

# 「英語 = 世界語」 ディスコースはどのように造られたか?

— 「常識的」 ディスコースの欺瞞をあばく —

溝 上 由 紀

How Has the 'English as *the* World Language' Discourse Been Constructed?

— Revealing the Deceptions of the 'Common-sense' Discourse —

Mizokami Yuki

## 1. INTRODUCTION: THEORETICAL GROUNDS

As I have argued elsewhere<sup>1</sup>, language is never a neutral tool for communication. Far from that, language is a social practice inevitably bound up with ideology and power. Being literate means to become apprenticed to think and interpret certain things in certain common ways, unconsciously internalising certain sets of ideologies embedded in language. Then it can be said that language, especially 'Discourse', plays a key role in creating our perception and thoughts.

The word 'discourse' generally refers to what is spoken and written. Meanwhile, the notion of 'Discourse' (with capital 'D') which Gee (1996) proposes denotes far broader: 'Discourse' is a countable term referring to 'saying-writing-doing-valuing-believing' combination. An individual becomes a member of certain Discourses. All of them speak, think, act, and interpret the world within Discourses to which they belong. Any Discourse carries certain concepts, viewpoints and values at the expense of others. That is to say, a Discourse essentially marginalises viewpoints of other Discourses<sup>2</sup>.

In our society, there are discourses which are articulated once and just fade away on the one hand. On the other, there are discourses that are for some reason conserved and that then formulate the basis of other numerous related discourses, that is, the discourses which are told, and kept being told over and over again (Foucault, 1970). We may designate the latter discourses as 'common-sense' Discourses, or dominant Discourses. Common-sense is usually produced by the utterances enunciated by members of dominant Discourses such as academics, politicians and mass media, and then by repeatedly being told or written, these statements consequently become cemented and dominant in society as 'what is obvious' or

‘what everyone takes for granted’.

At this point, we must acknowledge that every common-sense Discourse essentially contains dominant ideology. Ideology is a social theory which naturalises and justifies the ways in which social goods are distributed in society<sup>3</sup>. For instance, the common-sense Discourse that the English language spoken by British white middle-class people is the authentic norm, functions as the ideology which facilitates people to ‘naturally’ evaluate that other varieties such as BVE (Black Vernacular English) and Indian English as mere worthless deviations. Common-sense Discourses, which usually embody the ideology of mainstreamers in society, thus work to force non-mainstreamers to unconsciously follow dominant value judgments; and thereby to their advantage, mainstreamers maintain the hegemony, or legitimise existing social relations and power differences. As a result, many people cannot help assuming without any doubt, for example, that women are naturally inferior, that the white race is superior to all others, that English is the best language in the world, and the like. Common-sense Discourses fix and justify the existing dominant/dominated relationships and discriminating/discriminated relationships in society. The exploited people are thus induced to consent to the conditions of their own subordination.

It has confirmed that common-sense is formulated through tolerating Discourses. The problem of common-sense Discourses is that they indeed function as a system which pull up our deeper contemplations and perceptions in society by making things seem natural, common and taken-for-granted. The individuals may appear to be thinking and acting subjectively, however in fact they only tend to think and act within the limit imposed upon by common-sense Discourses. Common-sense Discourses as a thought-regulating system might be necessary for individuals to live everyday life ‘efficiently’ (Yamada & Yoshii, 1991). Yet we must consider the questions such as: For whom the seemingly neutral, universal and common knowledge exists? Who has been excluded and suppressed under the name of ‘common-sense’? The fact is that while people unconsciously, uncritically and unreflectively live within dominant common-sense Discourses, they are essentially harming members of other Discourses.

