

Margaret Rogers, Reader in German, is the Director of the Centre for Translation Studies and teaches terminology, translation and text analysis on the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in Translation Studies at the University of Surrey, UK. Her publications are in the field of Terminology, LSP and Translation.

Christopher Rollason obtained a First Class Honours in English Literature from Trinity College, Cambridge in 1975, and a PhD from York University in 1988. A former member of the Department of Anglo-American Studies at Coimbra University, Portugal, he is now an independent scholar and Language Editor for the Delhi-based Atlantic Literary Review. Research publications include articles in the field of Translation Studies.

Marcel Thelen is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Translation and Interpreting at the Maastricht School of International Communication of Hogeschool Zuyd, Maastricht, The Netherlands. He is also editor-in-chief of the *Translation and Meaning* book series.

Polymnia Tsagouria studied Greek literature and Psychology at the University of Thessaloniki in Greece. She holds an MA in Classics and an MA in Ancient History, both from University College, London, where she is currently pursuing research in Ancient Greek Economic History. Since 1997 she has been working as a Greek language and Literature teacher in schools and universities in Greece as well as the UK.

Krista Varantola is Professor of English in the School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies and Rector of the University of Tampere, in Finland. Her research interests include the use of dictionaries and corpora in translation.

Chapter 1

English in Europe: For Better, for Worse?

GUNILLA ANDERMAN AND MARGARET ROGERS

Introduction

When in 1977 the NASA spacecraft Voyager One blasted off on its historic unmanned mission to Jupiter and beyond, the capsule was equipped with greetings from the planet Earth, brief messages in 55 languages in preparation for the wide-ranging choice of languages that might be spoken in outer space. Preceding the individual language messages, however, was a lengthier statement from Kurt Waldheim speaking on behalf of the then 147 member states of the United Nations. Prophetically the statement made by the Secretary-General of the UN, himself an Austrian, was delivered in English. While, at the time, the use of English to ensure universal understanding of his message might not have been a foregone conclusion, at the present moment in history the choice of English as the language to represent the planet seems indisputable.¹

For English to assume the role of global language is, however, not an altogether uncontroversial issue. While the availability of a *lingua franca* helps individual nation states to gain an increased international profile, the coexistence of a national and an international language is not always unproblematic; a number of major arguments have been raised related to retaining and promoting English in its present global role, and more particularly its role as European *lingua franca*. Six of these arguments are first presented in outline, then addressed in this introductory chapter.

Linguistic imperialism

The first argument concerns the hotly debated issue of linguistic hegemony, also known as 'linguistic imperialism' (see for example Phillipson, 1992 and Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999). Concern has been voiced that the needs of developing countries are better met through linguistic expertise used to help promote their own national languages than through the English-language programmes offered by Western, post-colonial powers. In a European context, as the use of English for

cross-national communication makes inroads into an increasing number of specialist domains and activities, warning voices point to the risk of erosion of the European Union (EU) commitment to cultural and linguistic diversity of its member states (Phillipson, 2003).

A related issue resulting from the expanding use of English in many different spheres of activity – not only within the European Union – is its linguistic influence on many of the languages of the world. Given the tendency for languages with small numbers of speakers to be nudged out by languages spoken by many, it is estimated that in a hundred years' time about 3000 languages may have become extinct. According to some estimates, there are about 6500 languages in the world, about half of which are likely to cease to exist within that time period (Crystal, 2003, personal communication).² This means that on average, every two weeks, somewhere in the world, a language becomes extinct. Since 96% of the world's languages are spoken by only 4% of its people, it is hardly surprising that many of them may feel under threat.

Global English: Language change and language use

For speakers with English as their first language, the development of English as a means of international communication constitutes another, closely linked issue of concern. Signs of global English, developing as a homogenised 'reduced standardised form of language for supra-cultural communication' (Barber, 1992, discussed in Snell-Hornby, 2000: 36) have made some mother tongue speakers fear that, in the process of becoming common property, their native tongue is turning into a 'hybrid' language, sometimes referred to as *Euro-speak* within the European Union and more broadly as 'McLanguage', reflecting the globalised nature of the modern commercial world (Snell-Hornby, 1999). Concern has also been expressed about the uniqueness and survival of some of the European languages spoken by small numbers of speakers. According to some, English is making visible inroads into their grammar and vocabulary and is therefore perceived as an accelerating force hastening their journey towards extinction to state the extreme case. Hence, linguistic developments in the context of global English, constitute the second, topical issue to be addressed here in this volume.

English and translation

Closely linked to the linguistic problems developing in the wake of global English is the third issue: the need for non-mother tongue speakers to communicate and often translate into a language which is not their own (what Emma Wagner calls 'two-way translation', see this volume). This is already the case among first-generation immigrants in countries

such as Australia (see Campbell, 1998); in Europe, the same situation persists in countries such as Finland, where languages of limited diffusion are spoken (see Mackenzie, 1998: 15–19). The enlargement of the EU with its anticipated array of additional languages is likely to intensify even further discussions about the continuing usefulness of the concept of the 'native speaker'. Projections show that the balance between first-language and second-language speakers of English is changing. According to Graddol (1999), the number of second-language speakers will overtake that of first-language speakers within the next 50 years. Others maintain that this has already happened (Davies, 2003: 160; Jenkins, 2003: 2).

Any discussion about the language of a nation also needs to consider its literary traditions and its link with social identity; the influence of English on the languages of Europe also has important implications for translation. At the moment, the present linguistic stronghold of English is matched by the central position held by the Anglo-American literary tradition in Europe, sufficiently firmly established for translated literary works from other languages to be assigned more peripheral positions (see Even Zohar, 1978 and 1990). Hence, for European literature to travel successfully in translation into English, adjustments are often required in order to ensure that European literary imports fit the literary traditions prevailing in the receiving anglophone target culture, not infrequently at the cost of reducing the element of 'foreignness' in the original (see Venuti, 1995).

Language learning and teaching: Some implications of global English

The rapid spread of English has also been quoted as a possible factor underlining the present decline in interest among European students in the study of modern languages, a side effect of the use of an international language for purposes of cross-national communication. Nevertheless, there is evidence in the UK, for example, that graduates with a knowledge of modern languages other than English are highly employable by industry. One account estimates that modern-language graduates have lower unemployment rates than those in Business/Administration, Engineering/Technology and Computing³ but claims that not enough UK businesses are aware of the consequences of using only English. The development of English into the language in which many European citizens now tend to communicate with each other therefore raises the question of the way forward for modern-language teaching, not only in the UK but also elsewhere in Europe. While the approach which has most recently informed modern-language pedagogy places primary emphasis on listening comprehension and speaking the foreign language, with the emergence of a European *lingua franca*, a shift to the early development of

reading and translation skills may more accurately reflect the needs of an enlarged Europe. Concentrating on the learning of a closely defined set of skills might help to ensure a continued supply of linguists with a knowledge of the less commonly known languages of Europe. A further step towards protecting such languages might be the introduction of a language policy following the precedents of Australia and South Africa (Phillipson, 2003).

The nature of the beast: What is International English?

