today’s English manifests both global and local features while serving both global and local needs, it is sometimes called a glocal language:

“The term ‘glocal,’ derived from the words ‘global’ and ‘local,’ indicates that one has to be open to new ideas and yet to be embedded in one’s own culture. Today, the clarion call is ‘think globally, act locally.’ “ (Pakir 2001/2006: 192)

The term ‘glocal’ means that as a global language English supports its local users and their specific functions for the language (Pakir 2001: 84). By bringing a country into the global community and having an international status of a global spread, English is used to express ethnic culture and ethnic identity. Being rooted in the local contexts, English gets enriched from other languages and cultures. Thus to describe our history, everyday life or culture, we, Russians, use Russian culture-loaded words like samovar, gzhel, kommunalka, perestroika that become known to other countries as well. Borrowing non-Anglophone culture-loaded words, English spreads them throughout the world, making them international. This, for example, happened to Japanese words like karaoke (cf. караоке по-русски), karate, geisha, bonsai a.o., now known in every country. When becoming international, these words are used as a basis for deriving new words and collocations: karaoke-bar, karaoke bus/taxi, karaoke machine. Employed by many other nations, these words still retain their ethnic flavor, which causes the antinomy of national vs. international. But though they have still preserved their ethnic connotation, they have become international or used world-wide (e.g., the world community has been so much scared and infuriated by the actions of Arab kamikaze since the tragic days of September 11 – the word kamikaze is of Japanese
This spread of nationally-colored words all over the world may be called language glocalization. Glocalization proves once and again that we are living in a small world – what is happening in one part of it effects other nations and countries. Words specific to one culture become known to and used by people of other cultures.

Thus from a monocentric language, with British as its primary center, English has turned to be pluricentric, with many centers and many cultures.

In this respect, another question may arise: what is the difference between the terms ‘variety,’ ‘dialect,’ and ‘language’? It is well known that many languages are not homogenous and may have several dialects. Can this be interpreted as pluricentrism? On the other hand, there have been attempts to separate English varieties into independent languages, like American language (Menchen 1919) or Spanglish, a New American Language (Stavans 2003). What are the criteria that differentiate the three concepts?

A really insightful differentiation has been suggested by Henry Widdowson (1997). He pointed out that there are two main features that differ dialects from varieties: historical development and dependency. A dialect is “a variation which has a pedigree in that it has also developed as change over periods of time” (Widdowson 1997: 141) not far from its ancestral home. Dialects of the same language have a common history. They evolved in a long period of time and developed concurrently within the same larger community, whereas varieties “have sprung up in a relatively extempore and expedient way in response to the immediate communicative needs of people in different communities with quite different ancestors” (Widdowson 1997: 141). As a rule, dialects are older than the standardized form of the language; therefore, they are seen as reflexes of a historical development (Bussmann 1996: 125). The history of a variety development is different. Varieties of the Inner Circle and most of varieties of the Outer Circle have started from primary British English, with some varieties having a tertiary relation to British English (through American English). The same is true about varieties of the Expanding Circle. They have developed in far flung regions,
while dialects have a proximity regional distribution (this geographical criterion can be added to the parameters singled out by Widdowson). The criterion of dependence implies a certain hierarchy with a standardized language: “a dialect presupposes a language it is a dialect of”, while varieties are independent, “in their own right” (Widdowson 1997: 141). In the long run, varieties can happen to end in converting into distinct languages - D.Graddol and D.Crystal warned us about this possible fragmentation (see Chapter 1).

Though varieties of English are “incipient languages” (Widdowson 1997: 141), they are not proper languages yet.

“A particular virtual language gets variously actualized over a period by communities adapting it to their changing needs. If these communities have reason to assert their own independent identity, they will gradually generate their own norms dissociated from previous coding conventions. They will be oriented inwards rather than outwards, and their actual language then ceases to be exonormative as a dialect and becomes endonormative as a separate language. And once a community invests its separate social identity in its language in this way, conditions are naturally created for it to become different as a virtual resource. Once a new linguistic species has been brought into being, so to speak, it becomes increasingly distinctive under its own momentum. The change in psycho-sociological attitude to the language triggers off linguistic change. So it is that varieties evolve into autonomous languages ultimately to the point of mutual unintelligibility.” (Widdowson 1997: 142)

So mutual intelligibility and social acceptability is what differs languages from varieties.

Thus, dialects are representations of a monocentric language and variants cause the pluricentricity of a language.
Questions to discuss:

11. Fill out the following table that shows the applicability of the three criteria to the three circles of the Kachruvian theory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions:</th>
<th>Inner Circle</th>
<th>Outer Circle</th>
<th>Expanding Circle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Users:           |              |              |                  |
| Native           |              |              |                  |
| Ambilingual<sup>4</sup> non-native |              |              |                  |
| Additional non-native |              |              |                  |

| Patterns of acquisition |              |              |                  |
| ENL                    |              |              |                  |
| ESL                    |              |              |                  |
| IFL/ILF/EIL            |              |              |                  |

Compare the content of your table with that of your partner and discuss it (in pairs)

12. What is the difference between range and depth of English? How can you characterize range and depth of English in Russia?

13. What is understood by “acculturation of English”? Give examples.

14. Give examples of Englishization of the Russian language. What is your attitude to this process? Is it inevitable?

15. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.

<sup>4</sup> Ambilingual means ‘with equal competence in two languages’
3. Endonorms vs Exonorms

Language standards, or norms,⁵ signify prescriptive rules of appropriateness. They are selected, codified, accepted, and capable to perform a wide range of functions (Семенюк 1990: 337; Jenkins 2003: 29-30). A standard variety of a language, based on educated speech, has the highest status in a community. It is used in the news media and in literature, described in dictionaries and grammars, and taught in schools (Richards, Platt & Platt 1992: 351). However, standards are not absolute and rigid but are subject to gradual change because a living language is dynamic. This dynamism of standards can be observed nowadays in the paradigm of WE.

Though the British Received Pronunciation (RP) and the General American standard (GA) are distinguished mainly in phonetics, Peter Trudgill and Jean Hannah argue that “(t)he term Standard English refers to grammar and vocabulary (dialect) but not to pronunciation (accent)” (Trudgill & Hannah 1994: 1). This thesis is very important for defining varieties of English.


1. authoritative codification, which entails a recognized codification agency (like Academie Francaise for French). The English language has no such authoritative agency.

2. sociological (attitudinal) codification, which means broad recognition;

⁵ The terms are actually synonymous, though the Routledge Dictionary of language and Linguistics tends to differentiate them: linguistic norms are social expectations, which determine the forms of suitable linguistic interaction within the boundaries of the linguistic system; and standard is the historically legitimated, panreginal, oral and written language form of the social middle or upper class (Bussman 1996: 283,451) (highlighted by Z.P.).
3. educational codification – in dictionaries, the media, and educational textbooks;
4. psychological codification. “In this case, language is associated with a specific ‘power’ and that power diminishes if the authoritative norms for its use are not obeyed.” (Kachru B. 1985/2006: 252) in other words, psychological codification means acceptance of the norm.

Englishes of the Three Circles outlined by B.Kachru differ in terms of language norms.

“In a normative sense, then, the speech fellowships of English around the globe are primarily of the following three types:

1. **Norm-providing** varieties (the inner circle): these varieties have traditionally been recognized as models since they are used by the ‘native speakers’. However, the attitudes of the native speakers and non-native speakers toward such native varieties are not identical. One might say that traditionally the British variety was generally accepted as the model, and it is very recently that the American model has been presented as an alternative model. There is, however, still resistance toward accepting Australian or New Zealand varieties. ...

2. **Norm-developing** varieties (the outer circle): in regions using these varieties there has been a conflict between linguistic norm and linguistic behaviour. They are both endonormative and exonormative.

3. **Norm-dependent** varieties (the expanding circle): this circle is essentially exonormative.” (Kachru B. 1985/2006: 246)

The term “endonormative” (from Greek *endo* “inside”) refers to a language whose internal standards are localized, i.e. developed in this very language variety, e.g., British norms (RP) have developed in British English; American norms (General American, or GA), which are somewhat different from British standards, in American English. R.Quirk argues that standards of Australian, New Zealand,
and Canadian Englishes are “informally established” (Quirk 1990/2006: 505) though originally they were exonormative as they relied on British English standards.

The term “exonormative” (from Greek exo- “outside”) implies external norms developed in some other variety of language used as a model in teaching and learning practice. For example, Russian students of English using Russian English depend on standards of either British or American English. Exonorm is a norm transplanted to a new sociolinguistic context and used by educated users of English from the Expanding Circle.

Debatable is the issue of norms in the Outer Circle. Users of Outer Circle Englishes, like today’s users of Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, claim their own endonorms, which are different from the standards of their former metropolis English (Sridhar & Sridhar 1992; Bamgbose 1992; Bhatt 2001). Following the national sovereignty, there came “linguistic liberation” (Kachru B. 1991/2006) and the awareness of their own linguistic identity manifested in a localized English. These new norms are found on all levels of the language structure. Thus, for example, Indian English has its own norm of an undifferentiated tag question:

Cf. (IndE) You said you’ll do the job, isn’t it? (Bhatt 2001: 535)

(BrE) You said you’ll do the job, didn’t you?

These undifferentiated tags in Indian English serve positive politeness functions, “signaling deference and acquiescence”. They are “linguistic devices governed by the politeness principle of non-imposition” (Bhatt 2002: 94).

Many speakers of Outer Circle countries express their negative attitude to British and American endonorms. They take pride in their own varieties and frown upon those who approximate too closely to the native standard as “distasteful and pedantic,” “affected or even snobbish” (Sridhar, Sridhar 1992: 95). In one of his works Braj Kachru quotes Passe (1947) who described the attitude of Sri Lankans to standard English of native speakers:
“It is worth noting, too, that Ceylonese [Sri Lankans] who speak ‘standard English’ are generally unpopular. There are several reasons for this: those who now speak standard English either belong to a favored social class, with long purses which can take them to English public schools and universities, and so are disliked too much to be imitated, or have rather painfully acquired this kind of speech for social reasons and so are regarded as the apes of their betters; they are singular in speaking English as the majority of their countrymen cannot or will not speak it. ... Standard English has thus rather unpleasant associations when it is spoken by Ceylonese [Sri Lankans].” (Kachru B. 1984/2006: 451)

Since endonorms of the Inner and Outer Circles are different, the Ukrainian linguist Oleg Semenets (1985) suggested singling out the third type of norm – an enzonorm – intermediate between endo- and exonorms. Enzonorms are characteristic of the norm-developing Outer Circle Englishes.

Though the terms “norm” and “model” are very close, yet they are distinct (Jenkins 1998: 124). The concept of norm entails, on the one hand, prescriptivism and, on the other, “conformity with the usage of the majority of native speakers” (Kachru B. 1983: 69). The concept of model “implies a linguistic ideal which a teacher and a learner keep in mind in imparting instruction or in learning a language.” (Kachru B. 1981: 286). As was mentioned above, in most countries of the Expanding Circle, British or American Englishes are external pedagogical models (Strevens 1985/2006: 461). Today a new model has emerged – that of English as an International Language (EIL) (McKay 2002; Jenkins 2006). Unlike Expanding Circle, countries of the Outer Circle claim to have their own norms and their own internal model.

Quirk spoke for a standard that would uniform varieties of English. His opinion was that “(t)he relatively narrow range of purposes for which the non-native needs to use English (even in ESL countries) is arguably well catered for by a single monochrome standard form that looks as good on paper as it sounds in speech” (Quirk 1985: 6). B.Kachru objected to this: “[T]he native speakers of this language seem to have lost the exclusive prerogative to control its standardization” (Kachru B. 1985/2006: 259); “…we are witnessing a new phenomenon: the users of the institutionalized varieties are now not only ‘norm-developing’… but also function as the channels for the diffusion of their respective norms to the expanding circle of English (EFL contexts)” (Kachru B. 1985/2006: 257). In a number of other works (Kachru B. 1983; 1985/2006; 1986; 1991/2006) he emphasized that we should recognize a variety of norms based on the manner in which English is used within particular educated speech communities.

Quirk’s position was preceded by the work of Clifford Prator (1968) who spoke ardently against using models and local endonorms of ESL in teaching and who called Kachru’s position a “heretical tenet”:

“The limitation of objectives implied in the doctrine of establishing local models for TESL seems to lead inevitably in practice to a deliberate lowering of instructional standards. In the minds of many students it becomes a convenient, officially sanctioned justification for avoiding the strenuous effort entailed in upgrading their pronunciation. It weakens any sense of obligation a teacher may feel to improve his own speech and make it impossible for him to put any real conviction into his attempts to encourage or impel his students in the same direction... The total British effort on behalf of the teaching of English as a second language is too intelligibly planned, too well executed, too crucial to the successful development of the emerging countries to allow for an indefinite prolongation of this flirtation with a pernicious heresy.” (Prator 1968/2006: 137)
One of the main drawbacks of Prator’s arguments is that they make a good defensive position for British imperialism in linguistics, which was later developed by Phillipson (1992). Discussing the two opposite views on the problem of norms, Y.Kachru and C.Nelson (2006: 14-16) summarized the arguments of the sides. The supporters of the external models and exonorms in the Outer and Expanding circles put forward the following arguments: 1) a uniform standard will prevent fragmentation of the language and provide intercultural communication; 2) there is an abundance of instructional and reference materials codifying British and American varieties and there is no great difference between them. Educated varieties in the Outer and Expanding Circles are not so different from American or British varieties, which means no need for their internal norms; 3) English reflects primarily British and American culture; the creativity of non-native speakers is unmatched; their literatures in English are on the periphery and have value in sociological and anthropological terms; 4) voices in favor of regional norms reflect ‘liberation linguistics’ ideologies and are motivated by considerations of power.

The proponents of internal models and endonorms present the following arguments: 1) acculturation of the English language to new sociocultural contexts is unavoidable; the functional range of English is being increased; 2) “languages do not owe their existence to codification, they exist because they are used by people” (Kachru Y. & Nelson C. 2006: 15). Dictionaries and grammatical descriptions of many varieties are available or are being compiled; 3) nowadays English reflects many cultures rather than only British or American cultures; it turns to be “a configurer of multiple cultures and identities” (Pakir 2001: 78); 4) the assertion of status of localized varieties of English is an assertion of sociolinguistic reality and claim of identity; 5) most people are already multidialectal and they will be able to understand more than one variety of English; 6) supporters of exonormative ideology struggle for the competing market (Bhatt 2001).
Today, the problem of norm types is of utmost challenge for test developers. The proponents of WE paradigm express a legitimate concern that “large, powerful English language tests are fundamentally disconnected from the insights in analysis of English in the world context” (Davidson 2006: 709) as they are based mainly on the standards of British and American Englishes. Even such a test as English for International Communication (TOEIC), though claiming to be international, has no input from any of Englishes from the Outer Circle and fall far short of their claims (D’souza 1997/2006: 315; Lowenberg 2001; Davies, Hump-Lyons & Kemp 2003).

To sum up, the problem of norms, standards and models proves to be the central and most debatable one in modern linguistics. Many other disputable issues depend on a linguist’s approach to this problem.

Questions to discuss:

16. Do you think it is justifiable to divide ESL and EFL in terms of norms and standards? Why or why not?

17. What is ‘liberation linguistics’?

18. Does a non-native educator have to teach his/her variety of English or that of native speaker’s? Are efforts to reach the native speaker standards futile or realistic, in your opinion? Do you agree that in Russia the most appropriate teaching model is one based on the proficient Russian speaker of English? Give your reasons.

19. What is your attitude to using English textbooks created by non-native authors? Which book would you choose for your studies – one written by a native speaker or one created by a Russian author?

20. What is the main apprehension of the opponents of endonorms in the Outer Circle?

21. What is your position concerning types of norms in the Expanding Circle? Give your reasons.
22. How do you understand David Crystal’s comment that “all discussion of standards ceases very quickly to be a linguistic discussion, and becomes instead an issue of social identity” (Crystal 1985: 9-10)?

23. Do you agree that “(a) Japanese speaking English operates with much the same social norms as when speaking Japanese” (Baxter 1980/2006: 16)? Can you recollect any case proving or rejecting this thesis but referring to your language variety?

24. Compare the following diagram of the Three Circles with Kachru’s one depicted (Fig. 3) in the previous chapter. Do you think they are equal? Why or why not?

![Fig. 4. The Three Circles.](image)

25. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meanings of the terms.

4. **WE vs EIL**

Ключевые слова: стандарт, норма, варианты английского языка в мире, английский как международный язык, равноправие вариантов, автономность, равенство, разнообразие, плюрицентричность, мононорма, непонятность языка, общее ядро, лингва франка, язык-посредник, центр, периферия

---

6 See the discussion in more detail in Lovtsevich (2007)
The concept of standards divides scholars into those who stick to the terms ‘world Englishes’ and those who stand for the term “English as an International Language”. The central idea of WE is plurality and equality of all varieties of English, that is, equality of their own norms. This idea was emphasized by using the grammatical plural number of the term that was taken for the title of the journal *World Englishes* (Oxford, Boston: Blackwell Publ.). Later, the term spread in world linguistics. In the first editorial statement for the journal, the co-editors Braj Kachru and Larry Smith stressed:

> “The editorial board considers the native and non-native users of English as equal partners in deliberations on uses of English and its teaching internationally... The acronym WE therefore aptly symbolizes the underlying philosophy of the journal and the aspiration of the Editorial Board” (Kachru B & Smith L. 1985: 210).

So each English variety of the norm-providing and norm-developing status has its own autonomous standards, which makes us speak about the pluricentricity of English. “(T)he concept of ‘world Englishes’ embraces difference without losing the force of that which has come to be globally shared” (Dhillon 2006: 536). This seems to qualify profoundly the basic concept of the paradigm as equality of diverse entities and rejection of a “mononorm” (Kachru B. 1984/2006: 448).

> “The strength of the world Englishes paradigm has lain and continues to lie in its consistent pluralism and inclusivity.” (Bolton 2005: 78)
The pluralism stressed by Kingsley Bolton implies diversity and equality of Englishes and inclusivity means equal right of each variety to become a member of the global club of world Englishes.