Of all the common-sense Discourses, the Discourse this paper intends to probe into scrutiny is the prevalent ‘English as *the* world language’ Discourse of which its members articulate such as the followings:

**“[English] ought to have the first claim to becoming the language of the world, or, at least, the basis upon which the universal language of the future is to develop (Knoflech, 1890, 17).”**

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

**“It is a commonplace that English has become a lingua franca. . . In virtually every country in the world foreigners are learning English to enable them to speak across frontiers in a language most likely to be understood by others (Burchfield, 1985, 168-9).”**

**“ . . . all the signs suggest that this global language will be English (Crystal, 1997, 23).”**

There is a point to be checked. In this sort of Discourse, some call English ‘a world language’, others name it as ‘a universal language’. Also the language is sometimes referred to as ‘an international language’, ‘a lingua franca’, ‘a global language’ or ‘a common language’, all of which are the expressions implying glories of English and devaluing other languages. To be strict, each term should have a different meaning. For example, Nakamura (1989) points out that whereas the sentence; “English is used as a common language between the people in the Philippines and those in Japan.” makes perfect sense, the sentence; “English is used as a universal language between the people in the Philippines and those in Japan.” is nonsense. A common language implies the language which is shared by two or more people. In this sense, ‘a common language’ is a neutral expression carrying no value judgment. A universal language, on the other hand, is a loaded expression: It suggests the language which is used by everyone throughout the world. English is not actually spoken by everybody everywhere, so it can hardly be called a universal language. The argument that ‘English is a universal language’, then, can be said to be a rhetorical expression embodying the ideology of the English-speakers, which is the ideology to make people believe English superiority. The thing is that, however differently the English language is called in various discussions such as cited above, it constantly seems to imply the meaning of ‘a universal language’. It is actually problematic to mix up all the different expressions without any sensitivity. However, in the process of the following scrutiny for diverse arguments about English, we shall turn our eyes from the above problem, and for convenience of our discussion we will deal with all these sorts of arguments as the ‘English as the world language’ Discourse altogether.

The ‘English as the world language’ Discourse which, “necessarily represents a constant advocacy for a particular way of life, a particular understanding of the world (Pennycook, 1994, 178)”, has penetrated all over the world so deeply that many people cannot even recognise the problems behind English linguistic imperialism:

**“Linguistic imperialism has a subtle way of warping the minds, attitudes, and**

**aspirations of even the most noble in a society, and of preventing him from appreciating and realizing the full potentialities of the indigenous languages (Ansre, 1979, 13)."**

English linguistic imperialism is one example of 'linguicism' which;

**"is defined as ideologies, structures, and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language (Phillipson, 1992, 47)."**

The promise of English, Phillipson argues, is increasingly identified with a community of English users who are economically privileged in a world of inequalities and exploitation. This privilege is attributed to the structural favouring of English, nationally and internationally. 'English as the world language' Discourse as 'common-sense' now works as a system of excluding and discriminating against other languages and speakers of those languages as politically, economically, socially and culturally worthless. If this is the case, speakers of Japanese for example, are at an immense disadvantage in the global world. Yet many people, both English-speakers and non-English-speakers, do not or cannot even imagine such a problem, since they are trapped within the common-sense Discourse.

Here it is necessary to think about who is actually a member of the common-sensical 'English as the world language' Discourse. Nakamura (1998) divides speakers of English in the following three categories. The first group refers to the native speakers of English, mainly Anglo-Saxons, in such countries as Britain, the U.S., Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Phillipson (1992) calls this group as 'core English-speaking countries'. The second group refers to the people in former British colonies in Asia and Africa. In such countries as India and Nigeria, English was imposed in colonial times, and it has been successfully transplanted and still serves a range of intranational purposes. The third group refers to the people such as in Japan, Korea, China, Germany and France who learn English as a foreign language. Phillipson categorises the second and the third group as 'periphery-English countries' altogether in the sense that they generally attempt to follow the linguistic norms of the first group, or core English-speaking countries.

As Nakamura (1998) argues, the instigators of the 'English as the world language' Discourse are definitely those in the first group, the Anglo-Saxons. People who are in the non-English-speaking countries still accept or have been led to accept English as the world language

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

uncritically are the followers and thereby members of the 'English as the world language' Discourse. We will be looking mainly at what the Anglo-Saxons have articulated about the English language in history, although we sometimes refer to the arguments of people in periphery-English countries. The aim of this paper is to demonstrate how the 'English as the world language' Discourse has been constructed in history by revealing the ideological, historical, political, social and cultural backgrounds behind it. By doing that, we believe we can also reveal how the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons, which embodies Anglo-Saxons' linguistic ideology, has made use of their native tongue.

