# Chinese Englishes

# Chinese Englishes

## A Sociolinguistic History

KINGSLEY BOLTON

# Contents

# Maps

# Illustrations

# Tables

# 1 New Englishes and World Englishes: pluricentric approaches to English worldwide

> English is no longer the possession of the British, or even the British and the Americans, but an international language which increasing numbers of people adopt for at least some of their purposes, without thereby denying . . . the value of their own languages.
> (Halliday, MacIntosh and Strevens 1964: 293)

> 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.
> (Phillipson 1992: 47)

> [T]he pluricentricity of English is overwhelming, and unprecedented in linguistic history. It raises issues of diversification, codification, identity, creativity, cross-cultural intelligibility and of power and ideology. The universalization of English and the power of the language have come at a price; for some, the implications are agonizing, while for others they are a matter of ecstasy.
> (Kachru 1996: 135)

In this chapter, I hope to link the study of World Englishes and 'new' Englishes to a number of related disciplines – including English studies, English corpus linguistics, the sociology of language, applied linguistics, pidgin and creole studies, lexicography and critical linguistics – with the dual purpose of siting my own research within the tradition of research into World Englishes that has developed over the last twenty years or so, and of investigating how far the World Englishes paradigm may help clarify research on English in Hong Kong and China.

## New Englishes

Over the last twenty years, the term 'new Englishes' has been used to refer to the 'localised' forms of English found in the Caribbean, West and East Africa, and parts of Asia. One possible assumption here is that the occurrence of hybridised varieties of English dates from only the last two decades, although, in fact, contact language phenomena involving hybridisation between European and Asian languages have a relatively lengthy history, as long as the movements of European trade and colonialism in Asia themselves. 'New English' in Asia was predated by

'new Portuguese' for at least a hundred years, and there is clear textual evidence to suggest that we can speak meaningfully about the origins of 'Asian English(es)' from at least the seventeenth century onwards.[1] For the purposes of this chapter, however, I intend to place such questions on hold and to reserve historical scepticism. I accept, therefore, that in the early 1980s in various branches of linguistics, including English linguistics, sociolinguistics and applied linguistics, there was a relatively sudden interest in 'new Englishes' which took hold among language scholars and even gained recognition among the British and American general public through the popularised accounts of international English(es) in print and on television. Within the academic world at least it seems reasonable to accept Kachru's (1992) claim that a major 'paradigm shift' in the study of English in the world began to take place at the beginning of the 1980s.

Before 1980, there was a general assumption within Britain, the United States and many other societies where English was taught, that the primary target model was 'English' in a singular, or perhaps 'plural singular', sense, which included the 'standard English' of Britain and the 'general American' of the United States of America. During the 1980s, however, interest grew in the identification and description of global varieties of English. This shift in focus was based largely on a recognition of 'Englishes' in the plural, and the identification and recognition of geographical 'varieties' of English throughout the world as 'international Englishes', 'World Englishes' or 'new Englishes'. Tom McArthur (1992a) defines 'new Englishes' as: 'a term in linguistics for a recently emerging and increasingly autonomous variety of English, especially in a non-western setting such as India, Nigeria, or Singapore' (1992a: 688–9).[2]

The last two decades have seen the publication of a vast number of journal articles about 'new Englishes', many of which have been published by three journals, *English World-Wide* (1980 onwards, edited by Manfred Görlach); *World Englishes*

---

[1]  Issues of colonialism, imperialism, race and modernity played a major role in the encounters of the European powers (including the Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, French and English) with the colonial others of the Americas, Africa and Asia. Language was central to these encounters, as the contact between European travellers, traders, armies and colonial officials with the peoples of these 'new' worlds entailed 'languages in contact', almost always with unexpected and to this day only partly understood consequences, both for the history of linguistics and for the history of intellectual thought. The central issue here, however, is the problematic use of the term 'new' in association with 'Englishes'. It may also be argued that English itself is a relatively 'new' language. First, it has a history said to begin a mere 1,500 years ago, in comparison, for example, to Chinese, for which many scholars would claim a history of 4,000 years. Second, it is a new language in the sense that its structure and forms were created through a process 'something like – but *not* – creolization . . . in medieval England' as Anglian encountered Old Norse, French, Latin and Greek, a process that McArthur refers to as 'waves of hybridization' (McArthur 1998: 175–6).

[2]  One of the first references to the term 'new English' is in an article by Braj Kachru entitled 'The new Englishes and old models', published in 1977. In addition to the two books by Pride (1982) and Platt *et al.* (1984), the term 'new Englishes' also occurs in another chapter by Kachru (1980), in a chapter of Kachru's book on Indian English (1983), and in the final chapter of McCrum, Cran and MacNeil's popularised account of *The Story of English* (1986). Later in the same decade came *New Englishes: the Case of Singapore* (Foley 1988).

(1981 onwards, edited by Braj Kachru and Larry Smith); and *English Today* (from 1985, edited by Tom McArthur). *World Englishes* is worth particular note in this context, as its original title of *World Language English* was changed to *World Englishes* when Kachru, together with Larry Smith, took over the editorship in 1985. The use of the term 'Englishes' to refer to 'varieties of English' is again of recent popularity. The *MLA* (Modern Language Association) *Bibliography*, for example, has only one reference to 'Englishes' before 1980, but 292 references for the years 1980–2002; similarly, the *LLBA* (Linguistics and Language Behaviour Abstracts) *Index* has one reference to 'Englishes' before 1980 and 985 for the period 1980–2002.

One reason for the rapidly increasing use of the term 'new English(es)' has been the increased recognition accorded to 'international varieties' of English. In the Asian region, these varieties are said to include such 'dialects' of English as Indian English, Malaysian English, Philippine English and Singapore English. A plethora of terminology has come into use in such societies: 'English as an international (auxiliary) language', 'global English(es)', 'international English(es)', 'localised varieties of English', 'new varieties of English', 'non-native varieties of English', 'second-language varieties of English', 'World Englishes' and 'new Englishes'. At the time of writing, those terms currently enjoying greatest popularity are 'World English', 'World Englishes', 'global English' and 'new Englishes'.