For such a widespread and widely discussed phenomenon, it is surprisingly difficult to identify a commonly accepted definition of standard international English. According to McArthur, the term 'international English' stems from the 1980s and is also known as international standard English. He defines it as: 'the standard form of English conceived as an international language; international English in its standard form' (1992: 984). Similarly, in the case of English as the *lingua franca* of Europe, there appears to be little available data on the characteristics of this variety of English for purposes of cross-national communication (for details of an ongoing research project, see James, 2000). Hence the fifth and penultimate topic in the discussion of the present position of English includes some observations on the direction of this new variety of English now emerging.

Pragmalinguistics

As cross-national communication among European nationals increases, so does the need for greater understanding of social and cultural divides. In the act of communication, knowledge of a shared *lingua franca* may go a long way in the pursuit of mutually beneficial social intercourse; there are, however, additional factors that come into play, affecting the way speakers make use of a language other than their own and the way first-language interlocutors interact in such situations. Of considerable importance is an understanding of the prevailing social and cultural traditions which speakers, unwittingly, bring with them from their own language to a communicative situation. As a result, a successful cross-national exchange often requires pragmatic as well as linguistic competence, the sixth topic aired in this chapter, including a discussion of some of the factors concerned with the pragmatic competence required to use language appropriately in different contexts.

In the remainder of Chapter 1 we consider in greater detail these different issues in relation to the position of English as a global language and, in particular, its role as the *lingua franca* of Europe.

Linguistic Imperialism: Historical Precedents

Seen from the standpoint of linguistic imperialism (see for example Phillipson, 1999 and Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson, 1992), English in its present global role continues to serve as an instrument of colonial domination, reinforced after the end of World War II by the USA, the world's current superpower. As an argument in favour of a group of people being represented by a language of their own, the theory of linguistic imperialism points to the need to express group membership and the individual self as equal in importance to international communication (see also Seidlhofer 2002: 203). The debate further touches on the roles of specialists in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) and Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) and the extent to which their expertise meets the needs of developing countries, many of them too small or too poor to draw on their own resources. Accordingly, moves in favour of expanding the use of English, based on claimed economic and technical advantages, should not be made without careful consideration of the educational and social inequality deriving from the use of English for official purposes (see Görlach, 1988).

In Europe, voices critical of this ideological perspective point to the increased use of English as a *lingua franca* in many aspects of the lives of Europeans, particularly in professional contexts. This is, for instance, the language in which academics are increasingly presenting and publishing their findings rather than the language of their own country. Fears of the member states of the EU that the commitment to linguistic diversity, confirmed in EU treaties and European Parliament resolutions, will not be respected are fuelled by official US statements that the most serious problem for the EU is that it has so many languages, 'this preventing real integration and development of the Union' (Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999: 22). Along with the geopolitical agenda, not infrequently attributed to the US government whose 'first grand objective [it is] of course, to keep America as a European power, not just for today but for the indefinite future' (Walker, 1997, discussed in Graddol, 1999: 22), such comments project a future European scenario in which political and economic supremacy are followed by linguistic hegemony. In this volume, the perspective adopted in Stuart Campbell's discussion of the role of English in Laos can be understood against this general background.

It is not the first time, however, that linguistic issues following in the wake of the establishment of a superpower have confronted Europeans; history furnishes ample evidence of powerful nations and their conquests, followed by political, economic and linguistic submission. This does, however, also provide illustrations of the continued use of two languages in a variety of different forms of coexistence. As historical models, these examples indicate a range of possible linguistic outcomes.

The ancient world

In the Greece of antiquity, where each separate state or *polis* pursued its own political interests, the Greek language varieties of the different areas ranked equal in prestige. But in the course of the fifth century BC the importance of Athens and, as a consequence, Attic, the dialect spoken by the Athenians, started to grow at the expense of the other states. When, a couple of decades before the middle of the third century BC the Macedonian Empire began to expand rapidly, conquering Greece and the countries around the eastern part of the Mediterranean, the influence of Greek culture and education was such that Alexander the Great, King of the Macedonians, made Greek the official language throughout the Empire. In a modified form, it became established as the written language, known as *koine*, meaning the common language. Gradually it ousted the traditional dialects which, after a few centuries, began to disappear from written records (Janson, 2000: 81). First used in what is now present-day Greece, the cultural and political power of Greece established Greek as the language of the region around the eastern Mediterranean for more than a millennium. Then, from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, the period of time that Greece formed part of the Ottoman Empire, *koiné* continued to be used as a spoken language, to re-emerge in the nineteenth century once more as a written, official language but with a political and linguistic legacy in the form of two competing language varieties: *Katharevousa*, the purified language containing words and forms from Classical Greek, and *Dimotiki*, the popularly used language which, in 1976, was announced as the official Greek language, mirroring a political shift following the fall of the junta. The current situation is one of diglossia.

While the use of Greek, once the language of a superpower, is now largely confined to its area of origin, the history of Latin, the language of the Roman Empire, tells a different story of political and linguistic conquest. During the first few centuries following its foundation, believed to be in 753 BC, Rome was the sole locus for the use of Latin, although smaller neighbouring states are likely to have been using similar languages (Janson, 2000: 90). Over the next 800 years or so, the Republic of Rome and then the Empire expanded to cover the area around the Mediterranean and vast regions beyond, its European boundary marked by the Rhine and the Danube. This enormous power remained largely intact until the fifth century AD when the invasion of Germanic tribes shattered the western part of the Empire.

Unlike Greek writers and Greek literature, from the very beginning Roman writers used one homogeneous language, the variety spoken in Rome. Mastery of the Latin language soon became the key to success

in Rome, and this attention to language resulted in well-established language norms. Rules of grammar and rhetoric were formulated and scrupulously followed, including spelling and pronunciation, vocabulary and style (Janson, 2002: 92).

While at first Latin was spoken only in Rome, with time it spread, replacing not only the languages of the Italian regions but also a number of others, resulting in the emergence of the Romance language family. The use of Latin in school, in the army and in commercial life ensured that, within a few generations, urban populations shifted to using Latin, followed more slowly by speakers in rural areas. Also aiding the spread of Latin was the close link between Latin and Christianity; the new religion, the gospels and other texts having been translated earlier from Greek into Latin. However, while in its wake the Roman conquest was followed by linguistic submersion, history also reveals less far-reaching social and cultural contact and, as a result, the continued coexistence of two languages.

More recent times

In 1494, the Treaty of Tordesillas between Portugal and Spain provided a blueprint for the two leading naval powers of the time to carve up the world outside Europe between them. For South America, the Treaty was decisive; while Portugal occupied the eastern part of the continent, the rest fell under the rule of Spain, resulting in Portuguese becoming the language of Brazil, while Spanish dominates in virtually all other states of the Americas south of what is now the USA. While, in South America, Portuguese developed into a native tongue, in Africa, where Portugal also seized extensive territory along the coast, including what are now the independent states of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique, Portuguese, the official language, never became the first language for more than a very small percentage of the population, the majority of whom have continued to speak one of the many languages in use before the Portuguese arrived.