Discourses are related to power and ideologies. Dominant 'English as the world language' Discourse cannot be divorced from the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of British success in conquest, colonialism and trade, and the emergence of America as the world's major military power and technological leader after the Second World War. When a Discourse exerts its power, there are three phases: force, carrots and ideas. Concerning the English linguistic imperialism, at the first stage, the imperial power uses coercion ('force') when imposing their language, English. When brute force could no longer be applied or is no longer ethically acceptable, then 'carrots' become more suitable. Carrots make the colonised people see the benefits of English and the deficiencies of their language. Then the last phase, which is the ideal situation for the colonisers, is to make the colonised people want English themselves and to make them blindly believe that it is good for them. To maintain the hegemony, what people in power ought to do is to constantly reassert the supremacy of their language. This is the very mechanism of regulating the 'ideas' of the colonised (Phillipson, 1992). The Discourse of Anglo-Saxons has splendidly completed these phases and it seems to be succeeding in perpetuating linguistic hegemony by asserting and reasserting the statements to praise English. Now let us examine the mechanism of how the common-sense Discourse is created.

## 2. ALLEGED 'FACTS' ABOUT ENGLISH

***"The Triumph of the English Language" (Jones, 1953)***

***"English as a World Language" (Bailey & Gorfach, 1982)***

***"English as a Global Language" (Crystal, 1997)***

The above are the titles of the books about English published in recent years. Just a brief look at these titles implies that, for many people in the world, whether the English language is a world language or not may be no longer an issue. They would confidently claim that

English has already become the world language and that the view is just common-sensical unquestioned fact. For example, it is reported in a 1995 survey that of nearly 1,400 people who engage in English language teaching in some ninety countries, 96 percent strongly agreed or agreed that 'English will remain the world's language for international communication for the next twenty-five years' (Crystal, 1997).

However in the Middle Ages, for instance, English was just a barbarous vernacular<sup>4</sup> whereas Latin flowered as the language of education, or that of prestige. In the eighteenth century, not many people would boldly assert that any language other than French would become a future world language. Crystal (ibid.) modestly argues that even in 1950, the notion of English as a true world language was merely an obscure theoretical possibility. Why then, do people now seemingly have come to take for granted that English is the world language?

Let us look at a variety of recent arguments about English usage which are often cited to support the notion of English as the world language. The following sorts of discussions are supposedly based on objective facts. That suggests that there is no room for doubt; nonetheless they are not free from ideologies of the Anglo-Saxon's. With reference to the number of English-speaking population: According to a conservative estimate, the total figure of those who have acquired English as a first language is 337 million. The total of 235 million represents an estimate of those who have learned English as a second language. A further 100 million use the language fluently as a foreign language. In this way we end up with a grand total of 670 million people with a native or native-like command of the language. A more radical estimate, which uses a criterion of moderate competence rather than native-like fluency, suggests that an overall total of English-speaking population in the world is 1,800 million. As there is no single source of statistical information on language speaking population, such variations arise. We can never grasp the exact number, nevertheless the estimate we most commonly encounter nowadays is the total of 1,200 - 1,500 million, which occupies 20 -25 percent of the world population<sup>5</sup>.

Here it may be interesting to mention that in the late nineteenth century various enthusiasts speculated about the English linguistic future. For example, Axon (1888, qtd. in Bailey, 1991) speculated that there would be 1,000 million mother-tongue speakers of English by 1980. Pitman (1837 qtd. in Crystal, 1997) boldly estimated that English would be spoken by over 1,837 million as a mother-tongue in the year 2000. Such predictions have been proven dramatically wrong, however these optimistic speculations flourished as satisfying to the anglophone community which at the time enjoyed the empire-building and industrial supremacy.

Turning to the claims on English in recent years again, it is also commonly stated that no

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

other tongue has ever spread around the world so extensively: English is used as an official or semi-official language in over 60 countries, and has a crucial status in further 20 countries (Crystal, 1987). This means that the English language is dominant or well-established in almost half of the countries in all six continents in the globe.