One way to exemplify the distinction between 'World English' and 'World Englishes' is at the level of vocabulary. Susan Butler, writing as a lexicographer, claims that in most contexts where English is establishing itself as a 'localised' or 'new' English, '[t]here are two major forces operating at the moment . . . The first is an outside pressure – the sweep of American English through the English-speaking world' which Butler regards as synonymous with *World English*, because '[t]his force provides the words which are present globally in international English and which are usually conveyed around the world by the media' (Butler 1997a: 107). The second dynamic which Butler identifies, and which operates through *World Englishes*, is 'the purely local – the wellspring of local culture and a sense of identity' (1997a: 109). Thus at the level of lexis, items like *cable TV*, *cyberpunk*, *high five* and *political correctness* might be identified with 'World English', whereas items like *bamboo snake*, *outstation*, *adobo* and *sari-sari store* would be items found in 'World Englishes', more specifically 'Asian Englishes'.

When Kachru and Smith took over the editorship of the journal *World Language English* in 1985 it was retitled *World Englishes* (subtitled *A Journal of English as an International and Intranational Language*). Their explanation for this was that *World Englishes* embodies 'a new idea, a new credo', for which the plural 'Englishes' was significant:

> 'Englishes' symbolizes the functional and formal variation in the language, and its international acculturation, for example, in West Africa, in Southern Africa, in East Africa, in South Asia, in Southeast Asia, in the West Indies, in the Philippines, and in the traditional English-using countries: the USA,

the UK, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. The language now belongs to those who use it as their first language, and to those who use it as an additional language, whether in its standard form or in its localized forms. (Kachru and Smith 1985: 210)

McArthur (1987) also talks about the core of 'World Standard English', against which localised 'English languages' are ordered. A synoptic view of these two terms can be formulated thus: 'World English' generally refers to the idealised norm of an internationally propagated and internationally intelligible variety of the language, increasingly associated with the American print and electronic media, while 'World Englishes' refers to localised varieties of English used intra-nationally in many 'ESL' societies throughout the world, such as Nigeria, Kenya, India, Singapore and the Philippines. In many instances, however, we may be referring to the spread of English at either or both levels; so in my discussion in this chapter I frequently use the term 'World Englishes' to include varieties in both senses.

The term 'global English' can for the present be regarded as roughly synonymous with 'World English'; and the term 'new Englishes' is broadly similar to 'World Englishes'; although there is a difference of emphasis, as the following discussion of the origin and use of the term suggests. McArthur (1992b) notes that Pride (1982) was the first to use *New Englishes* as a book title. This volume comprised fifteen papers on English in Africa and Asia, in societies such as Cameroon, Nigeria, India, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines. The topics covered include the sociolinguistic description of English in Africa and Asia, bilingualism and biculturalism, language education and the classification and description of 'new varieties' or 'nativized varieties' of English. The term 'new Englishes' is dealt with only parenthetically, however, in spite of its choice as a title for the book. Pride's introduction to the volume, entitled 'The appeal of the new Englishes', fails to define the term itself, but instead discusses the range of issues contiguous to the volume's contents, including 'linguistic imperialism', the 'neutrality' of English in former anglophone colonies and extant discussions of 'integrative' versus 'instrumental' motivations in such contexts (Pride 1982: 1–7). Also of interest in the same volume is the article by Richards, 'Rhetorical and communicative styles in the new varieties of English', which discusses the emergence and importance of new Englishes:

The new varieties of English, described variously as 'indigenous', 'nativized', and 'local' varieties of English . . . are now asserting their socio-linguistic legitimacy . . . [T]he rapidity with which the new varieties of English have emerged and the distinctiveness of the new codes of English thus produced raise interesting questions of typology and linguistic change that call for adequate theoretical models and explanations. (Richards 1982: 227)

Platt, Weber and Ho's (1984) volume, *The New Englishes*, surveyed a number of issues related to the Englishes of Asia, including India, Singapore and the Philippines, and West Africa, notably Nigeria and Ghana. The authors suggest a number of criteria which identify a new English including:

- its use in educational systems (particularly those where English is a second language);
- its development in an area where a 'native variety' of English is not a majority language;
- its use for a range of functions, in a particular country or society; and
- linguistic evidence, at the levels of 'sounds', 'words' and 'sentence structures' of 'localised' or 'nativised' features. (1984: 2)

In addition they also mention the importance of political and related factors:

> Looking at New Englishes in more general terms, one can see that they have many things in common. When we consider their present-day functions, they often have a high status in the nations where they are used as official or second language. Many of them . . . are used by groups within the country as a regular language for communication in at least some areas of everyday activity. (1984: 6)

The books by Pride (1982) and Platt *et al.* (1984) are typically regarded as first and founding studies in this field. Although these were both 'centrist' publications as they were printed by US and British publishers, by the early 1980s work on new varieties of English was also underway at universities on the academic 'periphery' of Africa and Asia in those societies where such varieties were actually emerging. Kachru published an early study of Indian English in the mid-1960s (Kachru 1965), and Llamzon published a study of 'Standard Filipino English' in the late 1960s (Llamzon 1969). Noss (1983) includes a number of descriptions of Asian varieties of English including Wong on 'Malaysian English', Gonzalez on 'Philippine English', Tay and Gupta on 'Standard Singapore English', Nababan on 'English in Indonesia' and Sukwiwat on 'the Thai variety of English'.

Noss's (1983) book also included a number of position papers, including one by Llamzon on the 'Essential features of new varieties of English', which today might be read alongside Platt *et al.*'s (1984) set of criteria for defining 'new Englishes'. According to Llamzon, new varieties of English are identifiable through four essential sets of features: ecological features, historical features, sociolinguistic features and cultural features (Llamzon 1983: 100–4). *Ecological features* are a product of a linguistic environment where verbal behaviour involves 'polyglossic' linguistic choice, code-switching and code-mixing, and lexical shift (lexical borrowing from the local language). *Historical features* typical to new varieties of English relate to 'their comparatively brief historical development from the parent variety', and the fact that, in addition, 'the structural descriptions of the new varieties of English [are] . . . all fairly recent' (Llamzon 1983: 101). The most

important *sociolinguistic features* relate to the use of the variety in the more intimate domains of home, friendship and recreation. Does 'sociolectal-switching' take place, that is, do speakers vary their 'rhetorical' and 'communicative' styles according to context, for example to indicate social distance or intimacy? Finally, Llamzon discusses *cultural features* with reference to creative writing and a local literature in English, arguing that:

> works by novelists, poets and playwrights have demonstrated that the English language can . . . be used as a vehicle for the transmission of the cultural heritage of Third World countries. The appearance of this body of literary works signals that the transplanted tree has finally reached maturity, and is now beginning to blossom and fructify. (1983: 104)

Llamzon's reference to the importance of creative writing and literatures in this context is significant. In many Asian societies, including India, Singapore and the Philippines, there is a body of creative writing in English that reaches back five decades and more. In Llamzon's own society there are poets and novelists such as Nick Joaquin, F. Sionil Jose and many others who enjoy both national status and international acclaim.