The main argument against the diversity of autonomous Englishes is stated in the possibility of their future unintelligibility. For the variants to be understood universally, it is necessary that they have a common core, as suggested by the opponents of Kachru. Jenina Brutt-Griffler suggested a centripetal force that maintains the “Englishness” of world English varieties: “World English, rather than a variety, constitutes a sort of center of gravity around which the international varieties revolve” (Brutt-Griffler 2002: 177).

In her theory, the terms seem to be misplaced – what is World English in her understanding is more customarily called the common core, or International English, or Lingua Franca English. Jennifer Jenkins (2003: 125), who applies the core theory to teaching pronunciation, labels it “a core approach” to EIL teaching. She points out three main directions to establishing a core:

1) a contrived core established artificially by simplifying the existing language inventory, the examples being Gimson’s “rudimentary international pronunciation” (RIP), Quirk’s (1982) “nuclear English”, or Ogden (1930) and Richards’ Basic English;

2) an empirical core established by identifying shared components of all varieties of English, e.g., Jenner (1997, cited in Jenkins 2003: 126);

3) Lingua Franca Core, the idea developed by Jenkins (2000: 124) combining the empirical and artificial approaches.

Jenkins (2003: 126-127) described the core phonological features, which include acceptable substitutions of /T/ and /D/; rhotic ‘r’, /t/ between vowels (water) rather than American English flapped [], aspiration of word-initial voiceless stops /p/ /t/ /k/, shortening of vowel sounds before voiceless consonants (seat) and maintenance of length before voiced consonants (seed); omission of consonant sounds in middle and final clusters (factsheet > facsheet); maintenance of /nt/ between vowels like in British English /wintqr/ rather than American
English /\text{winqr}/; addition of vowels is acceptable \textit{(product \{pqrPdAkVtO\})} whereas omission is not \textit{(/pPdAk/)}; and maintenance of contrast between long and short vowels \textit{(live – leave)}.

The Lingua Franca approach to grammar and lexis is being implemented by Barbara Seidlhofer (2001) who has embarked on the compilation of a corpus of English as a Lingua Franca at the University of Vienna. Her project was supported by Oxford University Press and is called the \textit{Vienna–Oxford ELF Corpus}. The corpus comprises spoken English developed through interaction among non-native speakers from different first languages. There are some other attempts to create a corpus of International English, based mainly on the English learners’ material (Hassal 2000; Yang 2005). The largest project of the International Corpus of English, associated with ICLE (the International Corpus of Learner English), combines 18 national and regional corpora: Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Caribbean, East Africa (Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania), Fiji, Ghana, Great Britain, Hong Kong, India, Ireland, New Zealand, Nigeria, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, the USA (Greenbaum & Nelson G. 1996).

A similar idea of International English was expressed by David Crystal who emphasized the necessity of World Standard Spoken English (WSSE):

"Which variety will be most influential, in the development of WSSE? It seems likely that it will be US (rather than UK) English. The direction of influence has for some time been largely one-way. Many grammatical issues in contemporary British usage show the influence of US forms, US spellings are increasingly widespread (especially in computer contexts), and there is a greater passive awareness of distinctly US lexicon in the UK (because of media influence) than vice versa. On the other hand, the situation will be complicated by the emergence on the world scene of new linguistic features derived from the L2 varieties... This would be especially likely if there were features which were shared by several (or all) L2 varieties – such as the use of syllable-timed rhythm, or the
widespread difficulty observed in the use of th sounds. ... The concept of WSSE does not replace a national dialect: it supplements it.” (Crystal 1997: 138)

The definition of Standard English offered by Peter Strevens is also very close to the understanding of a neutral common core: “a particular dialect of English, being the only non-localized dialect, of global currency without significant variation, universally accepted as the appropriate educational target in teaching English; which may be spoken with an unrestricted choice of accent” (Strevens 1983: 88).

There is an opinion that International English is based on the formal level of communication which usually takes place in international negotiations, scientific discussions, etc. It is used mostly by international agencies (like the U.N., USIS, British Council) and by other international communicators (Johnson 1990). Linguistically, EIL comprises neutral modern vocabulary, excludes outdated words, expressive and very informal words; it uses simple structures. The least attention is paid to the phonetic accent of speakers. While observing Euro-English in the European Council’s “power corridors”, D.Crystal (1998: 92) concluded that EIL must have a slow tempo, syllabic rhythm, more distinct articulation, lack of phonetic assimilation and sound drops typical for native speakers.

The world leading linguists and TESOL educators Michael Halliday (1973), Peter Strevens (1978), and others believe that as an ELT model we can use only the variety of English which meets three requirements – intelligibility, appropriateness and effectiveness of communication. Henry Widdowson also argues that most learners study the language “not to conform to any national norms of general use, but to co-operate as members in international modes of [expert] communication” (Widdowson 1997: 144), which leads him to interpret EIL as English for Specific Purposes (ESP):
“Of course, if it serves the purpose of a particular expert community to develop a register as an ingroup language, this will inevitably lead to some loss of more general intelligibility. There are indeed registers which are inaccessible to outsiders. And these outsiders can be people who are otherwise highly competent in the language. As a native speaker of English, for example, I freely confess that the English registers of computer science, finance, stock exchange reports, genetics, and many more, are largely incomprehensible to me. As far as these uses of language is concerned, I am incompetent. But the crucial point is that there are innumerable people all over the world, speaking all kinds of primary language, from all kinds of primary socio-cultural background who have become competent in these secondary varieties of the language. And as they have achieved this competence, they become full members of these global communities with equal rights to initiate innovation. Whether you are a native speaker of the language or not is irrelevant. It is what you are now that is important, not where you have come from.” (Widdowson 1997: 144)

As International English proves to be a scholarly construct rather than a live variety, Braj Kachru raises objections against it. His main argument is that the concept proves to be too abstract, like looking for “dog-ness” in both terrier and alsation; “yet no single variety of dog embodies all the features present in all varieties of dog” (quoting Quick et al.; Kachru B. 1984/2006: 434). The abstract character of the concept of International English allowed Yamuna Kachru to make the conclusion:

“It is clear that there is no entity called ‘International English’ which every English-using person is competent in. Instead, what we have are world Englishes with their cultural underpinnings and rhetorical strategies.” (Kachru Y. 2001: 66)
Another reason for criticism is that the idea of a core English raises associations with the field theory, whose ethnocentric consequences are revealed by R. Phillipson (1992) who noted that the neo-colonial idea of core and periphery implies language inequality, imposes the perception of better and worse languages, and shuts out ‘other Englishes” (Pennycook 2003: 518).

An idea somewhat intermediate between the Kachruvian approach and the core approach was expressed by the Japanese linguist Yasukata Yano:

“...there will develop a loose league of acrolect-level varieties of English ... which have less regional specificity and have global mutual intelligibility, while keeping their local sociocultural uniqueness and identities for intranational use. There will be an amalgamation of varieties, rather than a single standard.” (Yano 2001: 126)

Questions to discuss:

26. Why are the terms “World Englishes” and “English as an International Language” not synonymous?

27. Read the following humorous article on Euro-English. Which position does this article illustrate? Comment on your attitude to the linguistic hypothesis described in the article:

Five year phase-in plan for "EuroEnglish"

The European Commission have just announced an agreement whereby English will be the official language of the EU, rather than German, which was the other possibility. As part of the negotiations, Her Majesty's government conceded that English spelling had some room for improvement and has accepted a five year phase in plan that would be known as "EuroEnglish".

In the first year, "s" will replace the soft "c". Certainly, this will make the sivil servants jump for joy. The hard "c" will be dropped in favour of the "k". This should klear up konfusion and keyboards kan have 1 less letter.
There will be growing publik enthusiasm in the sekond year, when the troublesome
"ph" will be replaced with the "f". This will make words like "fotograf" 20% shorter.

In the third year, publik akseptanse of the new spelling kan be expekted to reach the
stage where more komplikated changes are possible. Governments will enkorage the
removal of double letters, which have always ben a deterent to akurate speling. Also,
al wil agre that the horrible mes of the silent "e"s in the language is disgraceful, and
they should go away.

By the 4th year, peopl wil be reseptiv to steps such as replasing "th" with "z" and "w" with "v".

During ze fifz year, ze unesesary "o" kan be dropd from words kontaining "ou" and
similar changes vud of kors be aplid to ozer kombinations of leters. After zis fifz year,
ve vil hav a realy sensibl riten styl. Zer vil be no mor trubls or difikultis and evrivun
vil find it ezi to understand each ozer.

ZE DREAM VIL FINALI KUM TRU!

(Source: http://www.lib.ru/ENGLISH/rekonstr.txt)

28. In your opinion, is International English abstract or real? Give you arguments.

29. What features could be attributed to International English?

30. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the
chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.

5. Native Speaker vs Non-Native Speaker

Ключевые слова: носитель языка, неноситель языка, родной язык, успехность коммуникации, понятность формы, понимание значения, понимание смысла и подтекста, хорошее знание языка, акцент, нормированный язык, коммуникативная компетенция, образованный пользователь, лингвистическая идентичность
Before the world Englishes paradigm was established, there was (and still is in some places) a strong tendency in ELT pedagogy to orient English-language students to speaking only with native speakers (NS) who were considered “to be the owners of the language, guardians of its standards, and arbiters of acceptable pedagogic norms” (Jenkins 2000: 5). A native speaker is defined as a person speaking his/her mother’s tongue acquired as the first (L1) language in early childhood (Cook 1999: 186-187; Richards, Platt & Platt 1993: 241) or a person “born to the language” unlike a non-native speaker (NNS) who “learnt it through education” (Jenkins 2003: 15). Traditional ELT practice has predominantly relied on British and American native speakers only, which means that even some varieties of Inner Circle Englishes were not taken into consideration. ELT students were supposed to comprehend British or American oral speech; to imitate British or American accent, and to use British or American grammar and rhetoric rules in writing. The goal of English language learning was seen in approximating the native speaker as if native speakers did not vary in their accent, vocabulary, and even grammar.

Today, pedagogical objectives have shifted. It is assumed that no matter how hard non-native speakers may try to perfect their second or foreign language that is acquired or learnt, they will never become native speakers. As V. Cook put it, “Adults could never become native speakers without being reborn” (Cook 1999: 187). Their “non-nativeness” will be seen, to a larger or smaller degree, in their accent, syntax, or choice of words because their mentality or the way of thinking and inner visualizing the world is different. Of all language differences between native and non-native speakers phonetic accent is the least significant. So, for example, an outstanding British novelist Joseph Conrad, who was of Polish origin, is known to have been claimed as “a foreigner talking only broken English” despite the excellence of his written English (Cook 1999: 195).

Native speakers are often considered to be superior to non-native speakers because they have better intuitions about the language (Quirk 1990/2006: 506). However, the proponents of this view pay little attention to the fact that many
native speakers do not speak the idealized, standardized language; their speech is influenced by geography, age, occupation, and social status. Another factor to be taken into consideration is that beside native speakers of the Inner Circle there are quite a lot of bilingual native speakers in the Outer Circle whose English is different from that of the British or Americans. This gave ground for Jennifer Jenkins to criticize the term:

“The term, for example, fails to recognize that many varieties of English in outer circle countries, such as Singapore, are spoken not only as official languages but also in the home... Again it ignores the fact that English is often one of several languages available in the repertoires of the multilingual populations of, for example, India and African countries... In such contexts, it is often difficult to ascertain which language is a person’s L1 and which their L2. The term perpetuates the idea that monolingualism is the norm when, in fact, precisely the opposite is true for the world at large. ...[I]t implies the ethnic Anglo speaker as a reference point against which all other Englishes should be measured, which cannot be acceptable or appropriate for a language that has passed into world ownership” (Jenkins 2000: 8-9)

A. Holliday argues that “native-speakerism” is a linguistic ideology that establishes belief in dominance of Western culture (Holliday 2005: 6) and, therefore, should be taken critically.

Taking into account that bilinguals of the Outer Circle also consider themselves native speakers, Braj Kachru (1999) proposed a distinction between “genetic nativeness” and “functional nativeness” (cited by Yano 2001: 122) when giving a key-note address to the 12th World Congress of the International association of Applied Linguistics in Tokyo. While genetic nativeness is historically and geographically bound, functionally native English speakers can be met everywhere, especially in the Outer Circle.
With English serving as a lingua franca in the global context, it is evident nowadays that English is likely to be used not only for communicating with native speakers but mainly for non-native users speaking with other non-native users because non-native speakers outnumber English native speakers. Thus, in the Russian Far East, we often use English when communicating with the Japanese, Chinese, or Koreans. To communicate with them successfully and understand their local varieties of English, we need to know the major features of their Englishes and their cultures.

There are three dimensions of successful communication, singled out by Larry Smith (1992):

(a) intelligibility,
(b) comprehensibility, and
(c) interpretability.

Intelligibility means ability to single out a word or phrase in the speech flow and to recognize a word. Comprehensibility implies understanding the word meaning (locutionary force). And interpretability suggests having proper background knowledge and understanding the author’s intention of the speech act, that is, interpreting correctly a meaning behind a word or utterance (illocutionary force).

Difficulties in intercultural communication can occur at all the three levels. For example, intelligibility might be difficult when sounds are substituted and epenthetic vowels introduced between consonant clusters as it is often characteristic of East Asian Englishes. For an unprepared Russian listener it is difficult to recognize Vladivostok in Burabosotoku as sometimes pronounced by a Japanese speaker. Difficulties in recognizing a word can occur not only in oral speech but also in writing – a Chinese journalist from the China Daily put down a Russian place name exactly as he heard it (according to his Chinese phonetics) and it became next to impossible for a Russian to recognize the settlement of Pogranichnyi in his transcribed name of Bogelaniqinei. In non-native Englishes comprehensibility of meaning can be difficult since a meaning might be changed
for different reasons – either under the influence of the word semantics in the
indigenous language, or because a new word is just created by a speaker as s/he
thinks it suits the named thing better, or a word is sometimes mistakenly confused
with some other word. The following examples have also been picked in the China
Daily newspaper telling a reader about inking a deal on establishing Suifenhe-
Bogelaniqinei port – a place on the Russian-Chinese land borderline far from the
ocean, river or lake. Interpretability is most difficult, for it requires certain
background knowledge. Without knowing Chinese culture, it is difficult to
interpret the following sentence and say what stands behind its culture-loaded
words with implied connotations: During every major festival, like Duan Wu Jie,
Dragon Boat Festival, or Zhong Qiu Jie, Moon Festival, my parents and I would
go to Grandma's house for a short stay.

It is incorrect to believe that native speakers are the sole judges of what is
intelligible or that native speakers are always more intelligible than non-native
speakers (Smith L. & Nelson C. 2006: 429). At the East-West Center in Honolulu,
Hawaii, Larry Smith (1992) conducted an experiment on intelligibility with groups
of native and non-native educated users of English. The following most valuable
results of the experiment are very significant:

- Native speakers are not the most easily understood, nor are they the
  best able to understand the different varieties of English. Not all
  Inner-Circle varieties are mutually intelligible with one another.
- Language proficiency is most important for comprehensibility, but
  being a native speaker was not shown to be a deciding factor.
- Familiarity with several different English varieties makes it easier to
  interpret cross-cultural communication in English as it involves an
  awareness of cultural differences and some knowledge of various
  specific cultures.
- It is possible for Standard English to be spoken with many different
  accents.
- Interpretability is at the core of communication and is more important than mere intelligibility or even comprehensibility (Smith L. & Nelson C. 2006: 437-441).

Diverse in their three circles, World Englishes are equal. So are native and non-native speakers in their communicative competence if they are educated proficient users of the language. English is “a shared possession” (McArthur 2003: x) of both native and non-native speakers. Non-native speakers “should be considered as speakers in their own right, not as approximations to monolingual native speakers” (Cook 1999: 185).

Aware of their linguistic identity, competent and proficient non-native speakers take pride in their English variety. Tommy Koh, a senior minister in the Singapore government, became famous by saying proudly, "I should hope that when I’m speaking abroad, my countrymen will have no problem recognizing that I am a Singaporean" (Koh 1979, cited in Davies, Hamp-Lyons & Kemp 2003). A Philippine poet expressed it metaphorically, “We have our own way of thinking… own own way of feeling, by which we then use this language called English. So that English is ours. We have colonized it too” (Bolton & Bautista 2004: 1-2).

“Most relevant for international educational policies is the kind of relativism that has frequently been evident in the refusal of cultural groups to be judged by or to live by standards alien to them. Thus, when we consider the varieties of English spoken around the world, we can expect an increasing insistence on maintaining accents and syntactic constructions tied to particular ways of life not only in spoken English but also in written English.” (Dhillon 2006: 533).

David Graddol regrets that “Global English has led to a crisis of terminology” (Graddol 2006: 110) for the distinction between ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ has become blurred. With acknowledging all English speakers’ rights and
their property of English, the term “native speaker” begins to be used for all
educated users of English, both monolingual and bilingual.

“We need now to recognize that this is a much broader category than it
was a few years ago. I am still an example of a native speaker of
American English and I can be an informant about my particular variety
of the language. Randolph Quirk is still a native speaker of British
English and can be an informant of that particular variety. In the same
way, Yamuna Kachru is a native speaker of Indian English and she can
be an informant on her particular variety of the language. Anne Pakir is
a native speaker of Singapore English and Ma. Lourdes Bautista is a
native speaker of Filipino English. Each of them can be an informant of
their own variety of the language. I am willing to argue that Zoya
Proshina is a native speaker of Russian English and HU Wenzhong is a
native speaker of Chinese English. Professor Proshina and Professor Hu
may not be willing to accept my assessment today but Professor Kachru,
Professor Pakir and Professor Bautista may be. Whatever the case, this
is my understanding of the concept ‘native speaker’ from the perspective
of world Englishes.” (Smith L. 2007)

Questions to discuss:

31. Compare a native speaker and a non-native speaker using the following
parameters (singled out in Cook 1999):

- subconscious knowledge of rules;
- intuitive grasp of meanings;
- ability to communicate within social settings (depending on a social
  situation);
- range of language skills;
- creativity of language use;
- identification with language community (e.g., British in Great Britain);
Do you agree that all these parameters refer to solely a native speaker? Can you give arguments to prove the contrary, i.e. that they are applicable to a non-native speaker as well?