The need for a shared language to facilitate cross-national communication in Europe had long been filled by Latin when, in the late seventeenth century, France became the leading political and cultural force in Europe. This French dominance meant in turn that for Europeans of consequence it became imperative to know French. Not only did it become more important to have read Racine than to know Virgil by heart, in matters of social etiquette, French manners were also quickly adopted. To be able to converse in French became essential and French developed into the language of diplomacy and international contacts. While, in 1660, peace negotiations between Austria, Poland and Sweden were conducted in Latin, in Nijmegen in 1678 discussions between multilingual speakers including Frenchmen, Spaniards and Swedes, were held in French, with

only the peace treaty drawn up in Latin; and, not long after, the agreement of Rastadt between Austria and France was recorded only in French (Janson, 2000: 178), setting a diplomatic model for times to come. The linguistic hegemony of French was not, however, achieved effortlessly. The Académie Française, vested with the task of cultivating and furthering the French language, was founded as early as 1635. As the national language of the successful nation state of France, French achieved linguistic supremacy in Europe, following political and cultural hegemony, thereby usurping the position of Latin as a means of international communication.

Throughout the nineteenth century, French retained its status as the favoured international language in Europe, remaining the language of diplomacy. Following the unification of Germany under Prussia and the Franco-German war of the early 1870s, the position of French met with competition from German, particularly in view of its dominance as the *lingua franca* in Central Europe. Politically dominant for a number of decades and making rapid scientific advances, the influence of German was for a time reflected in the use of German in the domains of science and technology. German was also the *lingua franca* across much of eastern Europe, enjoying its heyday in the nineteenth century (Russ, 1994: 3–4). Two world wars, however, left Germany in political and economic ruin, in turn reflected in diminished prospects for German to assume the role of an international language. The collapse of the Iron Curtain in 1990 also strengthened the position of English as a *lingua franca* at the cost of not only German, but also Russian.

For a while, however, it looked instead as if Russian might lay claim to the status of international language in part of Europe, and even beyond. As a superpower, the Soviet Union moved to manifest its political might through instruction of the Russian language within the educational systems of its satellite states. But, following its collapse in 1990, the speed with which the subject disappeared from the curriculum of many schools in eastern Europe serves as proof of the vagaries of power as reflected in language. Still, at a different point in history, the steps taken by Russia to impose its own language on speakers of other tongues had a different, lasting result. In the nineteenth century, it succeeded in turning many of the inhabitants of Siberia into speakers of Russian, bringing many of the original languages of the region to the verge of extinction.

As history shows, when languages coexist, the language of the superior power will inevitably leave its mark on the languages of those brought within its political and economic orbit. However, the extent of the linguistic impact of this asymmetry may vary. In the past, a number of scenarios have ensued as the result of the interplay of a number of different factors. One such factor is the degree of closeness between the languages and cultures concerned; one of the reasons cited for Latin

failing to find a more permanent base in Britain, unlike in other parts of western Europe where the indigenous languages were suppressed, was the cultural divide between the rulers and the common man. To what extent then does the increasing use of English in present-day Europe also signal a growing change among Europeans to endorse the values and beliefs of today's superpower?

Global English: Language Change and Language Use

We have seen how the influence of a dominant language and culture can change over time, resulting in different outcomes. In modern-day Europe, in which English is increasingly functioning as the *lingua franca*, the question also arises, which or whose English? And to what extent does the increasing use of English signal a growing acceptance of the values of American mass culture with its closely linked commercial interests?

European culture and the language of the reigning superpower

There seems little doubt that most Europeans would not like to see their national language replaced by English. While a European Commission survey reported in 2001 (*Eurobarometer* 54, 15 February 2001), that 71% of Europeans felt that everyone in the EU should be able to speak one European language in addition to their mother tongue, and almost the same proportion agreed that this language should be English, 63% also believed that their own language needed to be safeguarded (cited in Phillipson, 2003: 61). There also seem to be valid arguments for believing that the increasing use of English among Europeans does not necessarily signal an equally rapid acceptance of values any more deep-rooted than the consumerism brought on by the so-called McDonaldisation not only of food but also of music and entertainment.

In his recent book, *The World We're In* (2003), the economic journalist and writer Will Hutton argues that Europeans are in fact more fundamentally different from Americans than is often assumed, as manifested in their attitudes towards property, equality, social solidarity and other public realms. At work here may be the shared use of English disguising more profound differences in values and attitudes, masked by formal lexical similarities. For example, a basic notion such as that of a *fair society* is, according to Hutton, interpreted radically differently in Europe and in the United States. In the United States, it stands for a concept that promotes opportunity for all but is indifferent to the consequential, unequal distribution of risks and rewards. In contrast, the European concept of a *fair society* assumes a large integrative role for the state as an actively conciliating social partner, providing public services and regulating business and society (Hutton, 2003: 45). Similarly, ownership and property

rights differ in their meaning in the USA and in Europe. In the USA, the sanctity of ownership and the right of property spread from settler farmer to company; acquisition and holding of property was a private initiative, with the federal state policing and upholding it and acting as the arbitrator of the resulting private contracts between property holders (2003: 59). In Europe, on the other hand, attitudes are more complex. Here the notion persists that property is held in trust for all and only delegated to individuals for as long as they accept reciprocal social obligations, a contrasting legacy of the fact that, at the time when Europe was already settled, America's founding fathers operated in almost limitless, unsettled land.

For many Europeans, the war in Iraq also crystallised other, equally deep-rooted differences. While throughout Europe demonstrators opposed to military intervention in Iraq did not in all likelihood see themselves as citizens of the EU, Brussels being far from their minds, to many Europeans the war represented a transgression of deeply-held values. What united them was their repudiation of the geopolitics of the twentieth century and their concern that it should not continue into the new century. On 26 April 2003, in an article in the *Guardian* newspaper entitled 'Thanks, Mr President', the political columnist, Jeremy Rifkin, referred to the Iraq crisis as having 'united Europeans and armed them with a clear sense of shared values and future vision'. Ironically, therefore, the use of English, the language of the invading forces, has in a number of ways helped in the process of uniting many Europeans, who now use English in order to communicate with other European citizens. But at what linguistic cost has this ease of mutual access been established?