Since at least the early 1980s, Commonwealth and postcolonial writers from a range of developing societies have increasingly won acclaim from the literary world in the form of the Booker Prize and other awards, and have also gained recognition within the western academy (particularly within the field of postcolonial studies). The emergence of 'new Englishes' in the early 1980s thus overlapped with, and was influenced by, these 'new literatures' (see, for example, King 1974; Hosillos 1982; Lim 1984). The end of the decade saw the publication of *The Empire Writes Back* (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1989). By 1993, the title of their book had been appropriated for a *Time* magazine cover story and feature article (Iyer 1993) detailing the successes of Booker nominees and prize-winners such as Salman Rushdie and Vikram Seth (both of Indian parentage), Kazuo Ishiguro (Japanese), Timothy Mo (Anglo-Chinese), Michael Ondaatje (Sri Lankan), Ben Okri (Nigerian) and Nobel prize-winner Derek Walcott (Trinidadian).

Iyer describes these writers as 'transcultural', because 'they are addressing an audience as mixed up and eclectic and uprooted as themselves [in . . .] a new postimperial order in which English is the lingua franca' (1993: 48). According to Iyer, publishing is becoming de-centred and new presses are being set up in Australia, India and Singapore. He quotes Robert McCrum: 'There is not one English language anymore, but there are many English languages . . . each of these Englishes is creating its own very special literature, which, because it doesn't feel oppressed by the immensely influential literary tradition in England, is somehow freer' (1993: 53).

As we can see, then, the last twenty years or so have seen a rapid growth of interest in the study of the 'new Englishes' as well as a number of related fields. With thousands of academic articles on these topics, at least three international academic journals devoted primarily to this branch of linguistics and increasing

numbers of books on the topic, some taxonomy of the literature may be required. From my own reading of the literature, I suggest that a number of discernible, yet overlapping, approaches to research (and publications) in the field of 'World Englishes', 'new Englishes' or 'new varieties of English' may be identified. These approaches include those of:

- English studies;
- sociolinguistics;
- applied linguistics;
- lexicography;
- 'popularisers';
- critical linguistics; and
- futurologists

On a cautionary note, it has to be stated that the classifications I am suggesting here are by no means discrete, as work in certain categories obviously overlaps greatly with work in others. For example, in the first category of 'English studies', I place linguists such as Tom McArthur and Manfred Görlach, but their work, in some instances, is not simply restricted to this category alone. McArthur, for example, also has done much in the fields of applied linguistics and language pedagogy. Similarly, Görlach's work on World Englishes also displays a strong interest in sociolinguistics, as many of the articles published in his journal *English World-Wide* indicate. Trudgill and Crystal are similarly wide-ranging. Trudgill and Hannah's (1982) influential book on *International English* was partly designed for teaching purposes and thus could be categorised as 'applied linguistics' (whereas I have categorised it under 'sociolinguistics'). Crystal's work might be judged by some to belong to the field of English studies, but I prefer to discuss it beneath the heading of the 'populariser approach' to World Englishes. Braj Kachru's work is another case in point, as he has published a great deal on the teaching of World Englishes, and many might see his work as 'applied linguistics'. For various reasons, not least his connection with J. R. Firth and his description of his own work as engaging in 'socially realistic' linguistics, I prefer to categorise his contributions as belonging more to the field of sociolinguistics, more specifically, the 'sociolinguistics of World Englishes'.

### The English studies approach

The 'English studies' approach to varieties of English is the approach favoured by the 'description of English' tradition, which arose partly from English philology and the study of the history of English, and partly from the study of phonetics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. More recently, this approach has been exemplified by the work of contemporary British linguists, such as Robert Burchfield, David Crystal, Sidney Greenbaum, Tom McArthur, Randolph Quirk and John Wells.

Randolph Quirk was one of the first in the contemporary period to discuss 'varieties' of English and the notion of 'standards' of World English in his 1962 book, *The Use of English*.[3] Quirk later (1990) assumed the role of a guardian of international 'standards' of English and was drawn into a celebrated debate with Braj Kachru on 'liberation linguistics'. In the mid-1980s, a number of books on World Englishes in the 'English studies' tradition were published, including Burchfield's influential *The English Language* (1985), Greenbaum's *The English Language Today* (1985) and Quirk and Widdowson's *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literature* (1985). Each of these in their own way attempted to address issues related to the learning and use of English from a global perspective. Burchfield drew a great deal of attention when he discussed the possible fragmentation of English along the lines earlier seen with Latin:

> The most powerful model of all is the dispersal of speakers of popular forms of Latin in various parts of western Europe and the emergence in the early Middle Ages of languages now known as French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and of subdivision (like Catalan) within these languages, none easily comprehensible to the others . . . English, when first recorded in the eighth century, was already a fissiparous language. It will continue to divide and subdivide, and to exhibit a thousand different faces in the centuries ahead . . . The multifarious forms of English spoken within the British Isles and by native speakers abroad will continue to reshape and restyle themselves in the future. And they will become more and more at variance with the emerging Englishes of Europe and of the rest of the world. (1985: 160, 173)

Burchfield's comparison of the dispersal of Latin in the Middle Ages with the position of English in the 1980s provides the starting point for Quirk's (1985) discussion of 'The English language in a global context', in which Quirk argues the case for normativity, declaiming at one point that 'the fashion of undermining belief in standard English had wrought educational damage in the ENL [English as a native language] countries' and that there is no justification for such an attitude to be 'exported' to societies where English has the status of a second or foreign language: 'The relatively narrow range of purposes for which the nonnative 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). By the mid-1980s, then, Quirk had lost some of the linguistic radicalism of his youth, if that indeed was what it was, and seemed anxious to join battle on behalf of both 'Standard English' and 'standards' of English. His 1985 paper also represents something of a rehearsal for his later engagement with Kachru and the forces of 'liberation linguistics' in the pages of *English Today*.