32. Do you support Paikeday’s opinion that the idea of native speaker as “the sole arbiter of grammaticality or one whose intuitions of a proprietary nature about his or her mother tongue and which are shared only by others of his own tribe is a myth propagated by linguists, that the true meaning of the lexeme ‘native speaker’ is a proficient user of a specified language" (Bhatt 2001: 540, citing Paikeday) ? Explain why or why not.

33. Can the above-mentioned three dimensions of successful communication (intelligibility; comprehensibility, and interpretability) refer to a monolingual/monocultural communication within one country? Give arguments.

34. What is your attitude to your own variety of English? What do you think interferes with speakers’ recognizing their local variety?

35. Study the following diagram of using English in tourism (Graddol 2006: 29). What does it tell you about?

36. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.
6. Fossilized Interlanguage vs Dynamic Lectal Cline

A non-native speaker’s English is a cline as far as its development and functional use are concerned. It is a cline from a beginner’s level to a proficient one.

There is a notion of interlanguage in a psycholinguistic theory of second language acquisition and foreign language learning. The term “interlingual identifications” was first mentioned in Uriel Weinreich (1953: 7) in regard to a language contact situation. It was further assumed by Larry Selinker as “a psychological structure” that “is latent in the brain, activated when one attempts to learn a second language” (Selinker 1974: 196).

**Interlanguage** (IL) is defined as “the type of language produced by second- and foreign-language learners who are in the process of learning a language” (Richards, Platt & Platt 1993: 186). It is a psycholinguistic phenomenon, as “(i)ntelanguage refers to the knowledge of the L2 in the speaker’s mind” (Cook 1999: 190). Selinker considers it to be a separate intermediate linguistic system that is formed in-between the mother tongue and the target language when a learner tries to achieve a native-speaker competence. Since a non-native speaker will never become a native speaker, interlanguage is an approximative system fossilized at a certain stage. **Fossilization** is “regular reappearance or re-emergence in IL productive performance of linguistic structures which are thought to be eradicated” (Selinker 1974: 198). In other words, it is regular occurrence of
permanent errors in a learner’s speech resulting from “imperfect learning” (Kachru Y & Nelson C. 2006: 85). These errors are caused by five different mechanisms:

1. language transfer, or borrowing patterns from the mother tongue (e.g., replacing the interdental sound th by t/d: that > dat);
2. transfer of training, or a result of training procedure (e.g., the pronouns she is often substituted by he as textbooks are full of drills with he);
3. strategies of L2 learning (e.g., a learning strategy of simplification results in avoiding articles, plural forms, past tense forms);
4. strategies of L2 communication, resulting in expressing meanings by using the words and grammar which are already known.
5. overgeneralization of target language linguistic material, or extending patterns from the target language (by analogy) (e.g., What did you saw him?)

Interlanguage was developed as a psycholinguistic phenomenon and since this concept does not deal with sociocultural perspective (Kachru Y. 1994: 798), it is not applied to the WE theory. This difference between ‘interlanguage’ and “World Englishes” was emphasized by Alan Davies (1998) who rejected the equation of the terms on the ground that an interlanguage accounts for individual language development and variation and World English “deals with societal varieties” (Davies 1998: 447). Interlanguage is idiosyncratic, not social or typical.

"Among the unfortunate consequences of the popularity of interlanguage studies among EFL/ESL teachers (important though Interlanguage may be as a concept in psycholinguistics) have been the unquestioned assumptions that (1) all deviations from an adult norm are deviations from a single NS norm, and (2) all interlanguages, or all individuals and groups, are points on a path toward a single, universal native-speaker norm. Interlanguage theory was originally developed in the context of the psychological conditions of the individual: social conditions and processes were of a minor relevance.” (Strevens 1982: 45)
The sociolinguistic context provides a bilingual cline both in terms of proficiency in English and in its functional uses (Kachru B. 1983: 77). This cline is a lectal continuum, which is not necessarily developmental but may be functional. Each variety of English includes sub-varieties that have functional values. These subvarieties making up a continuum are basilect, mesolect, and acrolect. The terms were introduced by Stewart (1965) who described a post-creole continuum. Later, linguists applied these terms to a speech continuum when referring to varying levels of proficiency in a variety of English. The acrolect is a sub-variety whose users are characterized by high level of English proficiency. It is sometimes labeled ‘edulect’ (< education + lect) (Bautista & Gonzalez 2006: 132) as it is the lect of educated users from the Outer and Expanding Circles. It is based on written standards and functions in formal situations. The basilect is the lowest point of the speech continuum. It is the sub-variety of users with low levels of education and is outstandingly marked by language transfer from the vernacular. The mesolect is the sub-variety in between. It is based on the communicative norm of spoken speech and is used by people that have incomplete education or by educated people in informal situations (Platt & Weber 1980: 274).

The following diagram shows lectal variations of world Englishes and their fluidity:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ACROLECT} & \quad \downarrow \quad \uparrow \\
\text{MESOLECT} & \quad \downarrow \quad \uparrow \\
\text{BASILECT} & 
\end{align*}
\]

Basilect can be considered pidgin English as it meets the following criteria:

- the language is reduced and simplified;
- it is no one’s mother tongue;
- it is restricted in functions (mainly to trade and services)
- it is primarily oral;
- it derives its features from languages in contact;
- its speakers have lower prestige.

Depending on the social context, users of this or that variety can switch from one lectal sub-variety to another. For example, an educated Singaporean can use an acrolect in his/her workplace, a mesolect at home, and a basilect (Singlish) at the market.

Questions to discuss:

37. Why is interlanguage a psychological phenomenon rather than sociolinguistic one?

38. What is fossilization?

39. Why is interlanguage fossilized while Kachru’s lectal cline is dynamic?

40. Why is it possible to speak about lects as a social phenomenon? Can they also be considered an individual issue?

41. Observe your classmates speaking, mark their errors and try to analyze mechanisms of their errors.

42. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.

7. Innovations/Deviations vs Errors

Ключевые слова: норма, стандарт, инновация, девиация, ошибка, кодификация, узус, нативизация, аккультурация, приемлемость, реалия
When comparing Inner Circle Englishes with Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes in terms of standards and norms, we mark differences that are labeled as innovations or deviations. For example, Singaporean English used by “the most educated segment of the population” (Trudgill & Hannah 1994: 134) has the following features (Todd & Hancock 1987: 424-425) that deviate from British or American standards:

- foregrounding the topic of the sentence: *This book I have read already*;
- using the Past Perfect instead of the Simple Past or Present Perfect: *He is very rich. He had bought another house recently*;
- using the plural with uncountables: *evidences, chalks, equipments*;
- using universal tags: *You are British, isn’t it*?
- changing meanings of some words: *fellow (= person, not exclusively male), follow (= go with someone)*;
- adapting words from the indigenous languages: *towkay* (< Hokkien = shop-owner, businessman), *makan* (< Malay – to eat).

These forms are rather regularly used by educated speakers. They represent their cultural mentality and are codified in literature and press. Therefore, these forms can be considered normative for that very variety of English. They represent innovations and deviations of New Englishes.

**Innovations** are new acceptable linguistic features resulting from language nativization and acculturation and accounted for contextually, formally, and logically. It is a kind of "linguistic price" (Kachru B. 1992: 309) paid by English for being used in a new cultural setting. The best example of innovations is culture-loaded words borrowed by English from other indigenous languages, like the following words in China English: *qigong, wu-shu;* in Japanese English *sushi, sakura,* or in Russian English *dacha, matrioshka.* Many of such borrowings have found their way to native English dictionaries (in the Inner Circle). Innovations can demonstrate linguistic creativity of a local variety, like Japanese English *silver seat* (a public transport seat for elderly people) or Nigerian English *go-slow* (traffic jam). Innovations occur in various levels of a language structure, for instance, the
China English examples above illustrate innovations both in lexical and phonographical levels (the combination of letters *qi* is not characteristic of native Englishes). Phonetic innovations are readily recognized as they easily reveal an accent of a non-native speaker. Innovations are typified deviations from the norm characteristic of local English educated speakers. In order to decide on the status of an innovation, Ayo Bamgbose (1998: 3-4) suggests five factors:

1. **demographic** – how many well-educated people use the innovation?
2. **geographical** – how widely is it dispersed? The greater the geographical spread, the higher is its acceptance as a standard form.
3. **authoritative** – who uses it? An innovation is used or approved by writers, teachers, examining bodies, media practitioners, and influential opinion leaders.
4. **codification** – where is the usage sanctioned? Once an innovation enters a dictionary, grammar or course book as correct or acceptable usage, its status as a regular form is assured.
5. **acceptability** – what is the attitude of users and non-users to it? To be accepted, an innovation is to be recognized as an appropriate expression of identity and solidarity.

Of the five factors, “codification and acceptance must be considered the most important, because without them, innovations will continue to be labeled as errors” (Bamgbose 1998: 4). Braj Kachru points out that the so called contact literatures, i.e. non-native literatures in English, have contributed a lot to innovation occurrence, which at first are regarded as “norm-breaking” trend in English around the world (Kachru B. 1984/2006: 452).

Unlike innovations, though very close to them, deviations are not necessarily codified. They can be just linguistic tendencies manifest in educated speech of many people in the community. **Deviation** “is the result of a productive process which marks the typical variety-specific features; and it is systematic within a variety, and not idiosyncratic” (Kachru B. 1983: 81). Deviations mark an educated
variety of language as distinct from another educated variety. Therefore, deviations that are salient for a variety of English are revealed on the acrolectal level.

For example, when we communicate with educated Asian speakers, we come across the following deviations in their English:

- epenthetic vowels in the consonant clusters and after the final consonant: *cheese* > *CHEESu*; *ice-cream* > *AlSuKuREAMu*; *blue* > *BuLUE*
- indiscrimination of voiced and voiceless consonants (*Pusan* – *Busan*);
- substitution of [l] - [r] (*Lee* – *Rhee*);
- reduplication (*small small things, hot hot tea*);
- using uncountables for countables: *much sweets, good furnitures*.

Deviations are very close to innovations in that they result from nativization of transferred native language habits in English and can be accounted for contextually (*I’d like to be a FRIGHT attendant* – the context helps us guess the correct meaning), formally (*Pusan, Busan* are the forms of the same word differently written in various systems of Romanization), and logically (i.e., we know why these deviation occur – due to language transfer or due to indigenous pragmatics, like the China English answer to a compliment, ‘I’m not that good. You’ve overpraised me.’ instead of ‘Thank you.’ (Honna 2006: 117)). What distinguishes them from innovations is that they are not necessarily codified whereas innovations are more creative and are often fixed in reference sources. For example, innovations may include:

- newly coined words like Japanese English *salaryman* (an employee);
- new collocations: Chinese English *a paper tiger* (not a real enemy), *one-family-one-child policy*;
- change of meaning: Japanese English - *a dry person* (too business-like, too serious, too distant); *a wet person* (overly sentimental, too sensitive, teary-eyed) (Stanlaw 2004: 41-42);
Both innovations and deviations are characteristic of well-educated speakers of a certain community. In case of a lower level of command of English, we deal with errors, or mistakes. **Error** is also a deviation from the standard, caused, however, by lack of language and culture knowledge and often resulting in misunderstanding and unintelligibility. Errors may be individual and typical of a community. Errors occur on the mesolectal and basilectal levels of language competence. They are made in an uneducated speech. If an error is self-correctable, it is labeled a **mistake** (James 1998: 78-79). Some of errors may be just funny and cause a smile of people knowing English well (*Please take yourself to anything you like*). Most dangerous errors are those that result in miscommunication (*Acid food*).

![Fig. 7. A service menu in a Chinese hotel.](image)
So the borderline between deviations and errors is rather fragile. It consists primarily in two criteria: educated/non-educated speaker and typicality of occurrence. Besides, a deviation must not break intercultural communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviations:</th>
<th>Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• educated speakers</td>
<td>• non-educated speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• typical, social</td>
<td>• individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• systematic</td>
<td>• idiosyncratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• always productive</td>
<td>• can be occasional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cognitively accountable (+ transferred from the indigenous language)</td>
<td>• interfered by the indigenous language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• not impedes communication</td>
<td>• may lead to miscommunication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In practice differentiation between errors and deviations very often depends on the form of speech, as observed by Gary French: “in oral language there is a tendency to accept errors at a greater rate for the facility of overall communication than in the case for written language, which is more static” (French 2005: 371).

Innovations and deviations as social phenomena are formal markers “to provide a regional and national identity and help in establishing an immediate bond with another person from the same region or country” (Kachru B. 1984/2006: 449). So they perform very important social functions. Sometimes “the recognition of a localized norm is used as a defensive mechanism to reduce the ‘colonial’ and ‘Western’ connotations associated with English. Such an attitude is one way of expressing what might be termed ‘linguistic emancipation’.” (Kachru 1984/2006: 452).

It takes time for a deviation or an innovation to be recognized and accepted as a characteristic feature of a variety of English. I cannot but agree with Jennifer Jenkins who says that innovations and deviations “often start life as forms that are widely perceived as errors in the standard language, the NS ‘error’ gradually becomes accepted as a new standard form (for example, the use of ‘data’ to replace ‘datum’ in the singular)” (Jenkins 2006: 44). Gradually, becoming traditional,
Deviations are standardized and, finally, codified. The same happens with deviations and innovations of non-native varieties as well.

Deviations can occur in any variety of English, including those from the Inner Circle. Peter Lowenberg (2001), for example, collected a number of sentences from the works of well-known linguists, who are native language speakers, and American media that contain such deviations as: *It's a nonsense to spend money*.... *West said they used a digital equipment* ... Since this type of using noncountable nouns as countables becomes a typical phenomenon, not an individual one, it turns from an error to a deviation. This means that deviations in any circle follow the same trend, gradually changing the standards.

Deviations are characteristic of code-switching from one lectal level to another, used at will by educated people, depending on a situation. “...(A) feature which may seem to be an error may in fact be a dialectal feature of Singapore English. If a speaker in formal setting marks the past tense, then does not mark the past tense in a domestic situation, there is no error – the speaker is merely using more than one kind of English” (Gupta 1998/2006: 384). This is a type of diglossia typical for the countries of the Outer Circle.

But to be accepted, deviations must belong to a variety of English which not only exists but whose status is recognized and accepted. So far this is difficult to implement, especially in an Expanding Circle country. We have reached a “vicious circle”: deviations are accepted if they are typical of a variety of English and a variety of English is recognized if it differs from other varieties in some deviations.

**Questions to discuss:**

43. Why is it necessary to differentiate between deviations and errors? Is there an essential difference between the terms or is ‘deviation’ just a politically correct term?
44. Comment on the table id deviations and errors and supply your comments with linguistic illustrations.

45. Analyze innovations, deviations, and errors (if any) in the Chinese hotel service menu (Fig.7) and the signboard in a park (Fig. 8).

![A signboard in a Chinese park.](image)

46. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.

8. Language Identity vs. Intercultural Pragmatics

Ключевые слова: межкультурная коммуникация, лингвокультурная идентичность, прагматическая компетентность, правила прагматики, коммуникативная компетентность, контактная литература, прагматическая неудача, межкультурная грамотность, уместность, приемлемость, понятность.
The use of English as a language of intercultural communication gives rise to one more problem with two facets. On the one hand, a local variety of English is employed to spread an indigenous culture and thus to express and maintain linguacultural identity of its speakers in the face of globalism. “... (A)s English becomes more widely used as a global language, it will become expected that speakers will signal their nationality, and other aspects of their identity, through English” (Graddol 2006: 117). On the other hand, if pragmatics of what is said or written is not clear to other variety communicators (and this often happens with speech items that have an ethnic flavor), the utterance will not be interpreted correctly and the interaction will not be effective and successful. For example, an African-English greeting “I see you’ve put on weight”, implying “You are looking well”, can be met with indignation by a representative of Western culture who is unaware of the cultural background of the greeting (Berns 2006: 720-721).

A good medium to learn “pragmatic ground rules” (Thomas 1983/2006) of a variety of world Englishes is the works of the so called contact literatures, i.e. new literatures of “a symbiotic relationship” (Thumboo 2006: 407), written in English by the so called non-native speakers. Edwin Thumboo (2006), however, criticizes the terms “new literatures in English” and “contact literatures” as interim labels meaning just a historical start and insists on saying Indian Literature in English, Nigerian Literature in English, Singapore Literature in English, etc. Today it is the literature that is negotiating between the demands of two traditions, one inherited from an indigenous culture, the other brought by English and its literature. This bicultural literature has caused quite controversial attitudes as many critics argued that it served only intellectual, not emotional purposes (Thumboo 1982: 272).

The use of English in creative function in the Outer and Expanding Circles has been controversial. The controversy consists in the ability of a localized English to express the ‘nativeness’ and emotions of the so-called non-native speakers. Indigenous writers in English are accused of abandoning their national language and writing in a western “foreign” language. Their “alien” medium is
considered inappropriate for expressing culturally and socially determined sensibilities. They are accused of catering to a foreign readership. (Kachru B. 1994/2006: 284).

“One has to convey in a language that is not one’s own the spirit that is one’s own. One has to convey the various shades and omissions of a certain thought-movement that looks maltreated in an alien language. I use the word ‘alien,’ yet English is not really an alien language to us. It is the language of our intellectual make-up – like Sanskrit or Persian was before – but not of our emotional make-up. We are all instinctively bilingual, many of us writing in our own language and in English. We cannot write like the English. We should not. We cannot write only as Indians. We have grown to look at the large world as part of us. “ (Raja Rao, quoted in McArthur 2003: 324)

Today English is considered to be “one of the voices in which India speaks” (Kachru B. 1994/2006: 283). The Indian poet Kamala Das responds to this controversy,

*Don’t write in English, they said,  
English is not your mother tongue...  
...The language I speak  
Becomes mine, mine alone, it is half English, half  
Indian, funny perhaps, but it is honest,  
It is as human as I am human...  
...It voices my joys, my longings my  
Hopes....* (cited by Gargesh 2006: 106)

In Sri Lanka English has become “a means of self-expression divorced from the self-consciousness that had accompanied it before” (Wijesinha, quoted in Kachru B. 1994/2006: 283). On the one hand, such literatures in English express national identities; on the other hand, they are components of world literatures in English.
A Chinese linguist Song Li (2007) argues against the necessity to teach native speakers’ pragmatic rules to WE students. Communicating in English, non-native speakers of English, who far exceed native speakers in number, want to express their linguacultural identity. That is why they are apt to follow their culturally rooted pragmatic rules that are used as markers of their in-group and out-group distinction. For example, Chinese speakers, who consider observing hierarchical relations in society to be very important, can use forms of address of the type “Family name + Laoshi (‘Teacher’)” like Li Laoshi as is typical in China. (cf. when addressing Russian seniors, English-speaking Russians use the pattern “first name + patronymic” rather than the native speaker pattern, e.g., Professor + Name.)