The influence of English on other European languages

We might want to start the discussion by asking whether it is in fact possible or even desirable to do without Anglicisms in matters relating to the contemporary world. This is the question posed by Christopher Rollason in relation to France in his contribution to this volume, 'Unequal Systems: On the Problem of Anglicisms in Contemporary French Usage', where he uses the framework of Even-Zohar's polysystem theory to capture the asymmetrical relationship between English as a global language, and contemporary French. One of the fields in which the impact of English is particularly strongly felt in France is that of information technology. As shown by Jeremy Munday in his contribution, '*E-mail, Emilio, or Mensaje de Correo Electrónico?* The Spanish Language Fight for Purity in the New Technologies', this is also the case in Spanish. Writing about another member of the Romance language family, in her chapter, 'The Influence of English on Italian: The Case of Translations of Economics Articles', Maria Teresa Musachio argues for a trend in modern Italian to borrow not only lexis, but also to reflect English textual and syntactic

patterns in the register of economics. The contribution, 'The Influence of English on Greek: A Sociological Approach', by Polymnia Tsgouria, shows the situation in Greece to be somewhat different from that in other European countries, as the result of the use of English in the development of the tourist industry. It also stresses the difference Greeks tend to observe between spoken language, where the English influence abounds and the written mode, where efforts are made to keep the foreign impact at bay. Arguing along similar lines to Rollason, this time in relation to Danish, a cognate Germanic language, in 'Anglicisms and Translation' Henrik Gottlieb proposes that the adoption of Anglicisms brings with it a different cultural view. In 'Anglicisms in Norwegian: When and Where?', Stig Johansson and Anne-Line Graedler show the impact of English on Norwegian to be very influential in the case of vocabulary, particularly in relation to certain subject areas such as business, entertainment and information technology as well as certain social groups (Johansson & Graedler, 2002). Although it has been argued that German is particularly susceptible to the influence of English (Hoffman, 2000: 10), in his analysis of the English influences on German, 'Contemporary English Influence on German - A Perspective from Linguistics', Stephen Barbour similarly makes a clear case for its main linguistic impact also being on the lexicon. The two Slavonic languages discussed, Polish and Russian, also present similar findings in contributions by Wlalislaw Chłopiński in 'Polish under Siege?' and Nellie Chachibaia and Michael Colenso in 'New Anglicisms in Russian', respectively. An interesting case of language contact between unrelated language families is presented by Kate Moore and Krista Varantola in 'Anglo-Finnish Contacts: Collisions and Collusions', a discussion of the influence of English as a Germanic language on Finnish, a member of the Finno-Ugric family with just over five million speakers. This genealogical difference seems, however, to offer few barriers to lexical borrowing (for more in depth examination of English influences on European languages see also Görlach, 2002).

The impact on English resulting from its present position

Due to its position as the language of global communication and the *lingua franca* of Europe, English may now be in the curious position of influencing itself. The type of English frequently found in international public places such as airports as well as in tourist brochures has been cited as putting English at peril and turning it into a 'free floating *lingua franca*' that has largely lost track of its cultural identity, its idioms, its hidden connotations, its grammatical subtleties and has become a reduced standardised form of language for supranational communication, the 'McLanguage' of our globalised 'McWorld', or the 'Eurospeak' of our multinational continent' (Snell-Hornby, 1999). In 'Translation and/or Editing: The

Way Forward?', Emma Wagner's discussion of English as a *lingua franca* in the context of the EU, she presents counter-examples to the idea of a standardised impoverished variety of English, arguing instead that the quality of both translations and texts originally written in English (possibly by non-native speakers) should be judged according to their purpose and edited or revised accordingly. Her view is therefore one of a functionally specific variety, especially within an enlarged European Union.

English: A foreign or second language in Europe?

Outside the UK and the Irish Republic, English in Europe has traditionally been viewed as a foreign rather than a second language, the role it plays in India and other former British colonies. However, as the result of a new pattern emerging in Europe, the position of English now seems to be rapidly changing. According to surveys of the populations of European Union countries such as *Eurobarometer* 50, based on figures collected in 1998, almost one-third of the citizens of the 13 non-English-speaking countries of the EU feel that they can manage to hold their own in a conversation in English. In Denmark, 77% of the adult population stated that they can participate in a conversation in English, and in Sweden 75% felt equally confident that their mastery of English would allow them to converse in English; in The Netherlands the figure was 71% (reported in Graddol, 1999: 65).

The command that speakers of these European nations now have of spoken English has led Phillipson to refer to two groups of English-speaking countries (1992: 17). The term 'core English-speaking countries' includes countries where the dominant group are native speakers of English as in Britain, the USA, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. These countries correspond to Kachru's 'Inner Circle' of English speakers (1985: 12). In addition, there are so-called 'periphery English' countries, covering in Kachru's terminology both the 'Outer Circle' and the 'Expanding Circle' (1985: 12). The Outer Circle embraces those countries where English was imposed in colonial times and where it continues to serve a number of international functions; the Expanding Circle includes those countries where English is used as an international link language such as Scandinavia and Japan. However, as mastery of English continues to improve throughout Europe, membership of the periphery English category cannot be viewed as fixed, as Kachru's term Expanding Circle indicates. At present there are large variations between European countries in the use of English, with only 13% of Spanish adults feeling able to conduct a conversation in English in comparison with the much higher figures for northern Europe (Graddol, 1999: 65-6). As student exchange programmes facilitate easy movement between countries for younger generations of speakers, such variations are likely to diminish.

Moreover, it is already the case that English is used as a *lingua franca* between traditional English as a Foreign Language (EFL) countries such as Scandinavia and The Netherlands (see Jenkins, 2003: 34) and in some non-UK companies.

English and Translation

While English is changing in the modern world, at the same time, it is also leaving its 'fingerprints' on other languages, not only through its uses as a *lingua franca* but also through a particular type of language contact, namely translation. In 'Fingerprints in Translation', Martin Gellerstam demonstrates how not only English words and expressions have left their mark in translations into Swedish but also sentence constructions and rhetorical devices, more characteristic of an Anglo-American than a Swedish literary tradition. Conversely, the increasing volume of translation carried out by non-native speakers of English may also be having an effect on its own further development.

Translation into the second language

In the aftermath of colonialism, translation into the second language has long been unavoidable in some parts of the world, while in others the need to translate out of the mother tongue has of necessity developed in the wake of immigration. In Australia, for instance, the need for immigrants to gain access to social and communal services by means of their own language resulted in community interpreting and translation services developing in the early 1970s. In such a situation, the source of supply of translators and interpreters is inevitably the community itself. As a result, many translators need to work into English, their second language. By the 1990s, political, economic and cultural links between Australia and Asia added further international links, reflected in the development of a number of programmes in translator and interpreter training (Campbell, 1998: 23). However, the emergence of a second and a third generation of speakers gradually brought about a reduction in the need for such services. Parallel developments may be found in the Asian communities of the UK where younger generations of speakers have developed a mastery of English, sometimes as bilinguals, and translation and interpreting services are no longer required. In the USA, second-generation Armenian, Italian or Polish speakers make limited use of the language of their parents.

With the expansion of English as a *lingua franca*, the need for documents to be available in English also increases, thereby stimulating the translation market. Since demand outstrips the supply of native speaker translators, the need for translation into English as a second language

becomes more acute. But when translating into a second language, however accomplished the English-language mastery of periphery speakers, the translator is normally 'by definition, on a developmental path with respect to that language' (Campbell, 1998: 12). From this follows a number of consequences with respect to translation competence, which Stuart Campbell discusses in his paper, 'English Translation and Linguistic Hegemony in the Global Era'. Campbell suggests these consequences may be considered in relation to the notion of Selinker's *interlanguage* (IL) (1998: 12). Among Selinker's observations, some are particularly pertinent to translation. In accordance with the IL hypothesis, first put forward by Selinker in 1969, learners create a partly separate linguistic system in which interlingual identifications and language transfer as well as a degree of fossilisation are featured (Campbell, 1998: 12-13).