---

[3]  See also Randolph Quirk's 1972 volume, *The English Language and Images of Matter*.

Another significant figure in the English studies approach in the 1980s was Tom McArthur, the founding and current editor of *English Today* (from 1985), and the editor of *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (1992a). McArthur's (1987) paper on 'The English languages' sets out part of his theoretical agenda for the study of World Englishes. As the title of the article suggests, the notion of plural Englishes is foregrounded in the discussion: 'If there are by now "English literatures" [by 1987 a well-established phrase] can the "English languages" be far behind?' (1987: 9). The article later continues, 'various ... Englishes are developing such institutions as their own dictionaries and grammars', citing the examples of Canadian and Australian English, Tok Pisin and Krio (1987: 10). McArthur presents a model to describe the diversity of World English, essentially in the shape of a rimless cartwheel with 'World Standard English' at the hub:

> Within such a model, we can talk about a more or less 'monolithic' core, a text-linked World Standard negotiated among a variety of more or less established national standards [e.g. British and Irish Standard English, American Standard English, South Asian Standard(izing) English, East Asian Standard(izing) English]. Beyond the minority area of the inter-linked standards, however, are the innumerable non-standard forms – the majority now ... being unintelligible to one another [e.g. Scottish English, Appalachian English, Indian English, Hong Kong English]. (1987: 10)[4]

Since 1985, *English Today* has had a substantial impact on the discussion and debate about 'English languages' around the world. Issue 41, published in 1995, provides an index of articles in the journal for the years 1985–95. These include articles on 'World English'; 'English in Africa'; 'The Americas' (including the Caribbean and Central America); 'Asia' (East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Australasia); and 'Europe' (including Britain, identified as 'offshore' Europe, as well as 'mainland' Europe). McArthur's editorship of *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (1992a) has had a great influence on recent scholarship on World Englishes. The *Companion* explicitly sets out to acknowledge and to accommodate a global perspective on 'varieties' of English, and 'the English languages' (xvii–xxiv). 'In the closing years of the twentieth century, the English language has become a global resource', McArthur asserts. 'As such, it does not owe its existence or the protection of its essence to any one nation or group. Inasmuch

---

[4] In a subsequent article, McArthur (1992d) discusses the whole enterprise of model-making in this field, with reference to the 'biological' models of 'language families' produced by such nineteenth-century German Indo-Europeanists such as August Schleicher; and the 'geopolitical' models of Strevens (1980), McArthur (1987), Görlach (1990) and Kachru (1990, etc.). Such models, McArthur suggests, aim at 'the management of diversity', adding that 'their creators have freely used such terms as "Englishes", "new Englishes" and "World Englishes" in discussing this diversity' (McArthur 1992d: 16–17). Later, he goes on to discuss the question of nomenclature, expressing a preference for his own term, 'English languages' because it 'goes further [than "Englishes"], implying that once what happened to produce the daughters of Germanic has happened again, producing the daughters of a once (more or less) unitarian English' (1992d: 20–1).

as a particular language belongs to any individual or community, English is the possession of every individual and every community that in any way uses it, regardless of what any other individual or community may think or feel about the matter' (xvii). McArthur summarises his thinking on these and other issues in *The English Languages* (1998) and in the recently published *Oxford Guide to World English* (2002).

Another substantial figure in the academic discourse of World Englishes is Manfred Görlach, who has been described recently as 'practically the founder of the study of varieties of English in a world-wide context as a scholarly field' (Schneider 1997a: 3). Görlach's intellectual interests are wide, but it is chiefly as the editor of *English World-Wide* that he has risen to prominence in the field of World Englishes; indeed his work in this field leads Schneider to claim enthusiastically that 'Manfred Görlach was the first to recognize the challenge and importance of these topics as subjects of scholarly study' (1997a: 3–4). Görlach's contribution to this field has been substantial. *English World-Wide* started publication in 1980 under the imprint of Julius Groos Verlag in Heidelberg. In the editorial to the first issue, Görlach mentions that an original suggestion for the title was *Englishes*, but this was discarded because many scholars found such a plural 'unacceptable and unwieldy' (Görlach 1980: 7). Finally a subtitle was added to accommodate the plurality of the object of study – *A Journal of Varieties of English*.

Overall, however, it is probably fair to comment that part of Görlach's own intellectual endeavour has been devoted to the history of English, rather than World Englishes, where his chief contribution has been as an editor, of books, bibliographies and journals. To the extent that he has written in detail about World Englishes, it is chiefly as a theorist (Görlach 1988, 1989, 1995a) and historiographer of lexicography (1990, 1995 a, b). Nevertheless Görlach's work in this field is of immense importance; and it is also worth noting that Görlach himself identifies his work in this area with that of 'English studies', commenting in 1988 that '[a]s a sub-discipline of English Studies, a consideration of English as a world language would provide an ideal opportunity to expand the social, historical and geographical aspects of English Studies – and . . . might well serve to enhance the appeal of a traditional and somewhat ageing discipline' (1988: 37–8). Since Görlach's retirement as general editor of *English World-Wide* in 1998, he has passed the torch to Edgar W. Schneider, who has already carried out extensive work of his own in this field.

Other notable academics in the field of English studies include David Crystal and Sidney Greenbaum. Crystal's early work centred on English studies (e.g. Crystal and Quirk 1964; Crystal 1969, 1975), but throughout the 1970s his interests broadened to include child language acquisition and speech therapy, and by the mid-1980s he was moving away from detailed empirical research and embarking on his present career of academic entrepreneur, encyclopedist, broadcaster and 'populariser' (see p. 32 below). Greenbaum's (1985) volume on *The English Language Today* included contributions on the history of

English, Britain and North America, and a section on 'English in the world context' with papers from Cooper, Görlach and Schröder, Kachru, Lanham and Rickford and Traugott. Greenbaum was also instrumental in setting up corpus linguistics research on international varieties of English, notably the International Corpus of English (ICE) project, which is discussed in the next section.