Another ubiquitously expressed claims about facts are the following sort:

**“It [English] is the main language of books, newspapers, airports and air-traffic control, international business and academic conferences, science, technology, medicine, diplomacy, sports, international competitions, pop music, and advertising. Over two-thirds of the world’s scientists write in English. Three-quarters of the world’s mail is written in English. Of all the information in the world’s electronic retrieval systems, 80 percent is stored in English. English radio programmes are received by over 150 million in 120 countries. Over 50 million children study English as an additional language at primary level; over 80 million study it at secondary level ( these figures exclude China) (ibid., 358).”**

The list continues. English-written publications are issued in over 60 countries: Each year Britain publishes the most books in terms of quantity (Graddol, 1999). The six member nations of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) conduct all their business in English, even though any one of them is not an English-speaking country (Bryson, 1990), and on and on.

Such enumerations seem to reinforce the idea that English is in fact the world language, since these figures are thought to be based on the objective truth. However, if we analyse these arguments from a different perspective, we can gain separate pictures of the English language. Regarding the numbers of the English-speaking population, supposing if it is 1,500 million in total, the rest of 4,500 million of the world population, which is actually 75 percent of the people in the globe, do not use the language. In terms of the number of countries, English in fact is barely used in over half of the nations of the world. Although people might have been led to believe that English is used by all the people in all the countries through the dominant Discourse of Anglo-Saxons, the reality is that it is employed by *only* 25 percent of people in *only* half of the countries in the world<sup>6</sup>. In the same vein, even though it may be true that over two-thirds of the world’s scientists articulate their ideas in English, this feature is limited to the scientific fields. This does not necessarily mean that all the academics in the globe write their paper in English. Statistics concerning research papers in literature or history, for instance, are never heard.

One phenomenon can be interpreted differently depending on the perspective one takes.

Indeed there is no absolute 'fact' or 'truth': What we have is 'realities' constructed through various perspectives (Ueno, 1998), although usually one version of reality becomes dominant and thereby others become neglected in society. Needless to say, the commonly circulated ideas about the English usage are constructed and articulated for convenience of the Anglo-Saxon countries. The dominant Discourse thus distracts our thoughts: in this way people are unknowingly and mistakenly directed to regard that English is the universally relevant language. We must become aware that even the things called 'facts' are not always independent of the particular ideologies.

Although Chinese and Arabic are reported to be used by 1,200 million and 800 million respectively (Nakamura, 1989), they are hardly called as a world language. By contrast English, which is just one of the 6,500 languages in the globe and has a population of 1,200 - 1,500 million, is most commonly regarded as the world language. We will see why one language gains a power has little to do with the number of people who speak it. Rather it is a question of WHO is the speaker of that language. We shall explore how people are led to believe that English is the world language by looking at Anglo-Saxon's Discourse about English historically.

### 3. JUST A VERNACULAR

**“For as I to fore haue sayd  
I am but a yong mayd  
And cannot in effect  
My stile as yet direct  
With englyshe wordes elect  
Our natural tonge is rude  
And hard to be ennuede  
With pollysshed tearmes lustye  
Oure language is so rustye  
So cankered and so ful  
Of frowardes and so dul  
That if I wold apply  
To write ornatly  
I wot not where to finde  
Termes to serue my mynde. (Skelton, 1545?, in Jones, 1953, 11)”**

The above poem is regarded to have been composed in the first decade of the sixteenth century.

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

In this poem, Skelton complains that English is “rude”, “rustye” (=rusty), “dul” (=dull), lacking in the “pollysshed” (=polished) and “ennuede” (=civilised) expressions so that he can never write “ornatly” (=ornately). This was a typical Anglo-Saxon’s view about English in the fifteenth and sixteenth century when ‘eloquence’ was thought of as the most important linguistic virtue: The negative adjectives most commonly used to describe the English language in this period were “rude, gross, barbarous, base, vile (Jones, 1953, 7)” which all meant ‘uneloquent’. Even people considering English as “plain, serviceable, honest and adorn (ibid., 19)” reckoned their language uneloquent. Besides uneloquence, the Elizabethans condemned the spelling of their language as “inept, maimed, detestable, uncertain, inconsistent, unstable, and stupid (ibid., 146)”, since the English words were not read and pronounced literally and fully as they were written.