Should learners of English study all the pragmatic nuances that might be implied in various world Englishes? No doubt, to know the meanings of both verbal and non-verbal means that might be different from culture to culture is essential but it is impossible to know all cultures. Therefore, we must study the culture and pragmatics of our most virtual communicators. Misunderstanding can result in “pragmatic failure” (Thomas 1983/2006) of communication and cause all sorts of ridiculous situations. A case told by a Russian journalist, expert in Japan studies, Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, and published in Rossiyskaya Gazeta (15 June, 2007, p.22) is a good illustration of such a misunderstanding. Staying in a Japanese-style hotel (ryokan), he was treated with sashimi, made of raw fish, by a Japanese hostess. He was so pleased by the meals that he expressed his admiration by a typical Russian gesture – showed his thumb while making a fist with other fingers of his hand. The gesture took the hostess aback. Slowly, she echoed him by showing her little finger and said, “Did you want to say that?” He shook his head vigorously and again made a gesture with his thumb, which means ‘excellent!’ She left and in some minutes was replaced by a big guy, brightly colored and dressed in a woman kimono and a wig. Evidently, in Japanese culture the Russian gesture meant a different thing.
One inference can be drawn from this: when preparing to communicate with people from a different culture, we must get to know that culture, i.e. we must be interculturally literate. The same idea is stressed by Nobuyuki Honna, Professor of Aoyama Gokuin University, Tokyo:

“One important issue is diversity management. Based on the observation that a common language is not a uniform language, but a diverse language, we will argue that a plausible way of managing the multiculturalism of Asian English is not standardization but intercultural literacy.” (Honna 2005: 122)

Acquiring intercultural literacy implies at least three dimensions (McKay 2002: 82-83):

- transfer information about other cultures;
- reflection on one’s own culture in relation to another;
- consideration of national identities as non-monolithic and diverse as regards age, gender, regional origin, ethnic background, and social class.

Intercultural literacy will result in cross-cultural pragmatic competence, that is “the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context” (Thomas 1983/2006: 23).

Margie Berns (2006) insists that intercultural communicative competence as a result of acquiring intercultural literacy relates to appropriateness in language use (what, when, and how to say), which has become “a cornerstone in the theoretical foundation of the new paradigm that is now known as world Englishes” (Berns 2006: 721). The controversy of this issue, like many others of the WE paradigm, is revealed in answer to the question: who is to determine what is appropriate and acceptable in the context of use – a native speaker or local users (Prator, Quirk vs. Kachru). Kachru’s “socially realistic assessment” ties communicative competence directly to choosing a variety by asking questions: Acceptable to whom?
Appropriate to whom? Intelligible to whom? Communicative competence is central not only in sociolinguistics but also in pedagogical theory, with the shift of focus in ELT from grammatical correctness to communicative effectiveness. M. Berns argues that the communicative competence is based on learners’ needs for the language, “the actual forms and functions of the speech community with which learners will interact and the attitudes of members of that speech community toward the language and its speakers” (Berns 2006: 726). So it must be taught through a polymodel approach.

On the other hand, there exists a point of view that

“[o]n the pragmatic level, speakers of English as a foreign language can also contribute to liberating the use of English from constraints of individual societies’ norms of language use by promoting culture-free varieties of English use for international communication. By avoiding expressions heavily-laden with beliefs, views and values of a particular society or accommodating silence and non-eye contact in non-verbal skills, the speakers of English as a foreign language may be able to contribute to the promotion of some common denominator-like language use to help create a global English communicative model, which would depend more on the language itself and, therefore, be more suitable for global use and less resisted by the speakers of English as a foreign language because of its neutrality. (Yano 2001: 130)

Yano’s suggestion seems to be in tune with the conception of formal denationalized model of International English discussed in the previous chapters.

Questions to discuss:

47. What causes the controversy between speaker’s identity and intercultural pragmatics?
48. In your opinion, whose pragmatic rules should a learner of English follow? Give your reasons.

49. Using the internet search, find the most prominent authors of Indian Literature in English, Pakistani Literature in English, Nigerian Literature in English, Singapore Literature in English, Chinese Literature in English. Are there any authors creating Russian Literature in English? Report your findings in class.

50. What do you understand by “intercultural literacy”? How can it be acquired?

51. Comment on the terms “appropriateness”, “acceptability”, and “intelligibility”. Give examples to illustrate their meanings.

52. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.

9. Varieties and Their Acceptance

Ключевые слова: коренное население, регулятивная функция, инструментальная функция, межличностная функция, креативная функция, официальный язык, билингвизм, мультилингвизм, вспомогательный язык, стандартизация, эндонорма, экзонорма, нативизация, аккультурация, инновации, акролект, мезолект, базилект, пиджин, гибридизация, кодовое смешение и переключение, девиация, субституция, редукция, редупликация, эпентетический гласный, аспирация, оглушение, щелевой согласный, смычный согласный, глухой и звонкий согласный, дифтонг, монофтонг, слог, слоговой ритм, иероглиф, диграф, диакритика, система письменности, глагол-связка, (не)исчисляемое имя, разделительный вопрос, калька, термины родства.
South Asian Englishes

South Asian Englishes include varieties of English spoken in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, the Maldives, the Seychelles, and Mauritius (Crystal 1997; Gargesh 2006; McArthur 2003, Melchers & Shaw 2003). These are the oldest varieties of the Outer Circle, dating back to the early 17th century. Brought by English traders and established with the foundation of the East India Company, English was stimulated by influential indigenous authorities who were sufficiently impressed by Western thought, culture, and scientific advances. In South Asia, English proves to be in contact with four major language families: Indo-Aryan, used by the majority of the population, Dravidian, Tibeto-Burman, and Munda (Kachru B. 1994/2006: 255)

The range of functions the English language carries out in this region is wide:

1. Regulative
2. Instrumental
3. Interpersonal
4. Creative

English is the associative official language, alongside Hindi, in India, a co-official language in Pakistan (with Urdu) and the Seychelle (with Seychellois, a French-based creole, and French). In Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka it is not an official language but it is extensively used in education and law, thus contributing to societal bilingualism/multilingualism in these countries. Supported by a number of state institutions, English is an institutionalized variety. It is the language used by politicians (e.g., Mohandas K. Ghandi), even for national awakening and struggle for freedom. It is used in the legal system, administration, armed forces, and for national business at home and abroad.

In education, English serves an instrumental function. It is an auxiliary language required for acquiring knowledge and used for internal communication in a multilingual society (Brutt-Griffler 2002: 5). In 2004, the Central Advisory Board of Education (India) discussed the issue of including English in the list of
modern Indian languages, which will be followed by standardization of Indian English (Gargesh 2006: 94). At present there is a growing trend in India to start early teaching English as a subject in Grade 1, as the “increasing demand for English represents the transformation of a society from an agrarian to an industrial and service-based one” (Gargesh 2006: 95). In Pakistan, English is a compulsory language from Grade 6. Bangladesh falls between an ESL and EFL country, with English introduced as a compulsory subject from Grade 1 to 12. English education in Nepal and Bhutan has significantly been influenced by India. The regional first English-language universities were established in 1857 in Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. English is still the medium of instruction in higher education in South Asia where it “continues to be a status symbol in society and commands prestige in all walks of life” (Gargesh 2006: 96).

The supplementary function of English is found in tourism. English is used by taxi-drivers, which gave reason for R.Gargesh to call it a “vehicular language” (Gragesh 2006: 92). It is a link-language serving to facilitate communication between various ethnicities.

Indian scholars’ research has found that South Asian audience enjoys English popular songs, soap operas, and sitcoms (Gargesh 2006: 100). English-language newspapers make up a significant proportion of published mass media in India, The Times of India having the largest circulation. There are also many English newspapers in Pakistan, Nepal, and Bangladesh. Radio news and debates during Indian parliamentary sessions are broadcast in English. Music programs are also in English. In India, 25% of sport programs are in English. Private TV channels provide entertainment and information in various Englishes.

“One can travel in any part of the region and find that even in an average-sized city, there is a newspaper in English, and the local radio and/or television station (if there is one) allocates some time to English. This is particularly true of India and Pakistan.” (Kachru B. 1994/2006: 282)
There is South Asian literature in English, both poetry and fiction. The best-known names are Raja Rao, Salman Rushdie, Taslima Nasreen, Bapsi Sihwa, Pritish Nandy, Kamala Das, Arundhati Roy, Kashiprasad Ghosh, Mulk Raj Anand, Anita Desai, R.K. Narayan, Vikram Seth, Arundhati Roy, and many others. The earliest poetry and fiction in South Asian English go back to the 1830s (the Bengali poet Kashiprasad Ghoshi and Bengali writer Sochee Chunder Dutt). These writers used English to write about themes and topics that are South Asian. Thanks to writing in English, these authors reach out to other Asian countries and the whole world.

“The common feature is that SAE writers nativize their English to the extent that the connotations and semiotics that exist in their local languages are imported into the medium used. Creative writing in SAE is a unique experiment wherein English is the second language of both the writers and their readers. Whereas Beckett and Conrad assimilated to the cultural semiotics of their adopted language, South Asian writers are contributing to the development of new canons in world English literature.” (Gargesh 2006: 107)

It is in South Asian English literature that the stylistic innovations have been most creative and national identity most evident. As a result, there appeared a variety of styles and the English language became nativized.

The attitude toward English in South Asia is in general favorable (Gargesh 2006: 101). Many Indians believe that being one of the Indian languages, English is sensitive to Indian culture and enhances progress in science and technology. There is strong parental encouragement of the study of English in Pakistan and Bangladesh.

Historically, South Asian Englishes were oriented towards British English norms. After the 1960s, localized varieties, such as Indian, Sri Lankan, and
Pakistani Englishes do not imply a derogatory connotation. There is a significant impact of American English through films, TV and radio programs, newspapers and literature, so the earlier British linguistic connection has become much more fragile. The discussion of the exocentric and endocentric norms is still a hot linguistic issue.

“...English is our language. After more than two hundred years of constant presence and use how can it not be? And though we have been diffident about setting standards, they have evolved very naturally and are in place even though they are not always acknowledged.” (D’souza 1997/2006: 313-314)

Despite a large geographical spread and cultural diversity, the South-Asian varieties of English have shared features (McArthur 2003; Gargesh 2006; Kachru B. 1994/2006):

**in phonology**

- Pronouncing diphthongs [əl] [əV] (as in *face, goat*) as monophthongs [e] [o];
- No clear-cut opposition between /A/ - /ɑ/ [bAs – bqs], /a/ - /ɔ/, /F/ - /x/;
- Using glides with word-initial high vowels (*em > yem; open > wopen*);
- No vowel reduction, no distinction between strong and weak forms of vowels;
- Unaspirated /p, t, k/ in the beginning of a syllable: *pin > pin*;
- Retroflex *t, d* pronounced with the tongue-tip curled up towards the hard palate;
- *[r]* pronounced in all positions;
- Palatalization of /ts/ and /ʃ/;
- No distinction between [S] and [Z];
- Possible substitution of [Z] by [z] (*pleasure [plezar]*);
- Substitution of the interdental [T] and [D] by [t] and [d];
• [f] is often pronounced as an aspirated [p];
• Substitution of [v] by [b];
• Pronouncing [z] as [G ] (bijit < visit);
• Not distinguished /v/ and /w/;
• Not distinguished /n/ and /N/;
• Epenthetic vowels in consonant clusters sk, sl, sp (ischool/ seekool < school);
• Syllables uttered with an almost equal prominence;
• Elision of syllables (university [jV nqst] );

in grammar
• Complex noun phrases (Metros Operation Control Centre) ;
• Tendency to use complex sentences as opposed to simple ones;
• The Present Progressive with stative verbs (I am having a cold);
• The Present Perfect preferred to the Simple Past (I have bought the book yesterday);
• Direct word order in questions (What you would like to read?);
• Universal tag-questions (You went there, isn’t it? He isn’t going there, isn’t it?);
• Yes and no used as tag-questions: He is coming, yes? She was helping, no?
• One is preferred to a: He gave me one book;
• Word reduplication (I bought some small small things; to give crying crying “incessantly crying”);
• Unusual verb government (He doesn’t hesitate from using four-letter words; She said that her party wanted that we should not intervene in internal affairs of Afghanistan.);

in lexis
• Fresh meanings of words in local contexts (secular “respect for all religions”; trade “exchange”; to intimate “to inform”; military hotel “non-vegetarian restaurant”);
New culture-bound loan-words (*lakh* a unit of 100,000; *rupee, sahib; atta* “flour”) – especially words related to flora, fauna, local customs, festivals and rituals, legal system, and administration;

Hybridization (*policewala* “police station”, *management guru; coooledom*);

New collocations (*address communication* “write a letter”, *body bath* “an ordinary act of having a bath”; *head bath* “washing one’s hair”; *full-boiled* “hard” and *half-boiled* “soft-boiled” eggs; *foreign-returned* of someone who has been abroad for educational purposes; *cousin-brother, cousin-sister*);

Idiomatic calques (*to sit on smb’s neck* “to watch a person carefull”);

Archaic words as compared with today’s British and American English (*needful*);

*Only* used for emphasis: *They live like that only* (“That is how they live);

in discourse

- Code-mix in informal talk and newspapers (especially in headlines and captions);
- Enhancing the communicator’s self-esteem (maintaining a positive face) (*What’s your good name please?*);
- Using kinship terms for addressing (*sister, auntie, uncle*);
- Honorific suffixes attached to names (*Gandhiji*);
- The author of an academic text does not provide solutions and convince the audience of their rightness; but informs the readers on all facets of an issue and thus leads them to find the right solutions (Kachru Y. 2001: 60).

The depth of English use has increased lately in South Asia. There are several lectal types of Englishes, with acrolect spoken by educated proficient users, basilect, pidgin English, restricted in use (Babu English used by low-level clerks, Kitchen English, or Butler / Bearer English used by domestic helpers;
Boxivalla/Boxwallah English used by door-to-door sellers), and mesolect indicating adequate competence in one or more registers (English used by civil servants and teachers). There is a general educated South Asian English with national variations.

**Questions to discuss:**

53. Color South Asian countries on the map and mark the areas and countries where the following languages can be found:

Indian English, Pakistani English, Sri Lankan English, Nepalese English, Bangladeshi English, Bhutanese English, Ceylonese English, Hindustani English

Fig. 9. South Asia.

54. Count the percentage of English-speakers and fill out the table (Source: Crystal 1997: 57-60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Population (1995)</th>
<th>L1 / L2</th>
<th>Usage estimate</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>120,093,000</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>935,744,000</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>37,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>20,093,000</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>5,927,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. Read a passage with an example of Baboo (Babu) English and mark its characteristic Indian features:

Application for a post

Sir,

Being in much need and suffering many privations I have after long time come to the determination to trouble your bounteous goodness. To my sorry I have not the good friendships with many people hence my slow rate of progression and destitute state.

Here on earth who have I but thee, and there is Our Father in heaven, needless to say that unless your milk of human kindness is showered on my sad state no other hope is left in this world.

Be not angry my Lord at this importunity for my case is in the very worst state. If your honour kindly smile on my efforts for success and bestows on me a small birth (berth) of rupees thirty or more per mensem then I can subsist myself and my families without the hunger of keen poverty, with assurance that I am ever praying for your goodness and liberality.

I remain
Yours obedient
S.C.

(Source: Kachru B. 1994/2006: 266)

56. Point out features of pidgin English in the following extract of Butler English (it is a report of an invitation to England by a butler):

One master call for come India ... eh England. I say not coming. That master very liking me. I not come. That is like for India – that hot and cold. That England for very cold.

(Source: Kachru B. 1994/2006: 268)

57. Describe each function South Asian Englishes are used in. Use the Internet as an additional source for the material to report.

58. Write down the words (in their standard form) that are pronounced with some phonological deviations:
South East Asian Englishes

The regional varieties referring to South-East Asian Englishes include Singapore/Singaporean, Malaysian, Philippine/Filipino, and Brunei Englishes, which make up the Outer Circle, and Indonesian, Thai, Myanmar (Burman/Burmese), Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian/Kampuchean Englishes of the Expanding Circle. English has been in South-East Asia since the 17th century (McArthur 2003: 332). The New Englishes (of the Outer Circle) emerged from their colonial histories: Singapore and Malaysia were British colonies, and the Philippines was under the American colonial government until 1946. In the group of Expanding Circle countries, Thailand has never been colonized by Europeans. The other countries were under the rule of either the French or the Dutch.

In Singapore, which became an independent republic in 1965, English is a dominant language over the other three official languages, Chinese, Malay, and Tamil. It is the language of law courts and government administration. Today English is considered to be a first language by many Singaporeans. Its use is not restricted to the social elite. Here primary, secondary, and tertiary education is in English. English is used in its interpersonal function as a lingua franca in everyday life. It serves as an international medium and a means of uniting the country. It is used in all domains (educational, business, finance, domestic, religious, and entertainment) and by all ethnic groups. At home many Singaporeans drop the formal English code for an informal Singapore Colloquial English (Pakir 1991/2006: 359).
Since 1976 Malaysia has taken the course of Malaysianization, with Malay being the only government language (Bautista & Gonzalez 2006: 131), so English is not an official language of the country any more and thus it may be regarded moving from the Outer Circle to the Expanding Circle (Ho 2005: 231). English is taught as a compulsory subject from Grade 1 to 12. However, being a language of science and technology and leading to modernization, English is a medium of instruction for technical subjects. It has become a path to better-paid and prestigious employment. About 25% of city dwellers are reported to use English for some purpose in everyday life (McArthur 2003: 335). Still, the main value of the language for Malaysians is for international communication. At the turn of the century, the Malaysian government adopted three plans that will enhance the role of English: 1) the development of Malaysia into an industrial nation; 2) the establishment of the multi-media super corridor, and 3) the establishment of Malaysia as a regional center of education (Gill 2005: 204).