The notion of interlanguage applied to translation provides Campbell with a framework for discussing translation competence that draws on related areas of research such as contrastive analysis, bilingualism and second-language acquisition. It may, for instance, explain the type of translation which Duff (1981: 10) describes as having been written in 'a third language', that is, translation into a language which is English 'but not quite'. It also provides an explanation of the observation, only too familiar to teachers marking translations into students' second language, that what is being achieved is frequently neither in the source nor in the target language (Campbell, 1998: 14). While not under time pressure, students are well aware of the specific differences between their own language and the one they are learning, but under the stress of examination conditions they tend to regress, drawing on structures familiar from their first language and projecting these onto the second language (Anderman, 1987). It is not uncommon for a teacher of translation to have to correct the same type of mistake repeatedly, the underlying first language of the student manifesting itself even in cases of anonymous marking.

The 'native speaker'

If the language learner is on a developmental path, as Campbell suggests, questions arise: can this learner become a native speaker? But what is a 'native speaker'? For monoglot English speakers, the concept of 'native speaker' is clear. For the majority of people around the world, however, multilingualism – most commonly found in the individual as a form of bilingualism – is the norm: with an estimated five to six thousand languages in the world and fewer than 200 countries, it could not be otherwise (Crystal, 1987: 360). Traditionally, teachers of modern languages and of translation have worked with the concepts of foreign language, second language and native language. As the result of modern communication

systems and global mobility, the notion of locus as a geographical place has been weakened, opening up possibilities for rapid interchanges in a global *lingua franca* unconstrained by space and time, thereby blurring any neat distinctions between 'foreign' and 'second' language. Moreover, the range of terms for the 'native language' is already suggestive of differing perspectives which cloud the idealised notion of the native speaker: 'mother tongue', 'mother language', 'first language', 'L1', 'native tongue' (for further discussion, see Davies, 2003), and the closely-related but more use-oriented terms sometimes found in connection with translation or interpreting training: 'dominant language', 'A-language', 'language of habitual use'. While this array of terms raises interesting theoretical issues, the notion of the 'native speaker' remains a cult concept which in the fullness of today's world of global communication needs to be questioned, as do the determining criteria linked to the type of speakers traditionally classified as speaking English as a foreign or second language.

It is generally accepted nowadays, at least among linguists, that there are a number of varieties of 'native' English, mainly in the UK, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand (see, for example, Jenkins, 2003: 14). But the status of the Englishes spoken and written in former British colonies and largely un-codified, such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nigeria and Singapore, is highly controversial. One widely held view, for instance, characterises deviations from a notional standard of native English as errors, rather than as locally-standardised features, firmly placing speakers of these Englishes in the second-language camp. This so-called 'deficit' approach (for recent discussion see Jenkins, 2003: 60-3) evokes traditional views of second language learning as error elimination on the path towards idealised native speakerhood, rather than as a developmental process towards a functionally appropriate means of communication with its own interlanguage features. Hence the question, whether second-language learners can become native speakers, can be re-framed in functional terms in accordance with fitness for purpose. So, for instance, if the variety of English used by the translator or interpreter is appropriate for the target audience, either ideologically as in the case of post-colonial translations into localised varieties of English (see Snell-Hornby, 2000: 41-3 for discussion), or functionally according to the type of text, then the native speaker issue becomes redundant. It also seems reasonable to assume that, as accomplished linguists, translators and interpreters who are speakers of 'Outer Circle' Englishes, would in any case be 'bilingual' or 'bidialectal', depending on your point of view.

In the context of *foreign-language* or 'Expanding Circle' learners, it seems unlikely, if we follow Davies's crucial criterion of early exposure to both language and culture (2000: 212), that such learners could become native speakers of the target language. But in translation and interpreting

surely this is not the main point, as we have seen in the Outer Circle users. Genres which are functionally informative (see also Adab, 'Translation into a Second Language – Can We, should We?', Rogers, 'Native versus Non-Native Speaker Competence in German-English Translation: A Case Study' and Thelen, 'Translating into English as a Non-Native Language: The Dutch connection' in this volume), for example, highly-conventionalised texts such as instructions for use, lend themselves more to translation by non-native speakers than others which are operative or expressive, because they can be written in an English which is largely devoid of idioms and finer subtleties (Snell-Hornby, 2000: 38), bringing us back to 'International English'.

The idea of a culturally deracinated language devoid of idioms, humour and connotations sounds deeply unattractive. But it can also be viewed as a blank canvas on which can be painted many different colours. Or, in a more positive light, the canvas can be repainted many times in order to adapt to local situations – such is the case with the localisation, or customisation, of texts for particular readerships and situations in other languages. In these days of translation as a growing international business, often part of a document-management or even content-management enterprise (see, for instance, Göpferich, 2002: 343–8), costs are closely monitored and controlled. If a document is to be translated into 20 languages for a company which has a global operation, any culture-specific problems in the source text need to be solved 20 times. Hence a source text in which any potential problems of a culturally bound kind are neutralised, whether through editing or authoring, has clear cost advantages. Such 'internationalised' or simplified texts facilitate the process of localisation, and indeed translation, as writing guides produced for that purpose demonstrate through recommendations on how to constrain variation in syntax and vocabulary.⁵ An international variety of English, which is simplified in the ways described, may go some way to meeting this commercial requirement. On the other hand, instead of the blank canvas that may be adapted to localisation, in its role as an international *lingua franca*, the form of English used may also be painted with the strong tones of specific cultural assumptions and behaviours. If strange or unacceptable to other 'viewers' of the canvas, this may lead to communication breakdowns, the type of problem to which we will return in the last section on Pragmalinguistics.

Asymmetry in translation

In matters related to literary translation between the less well known national languages of Europe and English, a further issue worthy of attention is the difference in approach necessary for working out of and into English. In the former case, for a European readership, often familiar with

the landmarks of Anglo-American history, geography and culture, major adjustments in translation to the source text are normally not required. In the latter case, however, limited knowledge about the everyday life and customs of many of the smaller nations in Europe on the part of English readers often necessitates explication in the form of added information. This asymmetry in translation may be viewed from the theoretical perspective advanced by Ithamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory that has already been mentioned with reference to Rollason's discussion of the power relation between French and English and the resulting presence of Anglicisms in present day French. In her contribution, 'À l'anglaise or the Invisible European' Gunilla Anderman also draws on the framework of polysystem theory to substantiate her observations that translation from other European languages into English often requires adherence to the norms dictated by Anglo-American literary tradition, making the passage into English more difficult for works originating in other European languages and written in accordance with different national and literary dictates. Parallels are drawn with translation into French during the previous reign of French as the leading European language provider of cultural and literary models and the more recently established, dominant role of English/American linguistic and literary norms.

Language Learning and Teaching: Some Implications of Global English

Over the millennia, the relationship between language learning and translation has evolved in interesting ways (see Rogers, 2000). As a written language, Latin was not only the model for the writing and formulation of grammars, it also served as a blueprint for the teaching and learning of other languages, a pedagogical approach that was largely translation based.