It is thus incorrect to suppose that the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons about English were quite the same in the old days. English had been treated as the inadequate and second-rate tongue of peasants for centuries (Bryson, 1990) since the Anglo-Saxons landed in Britain about A.D. 450 following the withdrawal of Roman troops from the Isles. Now it is intriguing to ponder how differently the historical event would be sketched by members belonging to different Discourses. Bryson, a U.S. born journalist who is a member of the Anglo-Saxon Discourse, describes the Anglo-Saxon migration as, “not so much an invasion as a series of opportunistic encroachments taking place over several generations”, and the tribes “settled in” Britain (ibid., 39). By contrast, Nakamura, a Japanese professor in sociology of English, asserts that Anglo-Saxons arrived in a defenseless Britain and invaded the Celtic land (Nakamura, 1989). Either way, this new nation gradually became to be known as England and its language as English after the Angles. Overall, as many researchers’ point out, Anglo-Saxons could gain no confidence in their language, English, until around the late sixteenth century. In the meantime, Latin had retained its prestigious position as the language of religion, education and literary work up to around the seventeenth century. The Elizabethan English people felt the inferiority complex to Latin which was the only language having an established grammar and orthodoxy, and also having a rich variety of vocabulary and apt phrases. Latin was then considered to be the most eloquent language, eloquence being the stylistic ideal of this period. Latin was also accepted as the linguistic standard, and its excellence was widely recognised:

**“But aboue all how necessary the knowledge of the Latine tongue is to any of vs, that either desire to be entred into other bordering tongues, or to serch the depth of any Science, or the assurance of our saluation through the true vnderstanding of holy scripture, is so commonly knowne, and so generally agreed on, that happie**

**seemes he that may attaine thereto, or procure and leaue it to his child as a sufficient heritage (Waddington, 1575, in Jones, 1953, 24)."**

Waddington asserted that for accurate understanding of science, religion and the like Latin was essential, and that it was fortunate to have a knowledge of it and passed it to the descendant. Interestingly, this argument is almost identical with the recent Anglo-Saxon's Discourse about the English language.

Before the end of the sixteenth century, there was little English used abroad. Consequently, until that time, the notion that English would become a world language would have been regarded as absurd (Bailey, 1991). Certainly Britain had no colonies, and it was assumed that the English language would inevitably be confined to the British Isles. Even patriot Mulcaster (1582) avowed: "It [English] is of small reach, stretcheth no further then this island of ours, naie not there ouer all (271)." England was a mere peripheral minor country in the world history up around this period, hence the English language also was depreciated not only in comparison with classical languages such as Latin and Greek, but also in connection with other modern languages such as French and Italian (Jones, 1953). Ascham (1570), for example stated that, "the Italien tonge, which next the Greeke and Latin tonge, I like and loue aboue all other (23)."

However, while Anglo-Saxons lamented the deficiencies of their own language, they increased the severity of official actions against other languages of British Isles. English people were in the process of conquering the whole of the British Isles: By the sixteenth century, Anglo-Saxons already conquered Wales, considerably anglicised Scotland, and also they were stretching to Ireland. To be precise, England was in the middle of expanding to establish a powerful nation. Yet the English language had hardly conquered the whole of British Isles. As Bryson (1990) points out, it became the language of England and lowland Scotland by that time, but it had barely penetrated into Wales, Ireland, and the Scottish Highlands and islands. In order to spread English, England began by concluding treaties with Wales, the Acts of Union in 1536 and 1542, by which Welsh speakers were compelled to use English in law courts and no Welsh speakers were admitted to have any official jobs in England, Wales and other English dominions without the command of English.

**" . . . from henthforth no personne or personnes that use the Welshe speche or language shall have or enjoy any maner office or fees within this realme or Englonde, Wales, or other Kinges dominions . . . onles he or they use and exercise the English speche or language of Englisse (1536 Act, in Nakamura, 1989, 54)".**

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

This means that English was appointed as an official language in Wales. A change in the wording may be that the socially superior linguistic status was given to English whereas the Welsh language was legally given the inferior (second-class) linguistic status. It is reported that when the Act of Union was enforced in 1536, only five percent of the Welsh population had a command of English, and that as a result all administrative and judicial roles, which were leading roles in the society, were entrusted to those five percent.