For Philippines, the bilingual (English-Tagalog) scheme was a compromise. English is a co-official language. Its role is still significant in all spheres, including education where it is a medium of acquiring knowledge in Science, Mathematics, and Communication Arts (Bautista 2005: 185).

In the independent Sultanate of Brunei (Brunei Darussalam), Malay and English are co-official languages. Both languages are prominent in education, with English being the medium for 80% of class time (McArthur 2003: 336).

English is widely used in the media in every country under discussion.

Singapore and Philippine Englishes developed creative literature and are in the process of standardization. The first novel in Philippine English was A Child of Sorrow by Zoilo M. Galang (1921). In 1940, the first Commonwealth Literary Awards were given to Salvador P. Lopez for "Literature and Society" (essay), Manuel Arguilla for "How My Brother Leon Brought Home a Wife and Other Stories", R. Zulueta da Costa for "Like the Molave" (poetry), and Juan C. Laya for "His Native Soil" (novel). Writers in English who have received the National Artist award include Jose Garcia Villa (1973), Nick Joaquin (1976), Carlos P. Romulo
There is evidence of Singapore literature published as early as the 1830s. After declaring independence, most published works of Singapore writing in English have been in poetry. Edwin Thumboo is the leading figure in Singapore poetry. Some other notable poets include Boey Kim Cheng, Alvin Pang, Cyril Wong, Felix Cheong and Alfian bin Sa'at (also a playwright). Goh Poh Seng is a pioneer in writing novels. Catherine Lim is Singapore's most widely read author. Other prominent names are Rex Shelley, whose first novel *The Shrimp People* (1991) won a National Book Prize. Another National Book Prize winner is Su-Chen Christine Lim.

The common feature of all these Englishes is that they are spoken as a second language. The English of each national community is a continuum showing acrolectal, mesolectal, and basilectal varieties. Basilectal varieties are often abbreviated as Malenglish / Manglish; Singlish, and Taglish/Engalog. There is code switching from one lectal level to another and back and from one official language to another depending on the situation. Highly educated English-knowing bilinguals are able to control a range of varieties and clines (Pakir 1991/2006: 362). The basilectal speech (the so-called lower varieties of English) are increasingly being used “in codified texts such as poems, short stories and plays by Singaporean writers” (Pakir 1991/2006: 352)

The major deviant features of these varieties used by average, educated speakers include (Cane 1994; Trudgill&Hannah 1994; Othman & McLellan 2000; McArthur 2003; Melchers & Shaw 2003; Bautista 2005; Bautista &Gonzalez 2006; Kachru Y. & Nelson C. 2006):

**in phonology:**

- Unaspirated stops
- Substitution of [t] for [T] and [d] or [f]: for [D] breath > bref; three of these > tree of dese
- Substitution of [s], [z], [S], and [Z]: zink > sink; shame > same
- Lack of length contrast in vowels: *sheep / ship*
- Devoicing stops in word-final position: *leg > lek*
- Substitution of stops for fricatives: *Pilipino / Filipino; vote > [bQt]*
- Reduction of word-final consonant clusters: *He lived here lass (<last) year.*
- Lack of weak forms of vowels: *boo-let < bullet*
- Monophthongization of diphthongs: *make [mek], coat [kot]*
- Syllable-timed rhythm (equal stress on all syllables).

in grammar:

- Past and present tenses not morphologically marked: *This radio sound good. My mum, she come from China many year ago.*
- Using the Present Perfect for the Simple Past: *I have seen her yesterday.* and the Past Perfect for the Present Perfect: *Several crocodiles had been sighted recently in the park. Visitors are advised not to go into the...*
- Aspect marked by adverbials: *Eight years she work here already.*
- A link-verb dropped to describe a state: *This coffee house cheap.*
- Use of *would* for *will* to express politeness and future: *We hope this would meet your requirements. Students are invited to the ceremony which would be held in the Staff-Student Center.*
- Using transitive verbs as intranstitve: *I enjoy.*
- Verb+preposition: *based from, result to; cope up with*
- Non-count nouns treated as count: *Pick up your chalks. A consideration for others is important.*
- Missing noun inflectional endings: *I got three sister. Many student go there; especially the plural marker (in one of the Nsing)*
- Interchangeable use of *he* and *she*: *Those familiar with Okara’s The Voice will recall how he exploits the praise poem structure to add both drama and texture to his narrative. Examples can be multiplied and it is here that the writer’s creativity, her ingenuity, shows...That of course,
is linked to where she brings as much as possible of her experience, memory, etc...

- Omitting articles: *He went to office yesterday. This is very interesting book. I am going to visit United States.*

- Reduplication: *no traffic police, stop stop a while. Don’t always eat sweet sweet things.*

- Object placed in the first position (OSV): *This book we don’t have.*

- Use of *or not:* *Like it or not?*

- Use of pragmatic particles *lah, ah* (SingE), *bah* (BrunE) and the interjection *aiyah* (tokens of informal intimacy or emotions): *Aiyah, it’s no good! How are you going ah? Sorry, can’t come lah.*

- Use of the universal tag question *is it?:* *You check out today, is it? They come here often, isn’t it?*

**in lexis:**

- Loanwords (kinship titles, local food terms, fauna, flora, traditions): *durian, orang utan, sarong*

- Calques: *making foolishness; eat well “enjoy your meal,” green joke “dirty joke,” comfort room “restroom”*

- Hybrids: *dadah addict “drug addict” (MalE)*

- Changes of meaning: *stay “to live permanently”; crocodile “a womanizer” (MalE); open the light “put on” (SingE). Can I follow you? < go with (BrunE)*

- Local neologisms: *captain-ball “a team captain in basketball”; hold-upper “someone who engages in armed hold-ups,” Amboy < American boy (PhilE)*

The lexical innovations have been gathered in Macquarie Dictionaries of Asian English.

**in discourse:**

- Using kinship terms (*Aunt, Uncle*) when addressing non-relatives (Ильина 2005)
The attitude toward the indigenous varieties of English is different in different countries. There is no doubt about the existence of Singapore English as a variety (Gupta 1998/2006). The sociolinguistic research conducted by Maria Lourdes S. Bautista (2005) revealed that the general idea of Philippine English among its users (students and teachers) is acceptable but only in the areas of phonology and the lexicon and not in the area of grammar. Grammar is expected to follow exonormative standard. The attitude of Malaysians is described by Prof. Gill from University Kebanggaan Malaysia:

“We need to be aware that nativised English, which is perfectly acceptable for communicating socially and informally and gives one a strong sense of identity, is not the variety that is found acceptable by the business community, by many members of the society and the political leaders of the Government.” (Gill 2005: 209-210)

Malaysia’s Prime-Minister articulated direct relationship of nationalism, as understood by Malaysians, and English learning:

“Learning the English language will reinforce the spirit of nationalism when it is used to bring about development and progress for the country. ... True nationalism means doing everything for the country, even if it means learning the English language.” (Mahathir Mohamad. The Sun, Saturday, September 11, 1999; quoted by Gill 2005: 205-206)

However, David Crystal (1995: 104) suggests that, though the traditional prestige attached to English still exists in Malaysia, it is too early to speak about the permanent variety of Malaysian English because the general sociolinguistic situation in this country is in sharp contrast with that in other Outer Circle countries. This variety is not a norm-developing one but is a norm-dependent one.
In the Expanding Circle cultures, English is used for international business and tourism. Schools incline to adopt an American model of English studied as the main foreign language. The educational systems of Cambodia, Laos, and Burma (Myanmar) are in slow revival, with English getting rather little attention yet. If taught in high school and universities, like in Laos, English is intended for developing reading skills mostly (Ho 2005: 225). The longest record of ELT is in Thailand where it is taught from Grade 1 as an elective subject (Sukamolson 1998: 81). About 99% of Thai students study English at school but, as it appears, not many succeed in acquiring proficiency (Bautista and Gonzalez 2006: 138). In Indonesia, English (American model, mainly) is taught from Grade 4 or 5 through high school, with the main objective being to provide reading skills (to read science-related materials). English is viewed as a linguistic resource to enrich Indonesian, especially in the field of terminology. Western pop-music is widely popular and broadcast by radio and TV. Significant is the influence of English magazines, paperback books, and movies. Tourism, especially on the island of Bali, makes the need of English particularly acute (Smith B. 1991/2006). Vietnam changed its education policy from French and Russian to English (American model), which is taught as a compulsory subject in Grades 10-12. Textbooks are written by Vietnamese authors. The main objective is to develop students’ reading skills in English (Denham 1992/2006). Ineffective communicative skills in most of these countries are accounted for by shortage of teachers, teachers’ inadequate command of English, large classes (up to 70 students), poorly designed teaching materials, and old methods of teaching (dominance of grammar-translation method).

Generally, authors from the Expanding Circle begin to write in English after emigration. They are often referred to as the "1.5 generation" (those born in their mother tongue country, but who came to the United States at an early age). Lan Cao and Monique Truong are representatives of the 1.5 Vietnamese generation. Shirley Geok-lin Lim is an award-winning Malaysian-born American writer of poetry, fiction, and criticism who received the 1997 American Book Award. Thai
literature knows a few Thai English bilingual authors – Kumut Chandruang, who is the first published Thai English author, Pongpol Adireksarn (Paul Adirex), a contemporary writer with many best-sellers, Somtow Sucharitkul (S.P.Somtow), Channongsri Ritnin, Karuvin Boon-Long, and Pira Sudham (Watthaolarm 2005).

Questions to discuss:

59. Find the countries of South East Asia in the map and color them in two different colors depending on the type of English in them – ESL (red) or EFL (yellow). Figure 10.

60. Count the percentage of English-speakers and fill out the table (Source: Crystal 1997: 57-60; Melchers & Shaw 2003: 161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Population (1995)</th>
<th>L1/L2/FL</th>
<th>Usage estimate</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>291,100</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>19,948,000</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
61. Fill out the table regarding the English language functions in South East Asian countries. Discuss the content of your tables with your partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>regulative</th>
<th>instrumental</th>
<th>creative</th>
<th>interpersonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. Analyze the dialogues between daughter and father, who are educated people with university diplomas and highly proficient in the language, and mark the linguistic features of Singaporean English (source: Pakir 1991/2006: 359-360)

D.: *Oh yes, Pa, now I know what I was going to ask you about. Why do you want to have your hair long again?*

F.: *I need to change my image.*

D.: *What image?*

F.: *...Change lah, I just want to change.*

F.: *...You know why or not? I just want to change my image lah. I just take a look and see how for a few months if not I just cut it off.*

D.: *O.K. but you got to have the will and the guts to last ... to last through the whole time because ... because we are going to keep making criticism at you.*

F.: *You know why, in our days, ah, in our days different lah. Studying is different lah. Studying is mixed with a bit of pleasure. Pleasure. Not nowadays.*

D.: *Now no pressure? Are you telling me now no pressure?*

F.: *No, ‘pleasure’, ‘pleasure’. Not ‘pressure’. ...Because that time that time nobody talked about this kind of thing. Competition or what. Yah. My colleague, myself, we never compare marks... Ya we heard people talk about wah this fella got 8 A’s. So what? Everybody still get a C. Go to Polytechnic or University or whatever.*

63. Among the notable Filipino English-language fictionists of recent years are:
- Linda Ty Casper,
- F. Sionil Jose,
- Erwin Castillo,
- Ninotchka Rosca,
- Antonio Enriquez,
- Amadis Ma. Guerrero,
- Jessica Zafra,
- Luis Joaquin Katigbak,
- Ian Casocot,
- Ma. Francezca Kwe.

Search the Internet and find titles of some of their books.

64. Match the following Singaporean authors with their works. Use the Internet search or the Wikipedia on-line encyclopedia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandran Nair</td>
<td>The Bondmaid</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Chiang</td>
<td>The Sea is Never Full</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han May</td>
<td>Fistful Of Colours</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Lim</td>
<td>City of Rain</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery T.H. Lee</td>
<td>A Third Map</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Wong</td>
<td>After the Hard Hours, This Rain</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Jeyaretnam</td>
<td>Star Sapphire</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Thumboo</td>
<td>Below: Absence</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin Pang</td>
<td>Army Daze</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-Chen Christine Lim</td>
<td>First Loves</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Asian Englishes**

East Asian Englishes include China English / Chinese Englishes, Japanese English, and Korean English. There are three factors that they have in common: geographical area, Chinese cultural legacy (all of them are the countries of the so called “Chinese cultural circle” (Маевский 2000: 34), i.e. the Chinese culture had a great impact on Korean and Japanese cultures - religion, characters, arts, martial arts, and so on), and common linguistic deviations despite the fact that their indigenous languages relate to different language families. The Mongolian variety
of English, as a rule, stands separately and the area of its diffusion is referred to Northern Asia.

Contacts of the English language with East Asian vernaculars started in the 17th century when the first missionaries and traders came to South China and Japan. Korea, “the Hermit Kingdom”, saw the expansion of English much later – in the late 19th century. It was a difficult “hate-and love” history of language and social contact (Прошина 2001; Adamson 2004; Stanlaw 2004; Honna 2006) that in the end resulted in the boom of English in these countries. Of particular interest is the story of Japanese-English contact. James Stanlaw argues that “there is no non-Anglophone nation where English is so pervasive” as in Japan (Stanlaw 2004: 8).

As a language of intercultural communication in the Expanding Circle, English performs restricted functions in China, Japan, and Korea. It has an instrumental (in education) and a culture-spreading, or “transculturization” function (Brutt-Griffler 2002:177) and very restrictively regulative, interpersonal, and creative functions.

In East Asian countries, there is a trend to start early teaching English as a subject - from Grade 3 in China (Wen & Hu 2007) and South Korea with the plans to start in Grade 1 in South Korea in 2008 (Choi 2007) and Grade 7 in Japan, though starting English in elementary school is in project in the country and now supplementary English activities are offered in 90% of Japanese primary schools (Koike 2007: 107, 112). In 2002 the Japan's Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) publicized a strategic plan to cultivate "Japanese with English Abilities" aimed at improving Japanese abilities to speak, read, write, and comprehend English. MEXT primarily requires that all

---

7 See the description of Mongolian English in (Cohen 2005: 203-216)
Japanese high school graduates acquire simple conversation skills to be able to use English at offices and in the international community of college graduates (Takeshita 2003-2004). New high-school textbooks were introduced, containing more Japanese topics (e.g., J-Talk) (Honna 2006).

Private schools and some universities teach all classes in English, especially in Hong Kong where English is no longer a second language but it has not become a foreign one either (Evans 1996: 36).

In China’s tertiary education there is difference between college English and university English. University English is for majors in English who will become teachers or translators (2000 hours’ classroom instruction in four years), while college English is the so called service English, English for special purposes, and English for science and technology (300 hours’ classroom instruction in two years) (Pride & Liu 1988; Wen & Hu 2007). A system of graded teaching has been introduced, i.e. students can take their English courses according to their proficiency levels. Considerable attention is paid to computer-based English teaching geared toward self-learning and tutoring. It is stipulated that a college student must work individually in a computer lab for nine hours before having one hour face-to-face teaching (Wen & Hu 2007: 17, 25).

Korea also makes emphasis on the use of computer and Internet for English education in classrooms (Choi 2007). Classes seem to be downsized enough to have small group activities. In today’s Korean tertiary schools English is the main medium of instruction (Choi 2007: 58). One of a few significant changes in English education was opening an English village in Geyonggi Province (2004) to promote English education in natural and authentic contexts and to build students’ international awareness (Park & Ahn 2004; Choi 2007: 58; see also Cho 2006).

Both in Korea and Japan native speakers are invited to work as assistant teachers in classrooms. However, currently the Japanese education system is getting more and more geared to teaching/learning communication with non-native speakers and relies on well-qualified local teachers, since “the native speakers have been no magic pill towards fluency” of students (Sakai & D’Angelo 2005: 324).
The major concerns with inviting native English speakers (NES) for teaching are the following: their low ELT expertise and experience; marginalizing NES and non-native English speaking teachers (NNEST); the wrong concept of the ownership of English to NES (Park 2006: 128-131).

In 2000, an advisory board to the then Prime Minister of Japan Keizo Obuchi proposed that English be promoted to the position of the second official language in Japan. This fact ignited hot controversies as to whether this policy should be implemented or not. This time again the opponents of the proposition won. As a matter of fact, that was not the first attempt to change the status of English in Japan. In the 19th century, the first Minister of Education of Japan, Mori Arinori, made the proposal to abolish Japanese and adopt English (Stanlaw 2004: 65).

“The latest [Obuchi’s] proposal did not make any headway due to the fact that it was simply flown as a trial balloon and it did not show any concrete action programs. Looking back at the proposal now, we may wonder if it is really necessary to have a law that declares English as a second official language in the country. Japanese people and organizations now are becoming more aware than before of the reality of the importance of English as a language of international information, communication, and cooperation.” (Honna 2006: 120)

A somewhat similar attempt to declare English as a regional official language is being made on Korean island Jeju-do, famous for its international tourism (in 2008 Jeju Island is expected to be declared Free International City in Korea) (Choi 2007: 58-59). In 2002, Taiwan’s President Chen Sui-bian also spoke in favor of making English the nation’s second official language and Premier Yu Shyi-kun promised to make English a “second semi-official” language in six years (Honna 2006: 126). All these proposals testify to the importance of and interest in English as an intercultural language in East Asia.
Regulative function of the English language can be found in Xianggang (in law court and administration) and in huge transnational corporations (Samsung, Daewoo, LG, Toyota, Mitsubishi, a.o.) that keep their documents in English. It is not infrequently that the employees of such companies have to take training courses in English, organized by the company (Morrow 1995; Jordan 1997; Crocetti 1999).