### English corpus linguistics

The history of English corpus linguistics in the last thirty years or so has involved the construction of databases to facilitate computer-based research on the characteristics of the language used by specific groups of users. In its infancy, corpus linguistics was very much concerned with the construction of 'native-speaker' corpora of language, e.g. the Brown Corpus of American English (compiled by researchers at Brown University in 1964) and the LOB Corpus of British English (devised by researchers at the universities of London, Oslo and Bergen from 1970–8). In subsequent years, other corpora followed, including those for research on language acquisition (e.g. the CHILDES database), as well as a large number of corpora with specific lexicographical functions (e.g. the Cobuild Corpus, the Longman Corpus, etc.) (Kennedy 1998: 19–54). The most important corpus for the study of English worldwide is the International Corpus of English (ICE), which is currently being compiled by fifteen research teams worldwide. This highly ambitious project aims at the development of parallel corpora to enable the comparative study of World Englishes, with particular reference to features at the levels of syntax and lexis. The project was started in 1990 by Sidney Greenbaum at University College London, but after Greenbaum's death in 1996 was led by Charles Meyer at the University of Massachusetts, and then Gerald Nelson of University College London. In many respects, the ICE project might be seen as an extension of Quirk and Greenbaum's earlier work on the Survey of English Usage at University College London, and as a continuation of the UCL English studies tradition. In Asia, the five societies represented by ICE research teams include Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines, and it is anticipated that at least three teams (Hong Kong, Singapore and the Philippines) will complete their lexical corpora in the next two to three years (Schneider 2000: 121–3).

### The sociolinguistic approach

Contemporary sociolinguistics, as it has developed over the last twenty years or so, subsumes a number of different approaches to the study of language and society. These include 'macro' sociolinguistic research (studies of societal multilingualism and language planning that are carried out as part of the sociology of language); 'micro' studies of language variation (linguistically oriented sociolinguistics); and a range of other studies, including anthropological

linguistics, language attitudes, pidgin and creole studies and critical linguistics (Trudgill 1978; Bolton 1992). As far as sociolinguistic approaches to World Englishes are concerned, these can be regarded as falling into four types of studies:

- 'the sociology of language' (Fishman *et al.* 1977, 1996);
- studies of the 'linguistic features' of World Englishes (Trudgill and Hannah 1982; Cheshire 1991a, etc.);
- 'socially realistic' studies of World Englishes (Kachru 1992); and
- pidgin and creole studies (Todd 1984).

This procedure of categorisation is by definition reductive, somewhat simplistic and presupposes a synchronic view of 'modern sociolinguistics'. The reality of the sociolinguistic intellectual tradition is a good deal more complex than these categories suggest. Koerner (1995), for example, traces the origins of the sociolinguistic enterprise back through 'several generations of linguistics workers' to the dialect geography of German and Swiss scholars such as Wenker, Wrede and Gilliéron in the late nineteenth century. In the course of his academic career Ferdinard Wrede was to supervise Max Weinreich, the father of Uriel Weinreich, who was to supervise William Labov's doctoral dissertation at Columbia. Raven McDavid was similarly trained by Hans Kurath, who emigrated to America from Austria. Koerner (1995) also traces a genealogy that links Dwight Whitney to Ferdinand de Saussure, Antoine Meillet, Uriel Weinreich and William Labov. Koerner (1995) conceptualises the sources of twentieth-century sociolinguistics as beginning with Wrede (in dialectology), Meillet (in historical linguistics studies) and Max Weinreich (in research on bilingualism and multilingualism). This is, as he points out, only a partial genealogy, as it is focused on the 'linguistic sociolinguistics' of the Labovian tradition, and excludes work on other types of sociolinguistics such as the 'sociology of language', 'anthropological linguistics' and 'the ethnography of speaking'.

### The sociology of language and World Englishes

The sociology of language is primarily associated with the work of Joshua Fishman, typically seen as the primary expert in the field, with over 700 publications on this and related areas (Spolsky 1994). During the 1960s and 1970s, a number of other sociolinguists including Charles Ferguson, Einar Haugen, Björn Jernudd and William Stewart also began to investigate areas such as multilingualism, diglossia and language planning using approaches and methodologies associated with the 'sociology of language' approach, and often collaborated with Fishman on joint research and publishing projects (see Fasold 1984).

Fishman has made a number of contributions to the field of World Englishes. Perhaps his primary influence has been at the level of methodology, specifically in investigating 'societal multilingualism', language spread, language maintenance and other 'macrosociolinguistic' phenomena. He uses a range of methods derived

from the social sciences, including social survey techniques designed to elicit answers to the question of 'who speaks what language to whom and when?' (Fishman 1965). Fishman began his academic life as a Yiddish scholar, but went on to work extensively on language maintenance and multilingualism in the United States (Fishman 1964, 1968). Later he collated and codified work on the language problems of developing nations (Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta 1968), addressed the issues of language and nationalism (Fishman 1972), and language and ethnicity (Fishman 1989), and edited the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, which he founded in 1973. According to Spolsky (1994), Fishman's work is 'preeminent for the meticulous analysis of large bodies of data collected in major surveys using the methods of sociology and . . . it has also incorporated the exhaustive elucidation and interpretation of archival materials' (1994: 1266).

During the 1970s, techniques from the sociology of language were also used in the administration and codification of macrosociolinguistic data in the form of 'sociolinguistic surveys' that were carried out (often with funding from the Ford Foundation) in East Africa, West Africa, the Philippines, Jordan and other developing nations (see Ohannessian, Ferguson and Polomé 1975). (Surveys of this kind were not entirely new, however; George Grierson's massive survey of Indian languages took place in the 1890s and the results were published in eleven volumes in 1927.) Language surveys and censuses (and by extension perhaps the 'sociology of language') were thus partly colonial in their epistemological origins, although in the contemporary era such techniques typically have been used in postcolonial situations in the context of national language planning (see Gonzalez and Bautista 1986 on the Philippines; Bacon-Shone and Bolton 1998 on Hong Kong).