Anglo-Saxons drastically discriminated against and contempered other languages in the British Isles. In process of anglicising Wales, Scotland and Ireland<sup>8</sup>, Anglo-Saxons labeled the language in these countries as “local jargon, uncivilised, barbarous, sinister (Nakamura, 1989, 35)”. A historical irony is that, as we have seen, these terms are exactly identical with the ones Anglo-Saxon people used to describe their own language in the same period. In short, before the end of the sixteenth century, Anglo-Saxons in England suffered from the inferiority complex to classical languages and European languages externally, yet at the same time they felt superiority over Celtic people and languages inside Britain (ibid.). Such ambivalent attitude may be universal to all human beings as Japanese are sometimes reported to feel inferiority to English language and Anglo-Saxons whereas feeling superiority to Asian languages and people.

#### 4. EMERGENT CONFIDENCE

**“I loue Rome, but London better, I fauor Italie, but England more, I honor the Latin, but I worship the English (Mulcaster, 1582, 269)”.**

Things gradually changed: By the end of the sixteenth century, England, although far behind, made its way into overseas markets, and gained the industrial power equal to other European countries. It is reported that around 1585, cannons made in England became the very popular commodity among European countries (Nakamura, 1989).

Along with social and economic changes, images of English were significantly altered. That is to say, the emerging celebration of English supported by national self-confidence was brought to maturity. It was Mulcaster, an educator as well as a classical scholar who most patriotically proclaimed confidence in the eloquential potentialities of English and asserted its independence of the classical languages as quoted above. Mulcaster lamented the current situation in which Latin was more appreciated than English, simply because the former was studied and the latter ignored. In his book known as *The First Part of Elementarie* (1582), which was intended as a complete curriculum for a vernacular system of education in England,

he insisted the excellence and eloquence of his language to urge its widest use:

**“I do not think that anie language, be it whatsoeuer, is better able to vtter all arguments, either with more pith, or greater planesse, then our English tung is, if the English vtterer be as skilfull in the matter, which he is to vtter: as the foren vtterer is (Mulcaster, 1582, 274).”**

Mulcaster was one of the earliest of those expressed respect and love of the English language. Such linguistic confidence has been unceasingly shared by members of the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons in the succeeding centuries.

Indeed it seems so quick and sudden that the images of English transformed from the rude and uneloquent vernacular into an eloquent and copious language within the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons. Jones (1953) presumes the turning point is not earlier than 1575 nor later than 1580. As for the reason of this change in the attitude, he speculates that it was the Elizabethan poets and writers such as Spencer and Sidney who were responsible for the drastic transformation. He argues that we are not told how they refined the language but their compositions achieved the end by merely revealing the rhetorical potentialities of their medium. Nakamura (1989), on the other hand, points out that the time when England gained confidence in its national power by moving into an industrial society coincides with the time when English people suddenly started praising their own language. Then it can be concluded that the value of a language spoken by people in a country is very much connected with economic and social power of the country. As Anglo-Saxons instantly discarded the inferiority complex, both linguistically and nationally, they began to declare that their language was at least as good as any other, if not better. Camden, for example, remarked:

**“So that our tong is (and I doubt not but hath beene) as copious, pithie, and significative, as any other tongue in Europe. . . I thinke that our English tongue is (I will not say as sacred as the Hebrew, or as learned as the Greeke), but as fluent as the Latine, as courteous as the Spanish, as courtlike as the French, and as amorous as the Italian . . . (Camden, 1605, 29-30)”**

He continued that the affection of foreign languages by admiring, praising and studying them in the previous centuries had distracted the dignity of the English language. We can see that even a Discourse which is dominant at one point in history can be subverted with

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

time and situation as thus.

While admiration rather than depreciation of the English language became suddenly dominant in the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons, the members of the Discourse successfully took in the ideology which could work to endorse their linguistic confidence. It was the 'Teutonic mania' ideology behind the sudden shift of the perception of the English language: It was the idea that flowered in the speculation about English and its origins in the seventeenth century England. It originated as the admiration of the German race and language in the continent and subsequently echoed in England. The 'Teutonic mania' ideology claims the antiquity and therefore the superiority of the Teutonic (=Germanic) language: It asserts that early Germans, not being at the tower, did not assist in building the Tower of Babel. Thus they continued to speak the same language as before to modern times(=the seventeenth century). In fact, it was regarded as the most ancient language of the world which Adam spoke in paradise and in which the Old Testament was first written. The grounds for this argument was that the first language must have been the most perfect, and since German is superior to all other languages, it must have been the first (Jones, 1953).