In China, Japan, and Republic of Korea, the language of some mass media is English, which is aimed at both international and national readership. According to the 1880s statistics, in Japan the rate of subscribers to English-language newspaper was 60 and 40 % correspondingly (Morrow 1987: 39). Today, the latter figure can be expected much bigger. China has 19 English-language newspapers and magazines, one English TV channel and one English radio service (Jiang 2002: 15). Almost all bookstores sell English-language books published in the country. These are the books by English authors as well as translations of local writers and especially country-study literature (travel guides, culture descriptions, encyclopedias, like, for example, the 9-volume Encyclopedia of Japan published by the Kodansha International Publishers.) After taking the policy of internationalization, the government of the Republic of Korea aims to express the traditional national culture in an up-to-date form, which is actualized by the English language (Korea in the 21st century 1995: 94)

Radio, TV, especially with the emerged genre of “language entertainment” (Moody 2006: 212), and movies play a significant role in spreading English in East Asia. For instance, in 1994, 41 out of 55 movies that were on in Nagoya were shown in English (Tanaka 1995: 48). Pop culture, with its intensive code mixing, is another vast domain for the English language (discussed in Pennycook 2003; Stanlaw 2004; Moody 2006; Lee 2006). For example, about 75 % of the song titles in the Japanese hit parade have English loanwords in their titles (Stanlaw 2004: 5). 62 % of Japanese pop-songs contain both English and Japanese lyrics (Moody 2006: 218).
English is extensively employed in creating brand names (Крыкова 2004) and in advertisement. According to the data of the 1990s, the number of Korean product names in English surpassed other languages (Jung 2001: 262). In the 1980s the term “decorative English” emerged in Japan to denote the ornamental function of English (words, sentences, letters) of decorating clothes, toiletries, bags, umbrellas, and stationery (Dougill 1987: 33; Morrow 1987; Takashi 1990; McArthur 1998: 14; Searjeant 2005: 315-317).

“Decorative English is meant to be seen rather than read, eye appeal taking precedence over accuracy and appropriateness.” (McArthur 2003: 369)

The interpersonal function of English is manifest in Xianggang (Hong Kong). After the city became a Chinese city (in 1997) some Hong Kongers prefer to use English when communicating with mainland Chinese, since the latter do not know Cantonese and the former are not proficient in Mandarin (Boyle 1998).

Creative function is observed in mass media (newspapers and magazines) and cultural literature. It is also characteristic of fiction created by authors immigrated to the Inner Circle countries (see in The Asian Pacific American Heritage 1999). The first generation of immigrant authors includes Mine Okubo, Kyoki Mori, Louis Chu, Han Syuin, Ha Jin, Frank Chin, Younghill Kang, Ko Won, Lee Chang-Rae, and others. Many Asian authors of the second generation return to their cultural roots and depict the traditions, customs, history, and life style of their people (Maxine Hong Kingston, Amy Tan). There are also creative writing works, though not very numerous, in Hong Kong: poetry by Anita Cheung, Loise Ho, Agnes Lam, Mani Rao, and Wong Ho-yin (Ho 2002; Lam 2002)8

East Asian Englishes, like any other Englishes of the Expanding and Outer Circles are not homogeneous. They represent a continuum of acrolect, mesolect,

and basilect. Chinese linguists (Zhang 1997: 40) insist on differentiating the lectal varieties by giving them the following terms:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ACROLECT} & = \text{China English} \\
\downarrow & \uparrow \\
\text{MESOLECT} & = \text{Chinese English} \\
\downarrow & \uparrow \\
\text{BASILECT} & = \text{Chinglish}
\end{align*}
\]

The terms ‘Japanese’ and ‘Korean Englishes’ are applied to both acrolectal and mesolectal levels of the languages.

“Every country is unique to some extent. In China, for example, we have China-specific things to express when we speak or write in English, such as Four Books (Si Shu), eight-legged essay (baguwen), May Fourth Movement (Wusi Yundong), xiucai (xiucai), Mr. Science (sai xiansheng), baihua (baihua), ideological remoulding (sixiang gaizao), and four modernizations (sige xiandaihua). All these translated terms are words of China English rather than Chinese English or Chinglish” (Ge Chuangui 1980; cited in Jiang 2002: 7)

Basilects of other varieties are also termed in a hybrid way: Japlish, Janglish, and Konglish.


- in phonetics:
  - epenthetic vowels in consonant clusters and in the word-final position after a consonant: bullu < bull; act > [x kqtq] ; stand > [sqtx ndq]
  - non-differentiation of voiced and voiceless consonants: bulgogi = pulkoki = pulgoki; garden > [kR tqn]; cheap > jeap
- substitution of fricative [v, f] for stops [b, p]: Buradibosotoku < Vladivostok
- substitution of the interdental [T, D] for [s] or [d]: thin > sin, then > sen/den, Smith > Sumisu
- affricatization of consonants: root > rutsu; radio > rajo; limousine > rimujin
- monophthongization of diphthongs: joking [G okINGV]
- syllable-timed rhythm (equal stress on all syllables)

**in grammar:**

- replacing non-count nouns by count one: equipments, furnitures; much sweets
- avoiding the plural ending of nouns: the proceeding of the Legislative Council. I love peanut.
- the use and non-use of articles: giving customers the full redress; in strictly legal sense
- interchange of the pronouns he and she
- reducing the 3d person ending of a verb: He give all de picture to you. My friend work as a waitress.
- using the present tense instead of the past: I don’t learn at secondary school.
- substituting the Past Simple for the Present Perfect: I became better at English since last year.
- substituting voice forms: Xiangjun was still lived in the House of Enchanting Fragrance... He was congratulated his student.
- combining affirmative and negative structures: No, I like it. Yes, he is not here.
- reduplication: I join join you in encouraging her....
• lack of a link verb: *English main language of instruction.*
• lack of the sentence subject: *Here is not allowed to stop the car.*
• lack of object: *I understand she said. Let’s listen to Brither Liu tell a story.*
• prepositions: *I venture to request for your kind permission. I care only Cheng Siu Chau.*

in lexis:
• new coinages from English stems: (KorE) *handphone* < *cell phone*; *skinship* < *close friendship*; *eye shopping* < *window shopping*; JapE *Camcorder, home stay, salaryman, Walkman*
• semantic and phraseological calques: (JapE) *pillow “sex”, stable “place where sumo fighters live and train”; capsule hotel; ChE *work unit, barefoot doctor; one-family-one-child-policy*
• “returned” loans: *anime* < *animation; beddo* < *bed; pidgin* < *business*
• loans: *dazibao, qigong; tamagochi, judo; taekwondo, kimchi*
• half-hybrids: *karaoke = Jap. kara “empty” + orchestra; chopstick* < Ch. Pidgin *chop “quick” + stick*

in discourse:
• It has been found that Asian learners (Chinese in particular) seldom use ‘general-particular pattern’ which is preferred by native speakers, that is why their writing is characterized as indirect (Jiang 2002: 10): Chinese English learners normally come to the point at the end of their writing rather than put a thesis in the beginning paragraph.
• In oral discourse small talk phatic phrases may include: *What have you been doing these days? Where have you been recently? That might be regarded by an unprepared communicator as too inquisitive and nosy.*

All East Asian countries have their own systems of writing. However, they have also adopted standard systems of Romanization, which is a way to express their vernacular words in Roman (English) letters. Japan uses the system labeled for one of its inventors, J.C.Hepburn, the US physician and missionary, the
compiler of a Japanese-English dictionary (1867). This system of Romanization is also known in Japan as *Hebon Romaji*. It represents consonants according to English orthography and vowels as if they were read from German or Latin. The alternative to Hepburn system is Kunrei, or Kokutei Romaji, developed under the Japanese physicist Tanakadate Akitsu and adopted in 1937. This system was influenced by the Japanese syllabary and has no consonant digraphs. Cf.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hepburn system</th>
<th>Kunrei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shi</td>
<td>si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi</td>
<td>ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsu</td>
<td>ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fu</td>
<td>hu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kunrei Romaji is used mainly in Japanese geographical terms, whereas Hepburn system is spread in all domains all over the world.

Chinese words can be found predominantly in two Romanized systems. The earlier one was created by the British sinologists Sir Thomas Francis Wade and Herbert Allen Giles (1859-1892) and is now known as Wade-Giles (system). Wade-Giles was widely used until 2000. The second system of Chinese Romanization was adopted in China in 1958 and in 1977 the UN accepted it as a standard for geographical terms. It has the Chinese label – Pinyin, a Chinese phonetic alphabet. In 2000, the US Library of Congress transferred its catalogues of Chinese sources to Pinyin, and all Chinese loan-words have been written in Pinyin since. The major features of Wade-Giles and Pinyin are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wade-Giles</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation of various dialects</td>
<td>Mandarin pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No voiced consonant letters. A consonant with the apostrophe indicated a voiceless consonant: <em>Tao</em> [daV] – <em>T’ang</em> [tQN]</td>
<td>Voiced and voiceless consonant letters in the initials: <em>Dao</em> - <em>Tang</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diacritics to show a new quality of a sound (though irrelevant for English) and superscript digits to mark a tone:</td>
<td>Diacritics to show a tone (often lost in print). No apostrophe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consonant digraphs $TS'$, $TS$, $HS$:

- $ts'ai-fu$
- $tsou$
- $hsing$

The letters $C$, $Z$, $X$ corresponding to the Wade-Giles digraphs:
- $cai-fu$
- $zou$
- $xing$

No letters $Q$, $X$, $Z$, initial $R$

- $(ch'i)$
- $(jen)$
- $(hsiang)$
- $(tsang)$

Letters $Q$, $X$, $Z$, initial $R$

- $qi$
- $ren$
- $xiang$
- $zang$

Several distributional meanings of $CH$

- $ch' + a$, $e$, $ih$, $u$
- $ch' + i$, $\ddot{u}$
- $ch + a$, $e$, $ih$, $ou$, $u$

Only one phonetic reading of $CH$ - [C]

- $ch$
- $(j)$
- $(q)$
- $(zh)$

Besides these two most popular systems of Romanization, there are several others, whose traces can be seen in English as a kind of exclusion, mostly in the proper names (e.g., *Chiang Kaishek, Sun Yatsen, Harbin*).

Korean Romanization is known of two types. The first one, widely recognized in the West, was designed by two American scholars George M. McCune and Edwin O. Reischauer in the 1930s. Based on transcription, it was the official system for Korean in South Korea from 1984 to 2000, and its modification is still the official system in North Korea. It is characterized by diacritics and apostrophe ($Ch'\ddot{ongnyangni$), as well as variations in writing voiced and voiceless consonants ($bulgogi / pulkoki / bulkoki / pulgoki$). The second system, Revised Romanization of Korean (also called South Korean or Ministry of Culture 2000) has been officially used in South Korea since 2000. It is based on both transcription and transliteration. All road signs, names of railway and subway stations on line maps and signs etc. have been changed. Romanization of surnames and existing companies' names has been left untouched; the government encourages using the new system for given names and new companies. Revised Romanization is similar to McCune-Reischauer, but uses neither diacritics nor apostrophes, which has
helped it to gain widespread acceptance on the Internet. The comparison of the two systems can be seen in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McCune-Reischauer</th>
<th>Revised Romanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diacritics above vowels ŏ, ŭ and apostrophe to indicate aspirated consonants: hangŭl, kimch’i</td>
<td>No diacritics or apostrophe: Digraphs eo, eu instead of vowels with diacritics. hangeul, kimchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŏ: Kyŏngju ŭ: maedŭp</td>
<td>&gt; eo: Gyeongju &gt; eu: maedeup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonants with apostrophe in the initial position: t’aekwondo Ch’ŏngnyangni</td>
<td>&gt; voiceless consonants without apostrophe: taekwondo Cheongnyangni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless consonants in the initial position: Kimp’o &gt; Pusan Cheju / Chechu</td>
<td>&gt; voiced consonants: Gimpo Busan Jeju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both McCune-Reischauer and Revised Romanization attempt to match a word spelling to how it would be written if it were an English word, so that an English speaker would come as close as possible to its Korean pronunciation. Since pronunciation depends on the context, the same Korean letter may be represented by different Roman letters. In addition to these systems, many people spell names or other words in an ad hoc manner, producing more variations (e.g. Lee, Yi, I, or Rhee are variations of one and the same family name).

In East Asia, there is

“the gradual acceptance of what was formaly known as ‘non-standard ‘English, as EFL speakers take the ‘new-English’ as their own. The huge volume of communication has simply swamped the former protocols, and increased sensitivity about the rights of other cultures has given ‘ethno-English’ an ethical base. Australia now has dictionaries of the ‘Australian’ language, India has a publishing industry that uses what
traditionalists would call a very strange English, and learners in Japan are slowly realizing that communicating with improper grammar is less embarrassing than not communicating at all” (Koike 2007: 111).

Questions to discuss:

65. Study the map and show the areas of East Asian Englishes.

66. Why is it possible to speak of China Englishes rather than China English? How many dialects does China have?

67. In Chinese Mandarin the word *tea* sounds *cha*. The similar pronunciation has this word in Korean and Japanese. How can you explain the pronunciation of *tea* taking into consideration that the word was borrowed into English in the early 17th century? With what Chinese dialects did the English tea traders have to deal with at that time?

68. What is the difference between the terms ‘China English’ – “Chinese English” – “Chinglish”?

69. Choose the letter which gives the best definition of a word as used in Japan (source: Stanlaw 2004: 37-39)
1. *ron-pari* < ‘London Paris’
   a. a European vacation
   b. a fashion boutique
   c. being cross-eyed

2. *beteran* < ‘veteran’
   a. a former member of the armed forces
   b. a retired company employee
   c. a professional or export

3. *saabitsu* < ‘service’
   a. having an automobile fixed
   b. being waited on at a restaurant
   c. complimentary extras for customers

4. *bebii kaa* < ‘baby car’
   a. a compact automobile
   b. a special car-seat for children
   c. a stroller

5. *baajin rodo* < ‘virgin road’
   a. an uncharted trail
   b. the main street in front of an all-girls high school
   c. the church aisle a bride walks down

Now check your guesses with the correct answers in the key:

Discuss with your partner whether the pronunciation of these Japanese coinages conforms to the phonetic deviations typical of Japanese English.

70. Write down the English words whose Korean pronunciation is given in brackets (from the pop-song lyrics performed by SMAP in 2001) (source: Lee 2006: 244):

```
Every [wad] you said, every [rav] you gave
Every you would make an ordinary day a [beda] day
Always
Every [riːsk] I [tuːk], every night and day
Just for you
Saturday in a crowd I’ve been waiting [fo] you
You said at one but it is almost two
On the phone you were [sjua] to be right on time
But you are late again. It’s same ol’ same
I’m looking out the window just wondering why’
People never [ruːk] above to see beyond the sky
```
You are the one who taught me how to find the day light moon
But now I’m just looking down because I don’t know what to do
Every day I feel, every night I dream
Every timm I close my eyes I see you
Smiling just [fo] me

71. Do the following Chinese texts describe the same or different people? What Romanization systems are used in them? (Source: Compton's Interactive Encyclopedia. Copyright © 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997 The Learning Company, Inc.). What features can prove your supposition?

(A) In early 1967 some of the highest ranking leaders, former close revolutionary associates of Mao Zedong himself, were criticized and dismissed... As the Cultural Revolution died down, Zhou Enlai, who had been premier since the founding of the People's Republic, quietly took control. Deng Xiaoping and other "pragmatic" leaders were reestablished. The party and government relaxed their control over the people and granted certain civil rights in a new constitution adopted in 1975.

(B) During the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s, China's Communist government publicly humiliated Teng Hsiao-p’ing by parading him through the national capital in a dunce cap. Yet, after the deaths of Chou Enlai and Mao Tse-tung in 1976, he emerged as his country's paramount leader. Deng was long acclaimed as a reformer who resisted rigid Communist ideology.

72. Match the following Korean geographical terms that are romanized in two ways and fill out the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McCune-Reischauer</th>
<th>Revised Romanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gwangju, Busan, Inch’ön, Chungcheong, Taegu, Kwangju, Gyeonggi, Incheon, Chōlla, Gangneung, Kŭmgangsan, Ch’ungeh’ŏng, Pusan, Paektusan, Kangnŭng, Daegu, Guwŏlsan, Jeolla, Kuwŏlsan, Kyŏnggi, Geumgangsan, Baekdusan.
European Englishes

English in continental Europe is used among non-native speakers as a lingua franca and is labeled Euro-English(es) (Jenkins 2001; Modiano 2001,2006; Seidlhofer 2001; McArthure 2003: 156) or Mid-Atlantic English (Modiano 2002). Margie Berns argues that

“...the label European English identifies those uses of English that are not British (and not American or Canadian or Australian or any other native variety) but are distinctly European and distinguish European English speakers from speakers of other [English] varieties” (Berns 1995: 6-7)

There are two evident trends in regards of English in Europe: on the one hand, a trend to claim a nation’s identity in a local variety of English – German, French, Hungarian, a.o. Englishes (Berns 1988; Durmuller 1991; Pulcini 1994; Davidson K. 1995; Goethals 1997; Van Essen 1997; Petzold & Berns 2000; Hilgendorf 2007), and on the other hand, a trend to create an English unifying the European Union. The term “Mid-Atlantic English” (MAE) proposed by Marko Modiano lays emphasis on the unifying regional rather than nativised variety: “MAE can be distinguished by being non-regionally or non-geographically localizable” (Modiano 2002: 241). These two trends are considered to be grounds for making the European communities bidialectal:

“...many English language users will have at least two varieties of English at their disposal, one for international forums and one for local purposes” (Modiano 2006: 225).
The unified Euro-English is developing as a formal register of written speech used by Eurocrats “in the corridors of power in the new European Union” (Crystal 1997: 136) Sometimes it is labeled ‘Eurospeak’ or ‘Eurojargon’. The typical features of Eurospeak are long redundant sentences, specialized jargon, abundance of acronyms, metonymical use of names of towns (e.g., Schengen “an agreement on a passport-free zone”, Amsterdam “a Treaty”, Gymnich “an informal meeting of foreign ministers”) (Wagner 2001). Besides, EU English, as a special-purpose variety (James 2000), is characteristic of newly created words and set phrases (Eurosceptic, member state).

However, acrolectal localized varieties of English are claimed to be gaining the status of an endonorm independent from the British or American standard (Seidlhofer 2001). It is believed that an emerging foreign-speaker-based, supranational variety of English becomes the basis of educational standards in Europe (Modiano 2002). Taking into consideration the proximity of Great Britain, one might expect the European educational standard to be based on British English. However, there is evidence that the British standards in European education are declining under the pressure of Americanization processes. The developing norm of European English adopts a mixture of British and American forms enriched with local culture content and preferring “situational adaptation” (Modiano 2002: 246) to consistency.