The specific relevance of the sociology of language methodology to the description of World Englishes is in the discussion of the background sociohistorical conditions which influence the use of English in postcolonial societies such as India, Singapore or the Philippines. Broadly speaking, most of the descriptions of 'new Englishes' found in the literature (see e.g. Platt and Weber 1980 on English in Singapore and Malaya; numerous entries in McArthur 1992a; Kachru 1983 on Indian English; and Zuengler 1983 on Kenyan English) are preceded or accompanied by details of the historical, sociological and political underpinning of those societies; the 'external history' of these Englishes, as it were. In such cases, sociohistorical information is typically expressed in a discussion of the 'status' and 'functions' of English in the community.

The term *status* here refers to the legal (*de jure*), official, or quasi-official position of a language within a certain society, as, for example, national, sole, joint official (co-official), 'major' or 'minor' and 'second', or 'foreign' language. Other terms may also be used to indicate the comparative status of various languages, including 'language of wider communication', 'regional official language', 'tolerated' language and 'discouraged' language (Bell 1981). The term *functions* refers to the range of uses of a particular language within a community, often involving

a dichotomy between the *intranational* functions and *international* functions of a particular language. The intranational functions of English may include its use as a 'lingua franca', and its subsequent use in government, law, education and the mass media. Its international functions include its use as a language of business and commerce, science and technology, international communications and diplomacy.

In addition to the methodological impact of the sociology of language on the study of World Englishes, two books by Fishman and his associates (Fishman, Cooper and Conrad 1977; Fishman, Conrad and Rubal–Lopez 1996) have also delivered specific treatments of 'the spread of English' and 'postimperial English'. These studies were published twenty years apart and the data cited, and commentaries given, suggest a number of developments in the sociopolitical realities of English worldwide. In the late 1970s, the study of World Englishes had just begun; many former anglophone colonies had only recently achieved independence and Fishman's perspective was heavily influenced by his concern to foster vernacular languages. By 1996, the impact of territorial colonialism had been dissolved by the tides of political change, which, Fishman has now suggested, include the increasing globalisation of the world's economy and intellectual life. Little is said directly in either study about the emergence of 'new Englishes', however, although there is some discussion of the indigenisation of English in 'postimperial' settings. Nevertheless, the two studies deserve attention, as they represent important collections of research into a number of issues linked to World Englishes.

In the 1977 volume, after reviewing a wide range of issues linked to the growing spread of English, Fishman makes a number of points: first, he notes the existence of English-speaking 'international' people in the cities of the world, such as foreign technological experts, cosmopolitan local elites, businessmen, students and tourists. At the same time, he notes the concern for maintaining local languages, and the need of many nationalities 'to protect their mother tongues'. He further enters a plea to elaborate a theory of ethnicity, asserting that 'in 3,000 years of social theory . . . no full-fledged sociological theory of ethnicity has been elaborated' (1977: 332), and he urges anglophones to learn more of the world's other languages, traditions and values. His final summation reveals both a sense of threat from English, and the desire to check and discipline the spread of the language. English is still spreading, he concedes, but it is also being checked and is increasingly a co-official language of government, education and even business, where 'protected vernaculars' are used at the middle and lower levels. He concludes that the 'international sociolinguistic balance' rests on three factors: the spread of English; the control of English; and the 'fostering' of vernacular languages (1977: 335).

Almost twenty years later in *Post–Imperial English*, Fishman and his colleagues (Fishman, Conrad and Rubal–Lopez 1996) return to a consideration of some of the same issues. In the first chapter Fishman poses three questions:

- Is English 'still' spreading in the non-English mother-tongue world? (Yes.)
- Is that continued spread in any way directly orchestrated by, fostered by, or exploitatively beneficial to the English mother-tongue world? (Yet to be judged.)
- Are there forces or processes which transcend the English mother-tongue world itself and which also contribute to the continued spread and entrenchment of English in non-English mother-tongue countries? (Yet to be judged.)

Fishman's answers to the second and third questions indicate at least a slight shift away from his earlier position. Noting the existence of multinational corporations from Japan, Germany and the Gulf, he comments that 'the spread of English . . . may have more to do with the growing dominance of the richer countries over the poorer ones (and not merely economically or particularly politically, but also culturally) than with the English mother-tongue countries *per se*' (Fishman 1996a: 4).

In the twenty cases surveyed by Fishman (1996b), five countries are providing elementary education mainly in English or another 'colonial' language (Cameroon, India, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea and Singapore); twelve countries or groups of countries use their own 'major vernaculars' (Cuba, Israel, Uganda, Malaysia, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Quebec, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and the European Union); and there are three cases of 'mixed models' (Kenya (with Swahili and English), the Philippines (with Filipino and English) and South Africa (African languages, Afrikaans and English)). In those countries where elementary education is most 'anglified' (e.g. India and Singapore) there is typically a high level of linguistic diversity, and a number of local vernaculars. Fishman also notes that, globally, English has intruded into tertiary level education almost everywhere as an instructional medium (to a greater or lesser extent); the main exceptions being the Sudan, Quebec and the European Union countries (although even here the situation in currently changing). The other seventeen cases break into two categories: those where university education is wholly in English; and those where English is used as a teaching and study medium only in certain faculties or departments. Tertiary education everywhere is thus far more anglified than elementary education, which is, Fishman comments, 'a reflection of the *internal* social stratification and the *external* econotechnical linkage that English so commonly (so omnipresently) both symbolizes and reinforces' (1996b: 625).

Fishman suggests that the status of English in postcolonial societies is related to 'social stratification', although he avoids the use of the term 'neo-colonialism'. Quoting Apple (1986) on 'hegemony', he cites the argument that hegemonic forms are rarely imposed from the outside, but rather more often reintegrated 'within everyday discourse, merely by following our "commonsense needs and desires" ' (1996b: 639). The former British and American colonies that Fishman reviews are, he asserts, 'participating in both trends, in various degrees and with differing priorities' and to characterise the former trend as 'the imperialism of English' is both 'antiquated' and 'erroneous' (1996b: 639).