This view is just a nonsense, but it is reported to have achieved considerable popularity, and it could be said to be still existent today in the sense that the notion of Aryan superiority was founded on this ideology. In the same vein, it was asserted in England that English people and the English language were derived from the Saxons, the noblest of Teutonic peoples, therefore the superiority of their race and language should be divinely ordained. Scholars such as Verstegan, as a result of his enthusiasm for the Germanic origin of English, upheld the superiority of the Germanic race on the ground that they were never subdued by the Romans, and that they could keep their race and language uncontaminated by others (Bailey, 1992). In this way the antiquity of the English language and people, by virtue of its Germanic inheritance, became a strong basis of claiming their superiority from the seventeenth century onwards.

In the same period, people began to question the common-sense assumption that Latin was the only appropriate vehicle for expression, a concern they shared with Mulcaster. Going to school had meant learning Latin, however English people began to doubt such educational absurdity as the celebration of English emerged:

**“I have often observed how children have been puzzled and confounded, by being set to the construing, parsing, and making of Latin, before they had the least knowledge of the Mother Tongue (Poole, 1646, in Howatt, 1984, 107).”**

Learning Latin suddenly became 'no use' and 'almost lost labour', whereas English with the value of 'utility' and 'usefulness' rose, utility and usefulness being the value that dominated the seventeenth century as it does today (Jones, 1953).

The quotation below is from J. Webster's *Acemiarum Examen* (1653). Proposing the giving of all instruction in English rather than Latin in the educational domain, he argued the negative aspects tied in with the learning of foreign languages.

**“Their [the universities’] custome is no less worthy of reprehension that in all their exercises they make use of the Latine tongue, which though it have custome, and long continuance to plead its justification, and that it is used to bring youth to the ready exercise of it, being of general reception almost through the whole world: yet it is as cleerly answered, that custome without reason and benefit, becomes injurious, and though it make them ready in speaking the Latine, while they treat of such subjects as are usually handled in the Schools, yet are they less apt to speak it with facility in negotiations of far greater importance. And in the mean time, the way to attain knowledge is made more difficult, and the time more tedious, and so we almost become strangers to our own mother tongue, loving and liking forein languages, as we do their fashions, better than our own, so that while we improve theirs, our own lies altogether uncultivated, which doubtless would yield as plentiful an harvest as others, if we did as much labour to advance it. . . (Webster, 1653, in Jones, 1953, 307 - 308).”**

It can be inferred that the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons is well aware that worshipping and learning foreign languages which especially have a higher linguistic status always has a danger of mentally enslaving the given people: As Webster himself pointed out, people's love of foreign languages without convincing reasons would be a harm to their own language and culture yet be a benefit to the given foreign languages and cultures. His argument is appropriate even in today as scholars in periphery-English countries sometimes argue about the English linguistic imperialism from the same viewpoint<sup>9</sup>, although the linguistic position of the English language today is contrary to that in Webster's argument: We could say that the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons now utilises the reverse argument to Webster's point of view.

In the light of Webster's discussion, it will be necessary for the Japanese people to reconsider the appropriateness of presently prevalent arguments such as: 'Students should start learning English in primary schools'; and 'We should establish the English language as the second official language in Japan'<sup>10</sup>. We must become critical of these sorts of arguments lest we

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

should become 'strangers' to our own language, for they are articulated by the people who identify themselves with the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons. By blindly appreciating the commonly articulated ideology in English teaching that 'the earlier English is taught the better the results', for instance, we will be led to cooperating for maintenance of the higher linguistic status of English: This ideology would result in only creating more jobs for teachers of English and lessening the jobs of those specialised in other languages (Phillipson, 1992).