In its present role as the *lingua franca* of Europe, English differs from Latin in that equal if not greater weight is given to the teaching of the spoken in preference to the written mode of the language. While for centuries language teaching focused on written modes of expression, the latter half of the twentieth century saw a move away from concentration on writing to emphasise spoken communicative competence. Hence, the role of English as a spoken *lingua franca* may have far-reaching effects on prevailing teaching objectives, and signs of changes in linguistic patterns are already making themselves known. A younger generation of Europeans is now conversant in English and, as a result, no longer feels as strong a need to learn to communicate in the other languages of the individual European nation states.

Language pedagogy: Changing role models

In the linguistic history of Europe, the continued use of Latin for about a millennium after the fall of the western Roman Empire is remarkable (Janson, 2000: 179). Even when competition started to rage with national languages, Latin remained the language used for official international communication up to the sixteenth century. In the educational sphere, however, its influence lasted even longer. The linguistic structure of Latin and its primary role as a written language came to leave traces in the teaching of other languages throughout Europe.

Following the rise of humanism and its reassessment of Latin, emphasis was placed on the teaching and pronunciation of Latin in its classical state. As Vulgar Latin, the spoken variety, was frowned upon, the language was effectively relegated to the position of a no longer living language (Baron, 2000: 115). This view of Latin as static and non-changing was in turn applied to other languages. Although William Lily's *A Shorte Introduction of Grammar* which appeared in 1542 was an early English grammar, it was in fact nothing but a grammar of Latin. In the sixteenth century the relationship between the two languages was characterised by English being considered 'a useful medium for teaching Latin and Latin . . . a good medium for learning English' (Baron, 2000: 116). In other words, English grammar as well as the grammar of other languages was perceived as much the same as Latin grammar. The end of the following century saw a change in that Latin was no longer viewed as the framework on which to drape English grammar, instead it had now become a normative model against which English was to be measured. The grammatical paradigms on which the description of English was based were provided by Latin, and if English was found to be different it had better be adjusted to achieve a closer fit (Baron, 2000: 116).

The learning of Latin as well as Greek included the study of grammar and the reading of texts with the help of a dictionary, a method usually involving the writing down of the translation of sentences and texts in English or vice versa. When applied to the teaching of modern languages, the method became known as the 'grammar translation' method and when, in 1858, its use was incorporated into the new public examinations in England, introduced and monitored by the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the method was further sanctioned (Malmkjær, 1998: 3). However, during the latter part of the nineteenth century, through the attention attracted by the neo-grammarian movement centred around Leipzig, interest among linguists started to shift from the comparative and historical study of languages to living languages. After studying in Leipzig and Berlin, the father of modern linguistics, the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, returned to teach at the University of Geneva. In his posthumous *A Course in General Linguistics* (1916) the distinction is

drawn between diachronic and synchronic linguistics, endorsing the non-historical study of language in its spoken as well as written form.

The shift of interest in linguistics also brought about a change of attitude to language teaching. The reaction came in particular from members of the Reform Movement which included Henry Sweet and Otto Jespersen, who pointed to the importance of the primacy of speech and the priority of oral classroom methodology. With the first Department of Phonetics in the UK established at University College London in 1912 under the leadership of Daniel Jones, spoken language became the subject of scientific study. It was not, however, until the opening up of Europe after two world wars and the renewed interest in linguistics in the late 1950s that linguists turned their serious attention to research into the interaction between language and society. Pioneering projects such as Labov's study of the interaction between language and social class among New Yorkers in 1972 and that by Trudgill in 1974 of the interaction between speech and social structure in Norwich set the stage for further, sociolinguistically-based research to come. By now, the Direct Method, later further developed into the Communicative Approach, had also shifted the emphasis from exclusive interest in the teaching of the written mode in Applied Linguistics to focus on spoken communication in the foreign language, seriously challenging the deeply entrenched methodology of previous centuries. As Phillipson's English periphery speakers, the present generation of European students are the products of a modern language teaching pedagogy which has placed primary emphasis on the spoken mode, prioritising the ability to communicate in speech in the foreign language. As early as the 1960s, the Swedish programme of 'rolling reform' in education placed the ability to communicate across national borders squarely at the top of linguistic priorities in language teaching (see Anderman, 1973). Reinforcing formal education in the English language, full-length feature films, television, pop music and computer games have further aided comprehension of the spoken language, leaving the development of writing skills as the poor cousin. Lack of stylistic awareness in written English often results in the use of constructions as well as other linguistic features characteristic of spoken language such as a preponderance of first and second person singular pronouns in more formal registers of written discourse. As a further force which tends to have established differences between written and spoken English, we need to note the pervasive use of e-mail, a form of electronic communication which has been viewed as a cross between speech and writing. (See, Collot & Belmore, 1996; Yates, 1996. Discussed in Baron 2000: 249-50.)

Changing linguistic needs

During the last few decades, the linguistic landscape of Europe has changed dramatically. It is likely to change even further during the years to come. While spoken mastery of the language of a nation unquestionably constitutes a linguistic asset, it would be unrealistic to hope that the speakers of languages such as Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian, the languages of the nations of some of the smaller members of an enlarged Europe, are likely to be able to converse with many other European nationals in their own language. With English as the spoken *lingua franca*, knowledge of the spoken mode of many other European languages will be in limited demand, while on the other hand reading and translation skills are likely to be more sought after. This in turn suggests yet another swing of the pendulum and a reassessment of the linguistic skills to be prioritised in a Europe of the future, with the possibility of a refocusing on translation as a language skill in its own right, rather than as a means to language proficiency. For example *ab initio* courses in some of the less commonly known European languages have already been incorporated into some UK postgraduate programmes in translation with an early emphasis on translation into English as the target language, rather than exposure to the full spectrum of linguistic skills formerly deemed necessary to form part of a programme in Modern Language Studies. There is little doubt that the increasing use of English as a means of international communication has helped to establish contacts across linguistic and cultural borders as perhaps never before. Research, technology and business all benefit from the use of a common language and, in some respects, English would seem an ideal candidate to take on the role of the *lingua franca* of Europe. The speed of development of English for use in international communication has been helped by a variety of already existing Englishes. The existence of a large number of non-standard varieties and the impossibility of a purist approach, given the large number of words that have been incorporated into English over the centuries, has the effect that 'speakers of many other languages can recognise features which are not too dissimilar to characteristics of their own language' (Graddol, 1997: 14). And as access to English is open to speakers from widely diverse social backgrounds, its use cannot be viewed as a marker of social class and hence cannot be considered 'elite bilingualism' (Hoffman, 2000: 20). How long English will retain its present position is a question that remains open to discussion (see, for example Graddol, 1997) but there seems little doubt that if a change is to take place, it is not likely to occur overnight. For the immediate future, it is difficult to foresee any developments which could seriously reduce the stature of English on the information superhighway. The biggest potential setback to English as a global language, it has been said with more than a little irony, would have taken

place a generation ago – if Bill Gates had grown up speaking Chinese' (Crystal, 1997: 112).