“Language issues also have a political dimension. For mainland Europeans, who are in the process of looking onto English as the most prominent and perhaps official language for Europe (together with German and French), the selection of BrE in language education in the Union would give the British an advantage in European affairs. With resistance to British dominance in the EU, it is conceivable that a rejection of BrE would by default act to promote AmE, something not in all respects an advantageous position for Europe seeing as Europe is
struggling to maintain a distinct identity in the face of massive Americanization (often referred to as ‘MacDonaldization’). It is clear that mainland Europeans must look for an alternative. A distinct European variety for the Union would not only allow foreign-language speakers an opportunity to mould English to fit their own needs and desires, it would also act as a barrier against widespread Anglo-Americanization, something which, in some quarters, is perceived as detrimental to the cultural integrity of mainland European society.” (Modiano 2002: 244)

Thus in Europe English is gradually moving to the second-language status. It has become the ‘first foreign’ language in educational systems of all European countries. Even in bilingual Switzerland, some German-speaking cantons have decided that English will be introduced at an earlier age than French, the second national language of the country. English is being introduced to ever lower ages in primary schools (Graddol 2006: 92-93).

English is increasingly used in higher education to teach various subjects, mostly in sciences. This might be the result of the domination of English in scientific research, the prominent position of British and US publishing houses, content and language integrating learning, and also a consequence of the presence of foreign students, particularly of students coming on exchange programs such as those offered by the European Union Universities which want to attract foreign students, but at the same time they do not want the national language to be a barrier (Truchot 1997: 71; Coleman 2006: 4). Mobility of students (encouraging foreign students to study) and faculty (universities tend to employ the best researchers they can get) leads to offering courses in English as a medium of education.

European English is frequently used in the domain of science. PhD dissertations in many subjects are routinely written in English in many countries for the scholars to become internationally known (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 184). Journals in Germany, France and Italy increasingly turn to English. Many German
journal titles, for example, have been renamed by using an English title (Hilgendorf 2007: 138). In 1994, 85 percent of the citations contained in PASCAL, the most important French databank for sciences compiled by the CNRS (National Center for Scientific Research), was in English. 95 percent of the researchers delivered their papers in English at conferences in foreign countries. At international conferences taking place in France, 76 percent of the scholars said they used English, and 24 percent French (Truchot 1997).

In European business the role of English is significant. Large international companies, like the Swedish Erikson, Volvo, and Dutch Philips, have institutionalized English as a company language, making it compulsory for any form of oral and written communication within the company. Negotiations between companies make use of English. Many advertisements and commercials use English intranationally for its fashion value. In Germany, business and commercial law is particularly influenced by increased interaction of the English and German languages (Berns 1992: 156). It has been found that in the legal domain English words are used for the pragmatic functions of precision and clarity as opposed to the political domain where English words are sometimes used to be vague and elusive (Hilgendorf 2007: 136).

English is used in planes, airports, trains, stations, buses, metro stations, museums. It is well noticeable in the media: films, TV programs (series), popular
songs, sports (mostly as transmitted on television), electronic games, computers and so on. In 1994, 53 percent of the films shown by 47 television channels in the European Union (15 countries) were American, and only 20 percent were national productions. In 1995, 76 percent of the viewers in movie theaters had watched American films. In France, movie theaters still show about 35 percent of French films while 55 percent are American films and 10 percent come from other countries (Truchot 1997: 69). In Germany, however, according to the figures given at the 1996 Berlin Film Festival, more than 90 percent of shown films were American, and only 6 percent were German. Many films are shown with subtitles providing the viewers with an opportunity to improve their English. Quite a number of European singers prefer to release their musical CDs in English. As Melchers and Shaw put it, “English enters European society not only institutionally or top-down via European institutions, education, etc., but also individually or bottom-up via subcultures” (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 183), the hip-hop youth culture being one of them.

The numerous domains of English use reflect both range and depth of the language in European countries. With the increase of borrowed English words, many Europeans use code-mixing and code-switching intensively. According to the 2004 statistics received from the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA), the Netherlands, Sweden and Denmark have the greatest number (80 %) of English speakers. Over 50% of English users are in Luxemburg, Finland, and Austria. The lowest percentage is characteristic of Italy (about 20%), Portuguese (18%), and Spain (15%) (Тер-Минасова 2007: 246).

In Europe, attitudes towards the spread of English vary greatly. In most countries the use of English is considered necessary for international purposes and to compensate for the limited reach of the national languages. In Denmark, for example, some form of bilingualism is being institutionalized. In Belgium and Switzerland, English tends to be used not only for international, but also for intranational communication. In Belgian Flanders, English is used to counterbalance the influence of French. However, in a very small language
community, as in the case of Iceland, English is sometimes considered a threat. In general, English is not tolerated everywhere and by everybody in the same way. The Germans, for example, tend to be more tolerant. Though there are voices disapproving of the intrusion of Anglicisms in the German language, the positive attitudes clearly prevail considering the wide functional range of the language use. In France, where some 30 years ago English met with fierce opposition, even now attitudes are more contrasted. The French government tries to regulate the relations between French and English. This policy includes status planning and corpus planning. Status planning mainly consists in the application of a law passed in 1994 and entitled Law on the Use of the French Language. Corpus planning is provided by Terminology Committees (Commissions terminologiques) established progressively since 1972 in each ministry to devise and promote French terminology in various specialized areas (Truchot 1997).

All localized varieties of English in Europe have their own specifics due to the transfer of their vernaculars. In general, the features characteristic of European English include (Jenkins 2001; Modiano 2001; Seidlhofer 2001):

**in phonetics:**
- consonant deletion: different [dlfq]
- consonant substitution: [T] > [t / s], [D] > [d / z]
- substitution of the dark [l] (pill, held) for the clear [l] (lip)
- devoicing final consonants: mug [mAk], chairs [CFqs]
- elimination of vowel length contrasts: leave > live

**in grammar:**
- the same form for all present tense verbs: you / he look very sad
- no article: our countries have signed agreement about this
- interchangeable relative pronouns who and which: the picture who, a person which
- use of the infinitive instead of the gerund: I look forward to see you tomorrow
- constructions of the type We were five people at the party.
universal tag-question: You’re very busy today, isn’t it?
in lexis:
- new words peculiar to the European experience: euro, Euro zone, additionality “demand for matching funds from national authorities”, internal market (different from domestic market); to hop over “to refrain from doing sth”
- calques of indigenous idiomatic expression, which Barbara Seidlhofer terms “unilateral idiomaticity” (Seidlhofer 2001: 16): This drink is on the house “This drink is a present from us”.

The considerable functional range and depth of English use in Europe has led the European linguists to raise a question of the status of English in the region. They believe that English is steadily “moving towards, if not already within, the Outer Circle” (Hilgendorf 2007: 145). This issue was first raised by Margie Berns (1995) when she discussed the impact of English in the context of the European Union. The change of the language status will mean a change of conceptualizing norms of European Englishes.

Questions to discuss:

73. In the map of Europe color the member states whose languages are official in the EU (Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, and Swedish) in blue and other European countries in yellow. What are the functions of English in these countries?  Fig. 13. Europe
74. In a musical CD shop, find out the names of European (except for British) singers and groups who use English for the names of their groups, titles of their CDs, titles and lyrics of their songs. Report your findings in class.

75. What are the reasons for sociolinguists to say that European English is moving to a second language status?

76. Which term – Euro-English or Mid-Atlantic English - do you like best? Give your arguments. What are the relations between European English and French or German English? Why is British English not included in the concept of European English?

77. What makes European universities offer courses in English? Suppose Russian universities were to follow this policy, what would your attitude to this be?

Russian English

Russian speakers of English belong to the Expanding Circle where, as compared with the countries of the Outer Circle:

- the functional spread of English is more limited - mostly to international functions, with English serving as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Intra nationally, English is used mainly in education as a school discipline rather than a tool of education. Being a prestigious language, it is also sometimes used in domestic advertising (Ustinova & Bhatia, 2005). However, as compared with other countries of the Expanding Circle, e.g., Japan or Korea, Russia is on the remote periphery of the Expanding Circle continuum (Ustinova 2005: 240), for the range of English in Russian society is pretty narrow, with the domains of functions being much smaller than in Japan or Korea.

- English is not an official language used by governmental and administrative institutions. The only exception is the Republic of Sakha-Yakutia where English is declared to be a working language along with two national
(Russian and Yakut) and five official (Even, Evenk, Yukaghir, Chukchi, and Dolgan) languages (Самсонов 2003).

- the English language model is exo-normative, i.e. oriented towards British English (mainly in the European part of Russia) or American English (primarily in the Asian part of Russia). As for the model of English to be studied, British English was so much predominant that until recently the word “English” has been associated with “British” and even now we can hear a question from our students, “Is it an English or American word?” However, today the use of British-American mixture is widely spread.

English in Russia is a school subject included in the curricula of almost every secondary school, *de facto* rather than *de jure*. It is not a mandatory foreign language to be studied, though such a discipline as Foreign Language is compulsory in every school curriculum. Nevertheless, although not imposed by law or regulation, English is the most commonly taught of all foreign languages. Whereas the majority of schools begin English classes at the middle school stage (5th grade and on), there is a clear tendency to reduce the age at which learners begin, and more and more schools have been introducing optional (and sometimes mandatory) English courses as early as first grade. The number of Russian schoolchildren studying English approximates 14 to 16 million (Ustinova 2005: 245). Even kindergartens, in order to be considered prestigious and high-ranking, hire English teachers to conduct 20 or 30-minute classes or games in English. Many well-to-do parents are eager to have their children enrolled in schools with an intensive English program (normally, education in Russia is free, but the so-called English-specialized schools are highly-competitive and parents are ready to pay considerable sums of money for their child to be admitted to such a school).

Though English is not an obligatory entrance exam for every university, school or college, this language is predominant in university curricula. About 3.8 million (out of 4.7 million) of students learn English at the university level (Ustinova 2005: 245). English language programs for part-time students who are certified as specialists in a particular sphere but need a better knowledge of English
for their career are also very popular – thus doctors, engineers, economists and lawyers take evening courses in the English department. So the situation in Russia’s education system clearly shows the English language boom: “an unquenchable thirst for knowledge of English” (Ter-Minasova 2005: 451).

English is a working language in the Russian divisions of many large transnational companies like Samsung, Mars, Coca-Cola, a.o. It is not infrequent to find intensive code-mixing and code-switching in the staff written and oral communication at these companies.

English is most popular in Russian advertisement and commercials (Ustinova & Bhatia 2005). According to the research conducted by Tej Bhatia (2001) and Irina Ustinova (2005: 249), the four main structural components of advertisement – product name (RED, a tariff rate of the MTC, Greenfield tea), company name or logo (shops: Funny Angel, Sweet Mama, Foot Land in Nakhodka; travel agencies Pacific Line, Double Step Travel, Lucky Tours, car repair shops Auto Oasis, Car; banks Trust, CIT Finance Investment Bank in Vladivostok and many others), wrappers or labels (Finely Selected Specialty Tea; Kid’s Clothing Company; Funny Things From All The World), and slogans (Digitally yours; Ideas for life; It’s different; You and only you) are most often created in English. Ironically, but Cyrillic letters are frequently used to transcribe an English name: Лоджистик Лайн, Визард, НЬЮ ТАЙМС, Старфиш, or a Russian-English mixture is used: Бубль-Гум. Kid’s super center. There are also reverse phenomena – names of companies (especially shops) transliterated from Russian into English, which brings exotic and prestigious flavor to the name: the shop Shik & Blesk, a cosmetics supermarket Zaichiki; the club for men Povesa. Letter mixture is also typical: e.g., the kid’s clothes shop СлаДкие Детки, the movie theater ИллюЗИОН, the clothes shop «Культ Личности» can be found in Vladivostok. According to sociolinguistic research, every year the number of English-language advertisement steadily increases in Russian cities. Thus, in the Yakut city of Neryungri, the number of English names for shops, cafes, and other services made up 4 % in 1994, 13 % in 1998, and 19 % in 2004. (Нерюнгри 2006)
After perestroika, almost every big Russian city started publishing English language newspapers. They are mostly intended for foreign businessmen and are generally launched by native speakers who are editors while many reporters and translators are Russians (Vladivostok News; Vladivostok Times; Sakhalin Times; Sakhalin Independent, etc.). In 2005 there emerged a new TV channel in English, RTTV, Russia Today, which broadcasts news reflecting Russia’s position concerning latest events.

English has been entering other media (TV programs, radio, internet, books), especially in the form of code-mixing that functions as “an English-Russian language play” (Rivlina 2007). Some examples are books of fiction that can be found in any bookstore today: Sergey Minaev Духless (дух “soul”); Irina Khakamada Sex в большой политике (“Sex in a big politics”), Lena Lenina МультиMILLIONAIRES (MultiMILLIONAIRS); Oksana Robsky Про любовь/он (About love + off/on); Tatyana Ogorodnikova Брачный коNтракт или Who is ху…(Marriage coNtract, or Who is who).

Tremendous is the role of English in Russian youth musical subcultures where it has “remained an identity marker of music circles, and served as an icon of modernity, freedom and high culture” permeating into most musical genres - jazz, rock, folk, hip-hop, and Russian pop music (Eddy 2007). Performers not only sing American songs but also create their own lyrics in English.

However, the nativized variety, Russia / Russian English, is not unanimously accepted within the country. To gain the status of a local variety in the Expanding Circle, Russia English, with its cross-linguistic and cross-cultural peculiarities, must be approved of by both its speakers and international communicators (Crystal 1998: 86). However, in Russia the attitude to the status of English used by Russians is complex and problematic.

A sociolinguistic survey, conducted among 232 students majoring in English and 39 faculty members at Far Eastern National University (Vladivostok), Sakhalin...
State University (Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk), and Amur State University (Blagoveschensk) from autumn 2004 to spring 2005, was to uncover the attitude of Russian speakers to the idea of Russia English as a local variety of ELF (See the full description of the survey findings in (Proshina 2006)).

The faculty members were asked some questions including: Which variety of English do you speak? The answer determined a choice of American English, British English, Russia English, a mixture (specify), and ‘I don't know’. This question implied only one answer; however, some respondents, while choosing ‘a mixture,’ wanted to emphasize the priority of the components in the mixture and thus ticked two answers, e.g., ‘American English’ and ‘a mixture’.

The answers about the self-identification of the variety of English used by our teachers revealed the following (Fig. 14): 13% of the teachers believe that they speak only American English; 31% consider themselves to be speakers of only British English (since the British model of English prevailed in all Russian schools before the perestroika period); 13% identified the variety they use as a mixture of British and American English, and only 5% said they speak Russia English, though 44% are aware that they speak a mixture including English influenced by their native Russian.

Fig. 14. Faculty’s self-labeling of the variety of their English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AmE</th>
<th>BrE</th>
<th>Br+AmE</th>
<th>RusE</th>
<th>mix+RusE</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I AmE</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II BrE</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Br+AmE</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV RusE</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V mix+RusE</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire given to students included the following questions: 1) Which varieties of English would you like to study most of all and least of all? (the students were to rank their preferences from 1, maximum, to 6, minimum) The answers were to be chosen among American English; British English; Australian English; East Asian Englishes; Russian English; and ‘I do not care’. 2) What variety of English do you use when communicating with foreigners? A multiple
choice of answers comprised British English; American English; Russia English; a mixture; and ‘I do not know’.

The answers to the first question about the preferred English variety to study (Fig. 15) revealed that 63% of the respondents prefer to study American English, 48% would like to study British English, 10% give preference to Australian English; 6% are aware of the need to study specific features of East Asian Englishes, 5% choose Russian English, and 3% of the respondents prove to be indifferent (the percentage was counted by the maximal rating number).

When commenting on the Russia variety of English, students claimed that “it is difficult to conceive what Russia English is” or “it is interesting to study Russia English, but for us it is of no use.” These comments indicate low awareness of the nativised variety of English in Russia.

Fig. 15. Students’ preference of the variety of English to study

The answers to the second question revealed the following (Fig. 16): 20% of the students believe that when communicating with foreigners they speak American English, 7% think they use British English; 6% are aware that they speak Russian English; 59% acknowledge that their English is a mixture, and 8% find it difficult to give a definite answer. The last option can be accounted for by the students’ theoretical unawareness of the differences in the varieties of English (though this question did not presuppose comments, some students wrote their explanations, “I simply cannot differentiate between the varieties since I do not
know the theory of difference. I automatically use both British and American words without noticing it and I suppose I have strong Russian accent.”

Fig. 16. Students’ opinions of varieties of English they use for communicating with foreigners

We see that most students are aware of the influence of their native Russian on the variety of English they use. However few students claim that their variety of English is Russia English. Since at school they are geared to American or British norms they believe that they rely on these norms and speak American or British English (especially regarding grammatical structures and lexical uses) with a Russian phonetic accent. Predominance of American English over British English is typical of the Russian Far East; in the European part of Russia the picture might be reverse.

These findings of the survey stress the dependence of Russians on native speakers’ models. By way of comparison, a similar study done by Willard Shaw (1983) revealed that students from Singapore and India (the Outer Circle) showed the awareness and a preference for speaking in their ethnic variety of English (“their own way”) used by educated Singaporeans and Asian Indians, though Singapore students divided their preferences almost equally between British English and Singaporean English (38.3% and 38.9% respectively, the difference being only 0.6%). 47.4% of the Indian respondents chose to learn and to speak Indian English and only 28.5% preferred to study British English. However, in Thailand (like Russia, referring to the Expanding Circle) students prefer learning British English (49.1% vs. 3.5% for Thai English) (Shaw, 1983).

Asian students’ preference of the variety of English to speak
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Their ethnic variety of English</th>
<th>British English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison leads us to the conclusion that the attitude of speakers to their local variety of English is quite positive in the Outer Circle countries but rather controversial in the Expanding Circle countries. While the Outer Circle speakers take pride in being identified as users of their peculiar variety of English, speakers in the Expanding Circle are oriented towards Inner Circle norms and tend to perfect their English by imitating native speakers.