### The linguistic features approach

A complementary method of describing World Englishes focuses on the discussion of linguistic features, through what I characterise here as a 'linguistic features' approach. This requires the linguist to identify and make statements about typical features of language in terms of pronunciation or 'accent' (phonology), vocabulary (lexis), or grammar (morphology and syntax). Typical exponents of this approach are Trudgill and Hannah who describe 'standard varieties' of English in terms of 'differences at the level of phonetics, phonology, grammar and vocabulary' (Trudgill and Hannah [1982] 1994: 3).

In some respects, Trudgill and Hannah's *International English* ([1982] 1994) is an extension of an earlier work by Hughes and Trudgill (1979), entitled *English Accents and Dialects*, which included tape-recordings, transcriptions and a brief linguistic analysis of a range of heavily vernacular British urban dialects, including London, Norwich, Bristol, Pontypridd, Walsall, Bradford, Liverpool, Newcastle, Edinburgh and Belfast. There are, however, a number of differences between *International English* and the earlier volume. First, Trudgill and Hannah ([1982] 1994) use a recorded word-list and reading passage, instead of short snippets of 'authentic speech', as in Hughes and Trudgill (1979). Second, again in contrast to the earlier volume, they focus on varieties of 'standard English' worldwide; in the first edition (1982), these included Australian, New Zealand, South African, Welsh, North American, Scottish, Irish, West Indian, West African and Indian English. The third edition (1994) added an expanded section on creoles, as well as descriptions of Singapore and Philippine English. The amount of linguistic detail covered by individual sections varies greatly; generally speaking there tends to be a rather detailed coverage of phonetics and phonology and somewhat less on grammar and lexis, although this varies, and the section on US English contains a detailed discussion of both grammar and vocabulary. The sections dealing with 'inner-circle' varieties also predominate, with some 100 pages in the latest edition allocated to 'native-speaker' varieties, and 30 devoted to creoles and second-language varieties. The influence of this book around the world has been substantial, both as a model for methodology and also for classroom teaching in sociolinguistics and in courses on World Englishes (Bolton 1983).

Other linguists such as Cheshire have strongly challenged the reliance on a notional standard thus:

> Current descriptions, whether of a non-standard dialect, a 'new' variety or even of a hypothetical international standard variety, are all too often given as lists of assorted departures from southern British standard English or from American standard English, with no attempt at determining the extent to which the local linguistic features function as part of an autonomous system . . . In the absence of systematic empirical research, descriptions of different varieties of World English have often been based either on the

writer's personal observations or on the recorded speech of a single person, so that there is no way of seeing how the linguistic features that are said to be characteristic of a given variety of English are governed by social and situational factors. It is impossible, from such descriptions, to distinguish reliably between features that are performance errors and features that are recurrent, 'legitimate' features of a local variety. (Cheshire 1991b: 7)

The above caveat is included in her introduction to her book, *English Around the World* (1991a). Cheshire is at pains to distance herself from earlier descriptions of World Englishes, noting that a rigorous sociolinguistic perspective has much more to offer than other approaches, as 'it can contribute to English-language teaching issues by ensuring that descriptions of world varieties of English have a sounder empirical base than is the case at present' (Cheshire 1991b: 7). Cheshire's collection of case studies is grounded firmly in empirical research. The first seventeen chapters cover Englishes of the inner circle (the UK and USA, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand and Australia); the other twenty-seven, Englishes in the outer circle (South Asia, Southeast Asia and Hong Kong, East Africa, Southern Africa, West Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific).

A number of these case studies focus on the analysis of sociolinguistic variation and are perhaps more accurately described as 'variation studies' (in the Labovian paradigm) rather than studies of linguistic features *per se*. Some papers attempt to analyse statistical regularities in the linguistic constraints that govern variation, others use qualitative methods and some adopt an eclectic approach. In the case of the outer-circle Englishes, some contributions are primarily 'sociology of language', some are 'variationist', others features-focused and others combine a number of approaches. Cheshire argues, perhaps rather optimistically, that in the case of 'second-language' varieties of English, sociolinguistic analysis can answer the question of where errors stop and where 'legitimate features of a local variety' start – an optimism also reflected in her claim that the chapters she includes are 'all empirical analyses of English which are firmly based on sociolinguistic research that has been carried out in the community in which the language is used' (1991b: 11).

Both approaches have had an influence on the description of World Englishes, although at somewhat different levels of detail. The Trudgill and Hannah approach has served as a model for some linguists when giving a 'broad' description of particular stereotypes of speech in second-language situations. The 'variation studies' approach advocated by Cheshire has been implemented in research aimed at analysing finer linguistic detail. What both researchers share is a focus on levels of linguistic description and a conviction in the centrality of linguistic variation to the study of World Englishes. As is evident from many other studies, however, recently this belief in the centrality of linguistic analysis has often been superseded by an emphasis on other factors, including the sociological and the political.

### Braj Kachru and the socially realistic study of World Englishes

Braj Kachru has been very closely associated with the study of new Englishes, or, to use the term that Kachru himself prefers, 'World Englishes'.[5] In his (1992) survey of 'World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources', Kachru summarises the study of World Englishes in terms of eleven related and overlapping issues, identified as:

- 'the spread and stratification of English';
- 'characteristics of the stratification';
- 'interactional contexts of World Englishes';
- 'implications of the spread';
- 'descriptive and prescriptive concerns';
- 'the bilingual's creativity and the literary canon';
- 'multi-canons of English';
- 'the two faces of English: nativisation and Englishisation';
- 'fallacies concerning users and uses';
- 'the power and politics of English'; and
- 'teaching World Englishes'. (1992: 2)

In his discussion of the first issue, Kachru argues in favour of the strength of his model of the spread of English in terms of 'three concentric circles': the inner circle (ENL societies), the outer circle (ESL societies) and the expanding circle (EFL societies), and he also discusses the statistics of English worldwide. In the section on the 'characteristics of the stratification' he discusses the terminology used by researchers to describe the structures of outer-circle Englishes, either as *a lectal range* similar to that found in a creole continuum (e.g. Platt 1977; Platt and Weber 1980), or as a *cline* in English bilingualism (e.g. Kachru 1983).