Looking to the future, the possibility of changing objectives in the approach to the teaching of modern languages is not the only factor that might need consideration in the era of English as the firmly established European language for purposes of cross-national communication. In order to plan for the avoidance of potential marginalisation of the national languages of Europe in the years to come, lessons might be learned from the management of multilingualism in other parts of the world. In Canada, the balance of power between English and French was redefined in a protracted process from the 1960s onwards. In South Africa, language policy has played an important part in the process of democratisation in the post-apartheid period, and, in Australia, language policy became a national need in the 1980s (Phillipson, 2003: 67–8). The guiding parameters in formulating language policy for Australia included enrichment (cultural and intellectual), for Europe economics (foreign trade and vocations), equality (social justice and overcoming disadvantages), external relations (Australia's role in the region and the world). In addition, Phillipson proposes a further 'E', standing for Europeanisation (2003: 68). Incorporated into such a policy may, for instance, be the suggestion put forward by Christopher Rollason in this volume that Anglicisms be confined to certain clearly specified areas of discourse, with writing professionals setting an example of good practice.

International English: The Nature of the Beast

International English as Language for Special Purposes (LSP)

Although frequent reference is made to the variety of English popularly known as International English, defining the characteristics that set this variety apart from Standard English is not likely to be an easy task, given the documented attempts to define even Standard English. According to Tom McArthur, Standard English is 'a widely used term that resists easy definition but is used as if most educated people nonetheless know what it refers to' (1992: 982). And, writing in 1989, Sidney Greenbaum considered 'Standard English' (by whatever name it is known) to be 'the variety of English that is manifestly recognised in our society as the prestigious variety' (1989, as reported in McArthur, 1992: 982). However, in 1995, David Crystal estimated that Received Pronunciation in its pure form, was spoken by less than 3% of the population (1995: 365). Henry Widdowson has suggested that 'English spreads as a virtual language which is, in the process, variously "actualised"' (1997: 139–40) (discussed in James, 2000). In some cases, this process of actualisation may manifest itself in the form of different dialects, determined by the region in which English is spoken. But it may also take the form of a variance in a register

linked to special purposes which serves to hold International English in place and to maintain its global intelligibility. In his view of International English as English for Special Purposes, Widdowson has in mind international communication in quasi-institutionalised registers such as those of medicine, science and technology but, following Alan James, Widdowson's arguments apply equally to the *ad hoc* registers for more informal, international exchanges which also tend to 'regulate themselves in the interest of intelligibility and as actualisations of the virtual language serve thus as a brake on excessive diversity in the linguistic code' (James, 2000: 34). James draws on the Hallidayan notion of register as 'a variety according to the use', as 'what you are speaking (at the time), determined by what you are doing' (Halliday, 1978: 35). Thus James points to features of English as a *lingua franca* which closely fit the description of the characteristics of register with the principal controlling variables of *field* as type of interaction, *tenor* as role relationships, and *mode* the symbolic organisation. Controlled by these three variables, English as a *lingua franca* is a form of language which is characterised by the nature of the social activity, has a restricted special-purpose function, is semantically flexible and diverse, and shows typical features of spoken varieties of English (James, 2000: 33).

Higher degree of informality

The frequently quoted presence of spoken as opposed to written linguistic features in the emerging variety of English as a *lingua franca* may not only owe its origin to the mix of spoken and written styles used in electronic communication, as mentioned earlier, but may also be related to a more general move towards a higher degree of informality now prevalent in social intercourse. In Europe, the social and political upheaval of the 1960s and 1970s left its mark in changes in the mode of address in many European languages (see, for instance, Paulston, 1976 for a discussion of the so-called 'du' revolution in Swedish). The trend in some European languages towards increased use in writing of a more informal approach characteristic of spoken language is further reinforced by a growing American tendency for an overall more personal, less edited style of writing (Baron, 2003: 88-9).

In the USA, the years following the Vietnam era saw composition writing programmes switch their orientation from an emphasis on 'product' to 'process', to the more subjective 'I think', in preference to 'it may be argued'. Often taught as a form of conversational social interaction, now manifested in the marked speech-like character of much of contemporary American writing, these developments, deriving from transformations in American education, also owe their origin to social trends in the USA and the decline in concern about 'public face' (see

Baron, 2003: 89). For the last half century, American social preferences have changed to endorse a more casual style of behaviour whereby Americans no longer 'feel as driven as [they] once did to monitor what others see of [them]' (Baron, 2003: 92). This change in approach must, at least in some measure, be linked to the use of e-mail, a medium that demands less attention to the requirements of how we see each other.

These changes in American attitudes stem from a number of interacting factors: a reduced emphasis on established social stratification and on overt attention to upward mobility, a weakening of the link between education and rapid financial success made possible by information technology (IT) entrepreneurship, and a strong emphasis on youth culture. Steeped in the popular music, fashion and films promoted by the US entertainment industry since World War II, they have not failed to leave their marks on the everyday life and language of Europeans.

Pragmalinguistics

Although citizens of an immigrant country, Americans nevertheless belong to one and the same nation, while Europeans using English as a *lingua franca* are rooted in different cultural backgrounds, with their own traditions and notions of what constitutes their national understanding of 'public face'. As a result, when they function as participants in interactions in cross-national communication which requires the use of English as a *lingua franca*, other factors will come into play. Unless speakers are aware of cultural differences inherent in the use of language, wrong impressions can easily be formed, in the worst case leading to misunderstandings or national stereotyping. The aspect of linguistic competence lacking in such cases is pragmatic competence, which helps us to use language appropriately in different contexts. While 'pragmalinguistic' knowledge relates to the knowledge speakers have about how a particular language formulates speech acts such as requests, apologies and complaints, 'sociopragmatic' knowledge refers to the norms of a particular language for expressing politeness or for what constitutes suitable topics of conversation. Understanding these cross-cultural differences requires experience of other cultures which entails knowledge of other languages, yet another argument in favour of mother tongue English speakers studying other languages in spite of the present status of English as a global language. Thus the final chapter of this volume concludes with a contribution from Anne Ife on the linguistic dimension of intercultural communication under the title of 'Intercultural Dialogue: The Challenge of Communicating Across Language Boundaries'.

Conclusion

As membership of the EU grows to include more nation states, the use of English as the language in which Europeans can communicate cross-nationally is going to increase. Contributions to this volume seem to indicate that this development may be for better *and* for worse. In 'World English. A blessing or a curse?', Tom McArthur metaphorically draws on the polar opposites of yin and yang in order to describe the present situation:

Like many things, English is at times a blessing and at times a curse – for individuals, for communities, for nations, and even for unions of nations. The East Asian symbol of yin and yang might serve well here. Although they are opposites, they belong together, in this instance within the circle of communication. Such symbolism suggests that the users of the world's *lingua franca* should seek to benefit and as far as possible avoid invoking the curse. (McArthur, 2001: 61).

This, of course, leaves open the question of what constitutes a blessing and what a curse. We conclude, in full agreement with an equally tantalising statement, this time from David Crystal (1997: 114):

In 500 years' time, will it be the case that everyone will automatically be introduced to English as soon as they are born (or, by then, very likely, as soon as they are conceived)? If this is part of a rich multilingual experience for our future newborns, this can only be a good thing. If it is by then the only language left to be learned, it will have been the greatest intellectual disaster that the planet has ever known.