From this experiment we can conclude that the status of Russia English as a local variety, one of the world Englishes, is not strong enough in Russia. Neither teachers nor students are fully aware of the fact that we are using Russia English as a lingua franca. There are even voices rejecting local English as a variety in Russia (Сафонова 2000). However, the majority of the respondents understand that their English is a mixture of Standard American, British norms (Queen's English), and elements formed under the influence of their native Russian language and culture. They are just not accustomed to the concept of Russia (or Russian) English.

The attitude towards Russian English is mainly negative. Russia English (as well as Russian English) is associated with broken, bad English rather than with a lingua franca able to convey Russian culture and Russian mentality to other nations. We need an "attitudinal readjustment" (Kachru 1983: 85) about Russia English.

Although the status of the English language used in Russia is still a subject for domestic debate, it is quite evident that Russia English, as it is spoken and written by educated Russians, can be characterized by certain features deviating from the British or American standards. These deviations are noticeable at all language levels: phonetic, morphological, syntactical and semantic.

For example, in the **phonetic level** Russia English is characterized by
- lack of the intonation stepping scale;
- rising tone of special and alternative questions (why did you say that? Is his name Mike or Andrew?);
- lack of aspiration;
- shortening of vowels (sheet of paper);
- devoicing of final consonants and regressive assimilation of middle consonants (bag - back; absorption [æpˈsʌl ˈpɚzn]).

**Morphological deviations** are numerous, the most important being as follows:

- substituting the Past Simple or Present Simple for the Present Perfect
  Such words had different spelling in their history < have had; It means that the proper noun loses its lingual status; Since 1958 an official alphabet of China is Pinyin
- lack of articles (efforts for understanding and interpretation of information; metonymic model PLACE FOR INSTITUTION is quite common; in most countries typical EFL curriculum includes...)

**Syntactical deviations** are manifested in the following ways:

- avoiding attributive clusters, preferring of-phrases (the form of the 19th century < the 19th century form) (the Russian sentence places noun attributes to the right of the key noun)
- pre-positioning a key word in attributive clusters (the problem "generation gap" < the generation gap problem)
- lack of link verbs, especially in the present tense form (At the moment the main subject I'm responsible for American Culture), which is accounted for by the lack of a link-verb in a Russian sentence describing a situation in the present
- adverbal attributes (PR in business and particularly in mining business have some peculiarities)
- gerundial phrases (birth giving < giving birth) – there is no gerund in the Russian verb system, which is why this form is so problematic for Russians.
Semantic deviations are various and numerous. The most typical ones might be categorized as follows:

- **prepositions** *(differences among cognate languages < between; interest to what they like < in).* To some degree, these deviations can also be accounted for by Russian language interference: among and between both correspond to the same preposition in Russian; the Russian noun умение (interes, very much similar to the English one) is used with the preposition $к +$ Dative case, which usually corresponds to the English *to.*

- **full-meaning words,** cognate to Russian ones. In this case, "inner translation" (Кабакчи 2002) from Russian into English is a reason for the deviation: e.g., the verb realize is often used in the meaning "to achieve" *(...its acquisition may be realized only through active communication), "to make use of" (make it possible for the students to realize their own cognitive skills) – the cognate Russian word реализовать (realizovat’) is polysemantic and is able to express both these meanings.

- **gender-species relations** between corresponding English and Russian words are sometimes not taken into account: for instance, the words *science, scientific, scientist* are often applied by Russians to the humanities instead of the words "research", "academic", "scholar", etc. because the Russian word наука (nauka) can be applied to either field of studies.

**Lexical innovations** of Russia English include:

- Russian culture-loaded words: *dacha, Duma, kvass*
- **new coinages:** *home task, unpleasantries*
- **calques:** *to enter the university ‘to be admitted”, foreign passport (for Russian citizens going abroad), heroine mother “having many children”, Palace of Culture; New Russians “rich”; social work “unpaid work”*
- words borrowed from other languages with different meaning: hostess (geisha+waitress); Gymnasium (type of school); Chechen warlord (rebel leader)

Pragmatic deviations are most stable for they are related to the source (Russian, in our case) culture:

- masculine oriented language (The lexical units involved in our study concern man as social being, his activities...) – there is still no movement for the so-called “politically correct” gender language in the Russian culture;
- over-verbalization (the issue concerned in both cultures; it becomes the result of an elaborate fraud; My major specialized interest within this field is...).

No doubt, a lot is to be done yet in Russia to raise the awareness of Russia English and to foster the appreciation of it. Russia English, stigmatized as a mistaken variety, is still an unadopted child in Russian linguistics. But this variety is a vehicle for conveying Russian culture and, considered in its acrolectal level, it should be regarded as a means to tell our identity and to spread our culture. It is impossible but agree with Larry Smith when he argues that

“Although they [our students] will want to know a great deal about other people and other cultures, they should remember that they can only be themselves. English is a means to communicate to the rest of the world their identity, culture, politics, religion, and ‘way of life’” (Smith L. 1983b: 9).

Questions to discuss:

78. Is Russia English institutional or performing variety?
79. Are there any other uses of English in Russia that are not mentioned in this chapter? Which function of English do you find most prominent these days as compared with pre-perestroika period?

80. Here are some names of modern Russian American authors. Using the Internet sources find some material about them and present your findings in class:

81. Does Russia English differ a lot from other Expanding Circle Englishes? What do they have in common?

82. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.

10. **Direct vs. Intermediary Translation**

   **Ключевые слова:** прямой перевод, опосредованный перевод, переводческая транскрипция, транслитерация, заимствование

   Until recently learners of English in the Expanding Circle regarded their goal of studying English as “interaction with native speakers with a focus on understanding the customs, the cultural achievements (generally high culture only),
as well as learning the language ‘perfectly’ – ‘mastering’ it’ (Berns 2005: 86). Today there came awareness of another target – we are studying English to communicate not only with native speakers (probably, there will be a slight opportunity to do it) but mostly with other non-native speakers from neighboring countries (in the Russian Far East we mostly interact with East Asian communicators) in the domains of business, tourism, research, and culture. To be able to communicate with speakers of ‘other’ Englishes, we have to know two things: first, their typical deviations in order to anticipate them and be ready to comprehend the meaning and, second, to know their culture in order to interpret the meaning correctly. These are the things that are to be known by ordinary communicators and, first and foremost, by translators and interpreters.

In the 20th century, most Russian translators and interpreters that worked with East Asian speakers dealt with direct translation from Chinese / Japanese / Korean into Russian. The traditions of the so called Russian Oriental school of translation have been deep-rooted and well-established. They were based mainly on the transcription of oral speech which, as it appears, is perceived differently by Russian and British or American ear. It is well-known that due to transference from our native language, we hear new sounds produced by a speaker of another language approximating them to the sounds of our own language and, when imitating them, we articulate them in a manner we pronounce sounds of our own language. This accounts for the difference in translation transcription of Asian words in Russian and English – in particular, while Russians hear the Japanese pronounce palatalized $\tilde{c}^\ast$ [s’], the English hear $sh$ [S]; the Russians transcribe another Japanese sound as palatalized $m^\ast$ [t], while English-speaking people hear [C] and transcribe it as $ch$. Examples of direct translations from Japanese are Хиросима – Hiroshima, иваси - iwashi, мясо - chanoyu, сякухати – shakuhachi. Direct translation can be schematically shown as follows:
When English became a lingua franca, or an intermediary between an Asian language and Russian, those translators who were not familiar with Asian languages and did not know the rules of direct translation from Japanese/Chinese/Korean were apt to employ regular rules of transcription from English into Russian. In this case Asian words in a Romanized form were taken for English words and translated into Russian as if they were English. Thus the Japanese *sushi* was translated as *суши* instead of *суси*, the Japanese *Hitachi* was rendered as *Хитачи* rather than *Хитати* and *Mitsubishi* turned into *Мицубиши* instead of *Мицубиси*. As a matter of fact these words were transliterated rather than transcribed from English into Russian, as they were borrowed from an English written text. In this case we deal with the *intermediary translation*, i.e. translation from a lingua franca, which can be represented in the following diagram:

Since the influence and role of English in Russia is increasing, more and more people use the second scheme of translation. In translation of books on martial arts, which are abundant in Russian bookstores today, we can find a lot of examples of this type: Chinese *tai-chi* (Wade-Giles) is translated as *тэйчи* instead of *тайцзи*; Japanese *waza-ari* is transliterated as *ваза-ари* rather than *вадза-ари*; *jiu-jitsu* as *джиу-джицу* or even *джиу-джитсу* but not *дзюдзицу* and so on. Kids play with *тамагочи* as translated from *tamagochi*. Examples like these are so many in our everyday life. They sometimes are stigmatized as incorrect because many of these
words were borrowed into Russian long ago directly from Asian languages and have been codified by dictionaries in a different form. Ignorance of translators from English is usually considered to be inexcusable and is generally frowned on.

Since the tradition of direct translation is of longer standing than the trend of transliterating Asian words from English into Russian, it is recommended that even in case of intermediary translation the form of loan-words be adapted to the rules of direct translation. The major discrepancies between direct and indirect translations of East Asian words consist in the following$^{10}$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese loans (pinyin)</th>
<th>Japanese loans</th>
<th>Korean loans MR/RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ц</td>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>ЦЗ$^{b}$</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>НЬ</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ц$^{a}$</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WU</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>L (end of syllable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>СЬ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>ЦЗ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZH</td>
<td>ЧЖ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONG</td>
<td>-УН</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l,n,j,q,x,y)+U</td>
<td>ЮЙ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d,j,l,m,n,q,x)+IU</td>
<td>Ю</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUI</td>
<td>ХУЭЙ/ХОЙ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**examples**

cao  →  цао
jia  →  цзя
chanoyu →  тяною
judo →  дзюдо
chuch’e →  тэквондо

$^{10}$ In detail see (Прошина 2007)
| yin | янь | инь | чи | Жэньминь |
| yang | ян | ян | лун | Жибао |
| long | лун | лун | ци | Жибао |
| qi | ци | ци | ци | Сянган |
| Renmin ribao | Renmin ribao | Мао Цэдун | Чжоу Эньлай |
| wu-shu | У-шу | Чжоу Эньлай |
| Xianggang | Сянган | Мао Цэдун |
| Mao Ze-dong | Чжоу Эньлай |
| Zhou En-lai | Чжоу Эньлай |
| lu | лю | Чжоу Эньлай |
| juren | цзюйжэнь | Чжоу Эньлай |
| xiucai | сюцай |
| huishi | хойши |
| Shinto itzebu Zen | Синто идэбу Дэн |
| hanji k’okul ondol kisaeng hoe jeon p’ansori Shilla hot’unch’um Hangeul | ханджи кхокуль ондоль кисэн хве чон пхансори Силла, хотхучхум хангыль |

Every language is dynamic and changes in time. So do rules of intermediary translation. Though to-date the trend towards direct translation dominates over the tendency towards indirect translation, words translated by the rules of English-Russian transliteration gradually penetrate into the Russian language. Some of them have already been codified – e.g., гейша (cf. outdated гэйся < geisha; рикша < рикуся < (jin)rikisha, rickshaw). Given the fast and intensive spread of the English language, we can predict that the number of such words will grow. At least, today you can hardly see суши-бары anywhere; instead, суши-бары invitingly open their doors…

Questions to discuss:

83. What is the difference between direct and intermediary translation?
84. Why do the rules of direct translation prevail over the rules of indirect translation?

85. Besides a longer historical tradition of direct translating from Asian languages into Russian, could there be any other reasons for adopting the words суши and Дорошак? What are these reasons?

86. Which forms of translation, written or oral, prevailed in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century and which of them prevail now? What makes you come to this conclusion?

87. Find English equivalents to the Russian key words stated before the text of the chapter. Discuss the meaning of the terms.

88. Suggest the correct translation of the following Japanese loans: 
   Toshiba, Kitakyushu, Kagoshima, Kusiro, Fukushima, Kuroshio, 
   Shimonoseki, shinkansen, Chuko, Kochi, Hoichi, Ogimachi, Raicho, 
   Kanazawa, Miyazaki, Shizuoka, Kenzan, Fujisawa, Gosanjo, Hojo, 
   Izanagi, Jakuchu, Jigokomushi, Jizo, Josetsu, Jurojin

89. Fill out the table translating the names of Chinese provinces and their capital cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anhui</td>
<td>Hefei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gansu</td>
<td>Lanzhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jilin</td>
<td>Changchun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangdong</td>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangxi-Zhuang autonomous region</td>
<td>Nanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guizhou</td>
<td>Guiyang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaoning</td>
<td>Shenyang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningxia-Hui autonomous region</td>
<td>Yinchuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinjiang-Uygur autonomous region</td>
<td>Urumchi\textsuperscript{11}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sichuan</td>
<td>Chengdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taipei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>Lhasa\textsuperscript{12}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{11} This word is not Mandarin, as well as Uigur, it should be transliterated like an English word.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autonomous Region</th>
<th>Uhan</th>
<th>Changsha</th>
<th>Tianjin</th>
<th>Harbin</th>
<th>Zhengzhou</th>
<th>Fuzhou</th>
<th>Nanchang</th>
<th>Nangking</th>
<th>Xining</th>
<th>Hangzhou</th>
<th>Jinan</th>
<th>Taiyuan</th>
<th>Xi’an</th>
<th>Kunming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hubei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilongjiang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiangxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiangsu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qinghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shandong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shengxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90. Match the following Korean geographical terms in English and in Russian. Pay attention to the fact that Russian terms are closer to MacCune-Reischuer than to the Revised Romanization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Busan</th>
<th>Кванджу</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gwangju</td>
<td>Тэгу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeju</td>
<td>Ёндынпо</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheongju</td>
<td>Чхунчхонпукто</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeongdeungpo</td>
<td>Вольгот</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungcheongbuk-do</td>
<td>Пусан</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongno</td>
<td>Тхвегеро</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolgot</td>
<td>Чонно</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daegu</td>
<td>Чечжу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toegyero</td>
<td>Чхончжу</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 This word is not Mandarin, so it should be transliterated like an English word.
13 This word is not Mandarin, so it should be transliterated like an English word, ending in non-palatalized -н.
14 The apostrophe helps to divide the syllables in the word.
Conclusion

The awareness of a new linguistic paradigm, the paradigm of World Englishes that has emerged in the second half of the 20th century, has given rise to a great number of old philosophical questions about the interrelations of language and community, language and speech, language and mind, and language and culture. This book has discussed ten major problems: 1) the good and the bad of the English language becoming a global language; 2) English being one language or a number of new entities called varieties; 3) relevance of endonorms and exonorms for speakers of English; 4) existence of one standard or diversity of local norms; 5) dependence on native speakers and the role of non-native speakers; 6) correlation between static stages of one’s interlanguage and dynamic lectal cline of a speech community; 7) contrasts and similarities of the concepts ‘innovation / deviation’ and “error”; 8) contradiction between the desire to express one’s ethnic identity through English and intercultural pragmatic interpretability; 9) description of some varieties and challenges in their acceptance, and 10) influence of English on translation tendencies. Many of the ideas expressed here are provocative enough and continue to be debated heatedly for many decades on end. However, the line of the proponents of the paradigm is just getting more and more firmly established in these discussions. This line consists in the following theses:

1. The spread of English is a natural linguistic phenomenon caused by a number of reasons. Knowledge of English is essentially beneficial for people who have a tool for global communication but it may be dangerous in case of promoting political and lingocentrical dominance, which results in ignoring the rights of other than Anglophone peoples and their cultures.

2. English has become a pluricentric language actualized in diverse varieties enriched by localized cultures. These varieties are categorized into three main types schematized by Kachru’s Three Circles – Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles.
3. The pluricentric character of modern English reveals flexibility and continuum of its normative status: from the endonorms of Inner Circle Englishes through developing norms of Outer Circle Englishes, deviating from the norms of the Inner Circle varieties and geared to become endonorms on their own, to exonorms of the Expanding Circle Englishes dependent on British and American norms, usually mixed.

4. The concepts of World Englishes and International English, though close, differ in their approach to the pluricentricity. While the EIL conceptualization focuses on the single core common for all Englishes, the WE theory lays emphasis on diversity and plurality of varieties, with all localized Englishes being equal.

5. Today English is everybody’s ownership. It equally belongs to its native speakers and non-native speakers. Traditionally understood as non-native speakers, English-knowing bilinguals are now considered to be native speakers of their local variety of English. Thus the edge between native and non-native speakers has become blurred.

6. A variety of English, used by a speech community, is a lectal continuum, or cline, the lower point of which is basilect and the upper point is acrolect, the middle of the continuum called mesolect. Any description of a variety as a world English is based on the part of the continuum between mesolectal and acrolectal levels typical of educated users. The term “interlanguage” is rejected by the WE paradigm because it is a psycholinguistic concept characteristic of individual speech with its fossilized acrolectal, mesolectal, and basilectal stages.

7. Every variety of world Englishes differs from another variety by its innovations and deviations observed on all levels of the language structure. These deviations are systematic and typical of the variety of educated users. In norm-developing Englishes of the Outer Circle they tend to be standardized and codified.

8. Being acculturized and nativised, world Englishes express a language identity of their users, which is most manifest in creative writing of the so called contact literature. To be well interpreted internationally, the pragmatics of a world
English needs to be studied by would-be communicators. Intelligibility and comprehensibility of local Englishes, with their innovations and deviations, also require studying to establish successful communication.

9. Local Englishes, being in proximity to each other and referring to the same geographical area, prove to have many linguistic features in common, though they can belong to different language families, which makes it possible to include them into larger entities – regional varieties, such as South Asian, East Asian, European, a.o. Englishes. The acceptance of local Englishes varies in the Outer and Expanding Circles and within the Circles. In the Outer Circle, most Englishes are considered to be a means of linguacultural identity, whereas the attitude towards the Expanding Circle Englishes, Russia English in particular, is often negative as it is regarded as a hybridized erroneous entity characteristic of low level of the language command.

10. Wider use of world Englishes for intercultural communication, especially with non-native speakers, has an impact on the ways of translating local words borrowed into other languages through Englishes. Though today the tendency towards a direct translation still prevails, there are evident traces of the influence of English on loanwords through intermediary translation. Thus a translator dealing with English as a link language has to take into account a balance between trends of direct and indirect translations.
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