Kachru's analysis of the 'interactional contexts of World Englishes' acknowledges insights from Halliday (1978, etc.), Labov (1972a, b) and Saville-Troike (1981), which have stimulated work on discourse strategies, speech acts and code-mixing. He explains the linguistic and cultural 'implications of the spread'

---

[5] There seems to be general agreement that the recent study of World Englishes can be dated from the two conferences on English as a world language that took place in 1978, one in April at the East–West Center in Hawaii, and the second in June–July at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Braj Kachru played a major role in both conferences (Smith 1981; Kachru 1982). These conferences discussed the sociopolitical contexts of English in the world; the use of English in former anglophone colonies; the processes of 'nativisation' and 'acculturation' in such societies; and the description of varieties of English (Kachru 1992: 1). Throughout the 1980s, other conferences were organised under the auspices of such organisations as IATEFL, TESOL, the Georgetown University Round Table and the East–West Center. By the mid-1980s the term 'World Englishes' was gaining currency (Kachru 1985; Kachru and Smith 1988). The justification for the adoption of this term, Kachru argues, is that: 'The term symbolises the functional and formal variations, divergent sociolinguistic contexts, ranges and varieties of English in creativity, and various types of acculturation in parts of the Western and non-Western world. This concept emphasizes 'WE-ness', and not the dichotomy between *us* and *them* (the native and non-native users)' (1992: 2).

of World Englishes in the outer and expanding circles, while noting that a consideration of 'descriptive and prescriptive concerns' involves an evaluation of the main tenets of theoretical and applied linguistics; an evaluation using the descriptive techniques, methodology and analytical tools of sociolinguistics in the context of the research initiatives of scholars of the outer circle.

The issue of 'the bilingual's creativity and the literary canon' refers to the existence and development of the 'new literatures in English' that have appeared in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean, and the extent to which these 'contact literatures in English' have undergone *nativisation* and *acculturation*. Kachru argues that in South Asia, West Africa and Southeast Asia these literatures are 'both nativised and acculturated', as instanced by the work of the 1986 Nobel Prize winner Wole Soyinka from Nigeria, and the 1988 Neustadt Award winner Raja Rao of India, and he emphasises that the issue of the bilingual's creativity is an important area for linguistic, literary and pedagogical research (Kachru 1986c). The notion of 'multi-canons of English' attempts to accommodate the current sociolinguistic realities of World English and World Englishes, where speakers of a wide range of first languages communicate with one another through English. As a result, Kachru argues, English has become acculturated in many 'un-English' sociolinguistic contexts, in many African and Asian societies where there is no shared Judaeo-Christian or European cultural heritage or shared literary canon, and thus has become 'multi-canonical' (Kachru 1991).

Kachru's concept of 'the two faces of English: nativisation and Englishisation' focuses on the reciprocal effects of language contact: i.e. the effect on English in a localised context ('nativisation'), and the effect on local languages in the same situation ('Englishisation'). English vocabulary is borrowed into local languages around the world (Viereck and Bald 1986; Bhatia and Ritchie 1989); but Englishisation also extends to the level of grammar, as in the adoption of impersonal constructions in Indian languages, or the use of passive constructions with a 'by' equivalent in Korean, both of which have been traced to English (Kachru 1992: 8).

The 'fallacies concerning users and uses' comprise a number of mistaken beliefs, including that English is primarily learnt for its international utility and currency; that it is primarily learnt to communicate with people from inner-circle societies; that the aim of learning English is to adopt a native model of English proficiency; and that 'expatriate' teachers and advisors play a major role in formulating English teaching policies. A consideration of the 'power and politics of English' involves issues related to the ideological, cultural and elitist power of English, associated with 'the immense economic advantage of English to the countries in the Inner Circle, particularly Britain and the United States' (Kachru 1992: 9). On this point Kachru argues that

> [t]he very existence of their power thus provides the Inner Circle with incentives for devising ways to maintain attitudinal and formal control; it is both a psychological and sociopolitical process. And linguistic control

is yet another such strategy, exercised in three ways: by the use of various channels of codification and by controlling these channels; by the attitude towards linguistic innovations [in the Outer Circle]: and by suggesting dichotomies which are sociolinguistically and pragmatically unrealistic. (1992: 9)

On the last issue of 'teaching World Englishes', Kachru argues that this enterprise is particularly intellectually challenging as it relates to three academic areas, those of language, literature and methodology. It is a 'paradigm shift' with wide-reaching implications for English in a postcolonial world order of the kind indicated above. Kachru also points to the increased availability of resources for teaching, noting that many of the key academic books in this area appeared in the early or mid-1980s. Kachru's enthusiasm for the teaching of 'World Englishes' was not shared by everyone. By 1990, Randolph Quirk was becoming increasingly worried by what he termed the 'half-baked quackery' of English teachers preaching the gospel of 'varieties of English', and published a polemical paper taking issue with those he thought to be undermining the importance of Standard English. This involved a challenge to the growing study and teaching of 'varieties', and was to lead him into a celebrated yet decorous debate with Kachru (Quirk 1990; Kachru 1991).

### Pidgin and creole studies

In the field of World Englishes there has been periodic discussion about the relationship between the study of English-based pidgins and creoles and the development of new Englishes and World Englishes. That such a relationship exists seems clear; what is frequently in dispute however is its exact nature. As early as the early 1960s, Quirk described pidgins as a 'radical deviant' from English, and 'a different language from English, though closely related, rather than as one of the normal regional variants of English' (Quirk 1962: 16–17). Ten years later he argued that Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea deserved recognition as 'a newly emerged language' (Quirk 1972: 53).

As the study of World Englishes took off in the 1980s, the specialist journals in the field had to decide on how to deal with pidgin and creole varieties. Görlach (1980), in setting out the editorial policy of *English World-Wide*, discusses the place of pidgin and creole linguistics (PCL) in relation to the studies of varieties. He argues that because of the continuum that exists in many societies linking pidgins and creoles with standard languages, their study 'can therefore with some justification be regarded as being part of English or French or Portuguese studies, as is the study of the respective dialects', citing Krio, Tok Pisin and Sranan as cases in point. He also concedes that 'many will not agree that [. . . this] is sufficient reason to treat these languages this way' (1980: 6). McArthur's *English Today* has adopted a similar editorial policy, with articles by creolists such as Le Page (1986) and Todd (1995), as has Kachru's *World Englishes*, which