Notes

1. Discussed in 'They're talking our language' by Robert McCrum in the *Observer*, Sunday 18 March 2001. Also in Pennycook, A. (1994) *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*, p. 1. London: Longman
2. Figures made available in a personal communication from David Crystal, December 2003.
3. Why Study Languages . . . When Everyone Speaks English? CD-ROM produced by the Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, University of Southampton, UK.
4. A-language is normally defined as the mother tongue or the language of education (see Snell-Hornby, 2000: 36).
5. See, for instance Simens Nixdorf's *Empfehlungen für Fachtexte: Verständlich und unterstützungsfreundlich schreiben*, produced by the SprachenDienst und Redaktionen, 1993; European Commission Translation Service 'How to write clearly' n.d.

References

- Anderman, G.M. (1974) The Teaching of English within the Comprehensive School System in Sweden. *English Language Teaching Journal* Vol. XXVII (2), 150–9.
- Anderman, G.M. (1987) The use of style and grammar in the work of advanced students of English. In I. Lindblad and M. Ljung (eds) *Proceedings from the Third Nordic Conference for English Studies*. Håsselby, 25–27 September, 1986. Vol. 1. (pp. 21–9). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Barber, B. (1992) Jihad vs McWorld. *The Atlantic Monthly* 3, 53–63.
- Baron, N.S. (2000) *Alphabet to Email: How Written English Evolves and Where It's Heading*. London: Routledge.
- Baron, N.S. (2003) Why email looks like speech: proof-reading, pedagogy and public face. In J. Aitchison, and D.M. Lewis (eds) *New Media Language* (pp. 85–94) London & New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, S. (1998) *Translation into the Second Language*. London & New York: Longman.
- Collot, M. and Belmore, N. (1996) Electronic Language: a new variety of English. In S. Herring (ed.) *Computer Mediated Communication: Social and Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (pp. 13–28) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Crystal, D. (1995) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, Alan (2003) *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Duff, Alan (1981) *The Third Language. Recurrent problems of translation into English*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Even Zohar, I. (1978 revised 1990) The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In L. Venuti (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 192–7) London: Routledge.
- Göpferich, Susanne (2002) *Textproduktion im Zeitalter der Globalisierung. Entwicklung einer Didaktik des Wissenstransfers*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Görlach, M. (1988) English as a World Language – the state of the art. *English World-Wide* 9/1, 1–32.
- Görlach, M. (2002) *English in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graddol, D. (1997) *The Future of English?* London: British Council.
- Graddol, D. (1999) The decline of the native speaker. In D. Graddol and U. Meinhof (eds) *English in a Changing World. AILA Review* 13 (57–68). Also in G. Anderman and M. Rogers (eds) (2003) *Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives* (pp. 152–67) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Greenbaum, S. (1989) Why should guidance be left to amateurs? *English Today* 5, 9–10.
- Halliday, M.K. (1978) *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hoffman, C. (2002) The spread of English and the growth of multilingualism in Europe. In J. Cenoz and U. Jessner (eds) *English in Europe. The Acquisition of a Third Language* (pp. 1–29) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hutton, W. (2003) *The World We're In*. London: Little Brown.
- James, A.R. (2000) English as a European *Lingua franca*: Current realities and existing dichotomies. In J. Cenoz and U. Jessner (eds) *English in Europe. The Acquisition of a Third Language* (pp. 22–38) Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Janson, R. (2000) *SPEAK, a short history of languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Jenkins, J. (2003) *World Englishes. A resource book for students*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Johansson, S. and Graedler, A. (2002) *Rocka, Hipt og Snacksy. Om engelsk i norsk språk og samfunn*. Norway: Norwegian Academic Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1985) Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (eds) *English in the World* (pp. 11–30) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. (1972a) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Labov, W. (1972b) *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mackenzie, R. (1998) The place of language teaching in a quality assured translators training programme. In K. Malmkjær (ed.) *Translation and Language Teaching. Language Teaching and Translation* (pp. 15–19) Manchester: St Jerome.
- Malmkjær, K. (1998) Introduction: Translation and Language Teaching. In K. Malmkjær (ed.) *Translation and Language Teaching. Language Teaching and Translation*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- McArthur, T. (1992) *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McArthur, T. (2001) English Today. Discussed in *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paulston, C.B. (1976) Pronouns of address in Swedish: social class, semantics and a changing system. *Language in Society* 5, 359–86.
- Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2003) *English – Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. and Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1999) Englishisation: one dimension of globalisation. In D. Graddol and U. Meinhof (eds) *English in a Changing World. ALA Review* 13 (pp. 19–36) Oxford: English Book Centre.
- Rogers, M. (2000) Translation. In Michael Byram (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 635–8) London & New York: Routledge.
- Russ, Charles V.J. (1994) *The German Language Today*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Seidhofer, Barbara (2002) Habeus corpus and divide et impera: 'Global English' and applied linguistics. In K. Spelman-Miller and P. Thompson (eds) *Unity and Diversity in Language Use* (pp. 198–217) London: BAAL/Continuum.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1999) Communicating in the Global Village: on language, translation and global identity. In C. Schäffner (ed.) *Current Issues in Society*, Vol. 6(2), 103–19.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2000) 'McLanguage': The identity of English as an issue in translation today. In M. Grosman, M. Kadric, I. Kovacic, M. Snell-Hornby (eds) *Translation into Non-Mother Tongues. In Professional Practice and Training* (pp. 35–44) Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- The Observer (2003) Languages to bear brunt in schools crisis. 31 August 2003 (byline: Mark Townsend).
- Trudgill, P. (1974) *Social Differentiation in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Venuiti, L. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility*. London: Routledge.
- Walker, M. (1997) *Guardian Weekly* 12 January 1997.
- Yates, S.J. (1996) Oral and written linguistic aspects of computer conferencing. In S. Herring (ed.) *Computer Mediated Communication: Linguistic, Social and Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chapter 2

English Translation and Linguistic Hegemony in the Global Era

STUART CAMPBELL

The Illusion of Language Parity

The professional translation enterprise has largely ignored the most significant linguistic phenomenon of the last hundred years – the spread of English in the world. What there has been no lack of discussion about English in other Sociolinguistics and Post-Colonial Studies; yet much of the enterprise – and by this I mean the complex of theorists, practitioners – treats English as just another language. It sees at the centres of power in the professional translation enterprise an illusion that English is just one of a set of replaceable value, a notion symbolised by the idea of the translation position of two language names separated by a bland color implicit message of parity, masks the history of the global one language.

I was tempted to entitle this paper *The Empire Translates* and think that the root of the problem is a denial that English is property of native speakers. But there are other subtler kinds besides the traditional sense – linguistic empires within dev cultural states, the empire of the English teaching industry, rial enterprise of the aid industry. All of these contexts questions about English for the translation enterprise.

The role of English in the world has been extensively sociolinguists and post-colonial theorists. Researchers in both recognise that English is not a value-neutral code, but the leads to imbalance in a great range of human endeavour: discipline of post-colonial literary studies is virtually defined in terms of the role of English, and a rich and complex debate on the way in which the space occupied by writing in English is between the centre and the periphery. Gaurav Desai offers a metaphor for this debate in an account of the way that the geography of the Modern Language Association gradually 'acc