As the view of English as an eloquent, fluent and expressive language was firmly established, Anglo-Saxons became able to afford to pay attention to yet problematic aspects of English. The importance of establishing the standard grammatical principles for the language became an urgent issue. Wallis (1699), in his attempt to write the first grammar book of English which was not based on that of Latin, argued that only with the construction of the standard grammar, English could really be learned and understood not only by the English themselves but also foreigners. It is relevant to note here that the teaching of English outside Britain already began in the Netherlands and France before 1600, and moreover there was a growing demand for learning the language in other European countries among scholars and intellectuals attracted by the works of Shakespeare, Bacon, Locke and others (Howatt, 1984).

**“all kinds of literature are widely available in English editions, and, without boasting, it can be said that there is scarcely any worthwhile body of knowledge which has not been recorded today, adequately at least, in the English language (Wallis, 1699, 107).”**

While Anglo-Saxons became more and more proud of their language, they became concerned that their language must be regulated and stabilised. Grammatical regulation was considered to be essential if the language was to be freed from the arraignment of barbarism and allowed to take its place among the great languages of the world.

In due time, proposals for an academy were made in order to, “encourage Polite Learning, to polish and refine the English Tongue (Defoe, 1697, 93).” By the time Defoe's proposal appeared, Italian and French already established academies to look after the languages. Swift also deplored the corruption of English in his *Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue*:

**“our Language is extremely imperfect; that its daily Improvements are by no means in proportion to its daily Corruptions; that the Pretenders to polish and refine it, have chiefly multiplied Abuses and Absurdities; and in many Instances, it**

**offends against every Part of Grammar (1712, 107)."**

Swift proposed that the state establish an Academy to rectify and fix the English language. Such desire for linguistic improvement and standardisation continued to be voiced from time to time, although no major action was taken by any authority. Rather, since the eighteenth century, there has been an increasing flow of individual grammar resources and dictionaries (Crystal, 1987).

One of the most eminent attempts to fix the English language is the S. Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755). In the preface to his Dictionary, he lamented the current use of English as thus:

**"When I took the first survey of my undertaking, I found our speech copious without order, and energetick without rules: wherever I turned my view, there was perplexity to be disentangled, and confusion to be regulated; choice was to be made out of boundless variety, without any established principle of selection; adulterations were to be detected, without a settled test of purity; and modes of expression to be rejected or received, without the suffrages of any writers of classical reputation or acknowledged authority (1755, 4)."**

Howatt (1984) argues that Dr. Johnson established a model for dictionary-making: He was hardly able to 'fix' the language, rather he provided a fixed point of reference against which future change could be set and assessed. Johnson's dictionary is often referred to as "one of the greatest works of the language (Burchfield, 1985, 85)" within the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons. However, what we can clearly see in his famous dictionary is the racist ideology. A look at the familiar entry for the word 'oats'; "A grain, which in England is generally given to horses, but in Scotland supports the people (Johnson, 1755, 268)" could tell us how disdainful the confident English people were against people in other countries. It can be said that English dictionaries are one of the ideological apparatuses which work to transmit prejudices shared within the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons. Burchfield, a leading figure of the 'English as the world language' Discourse whom we shall deal with, naively argues that the prejudices which Dr. Johnson embodies are "reprehensible and delightful (86)". Such a deliberate innocence seems to have been justifying and perpetuating the Anglo-Saxons' unreasonable discrimination against other languages.

## 5. ENGLISH AND COLONIALISM

**“Black men -**

**We wish to make you happy. But you cannot be happy unless you imitate good white men. Build huts, wear clothes, work and be useful.**

**Above all you cannot be happy unless you love God who made heaven and earth and man and all things.**

**Love white men. Love other tribes of black men. Do not quarrel together. Tell other tribes to love white men, and to build good huts and wear clothes. Learn to speak English**

**(Queen Victoria, 1838, in Bailey, 1991, 85).”**

Britain's pioneering success in achieving the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century and its consequent prosperity as the center of the world economy in the following century were a sufficient condition to make the Victorian Anglo-Saxons regard themselves as leaders of the world. The above address was given by Queen Victoria towards an assemblage of Australian Aboriginals gathered to celebrate her birthday in 1838. What is clearly expressed in this speech is the notion of the 'civilising mission', or the 'white man's burden', which was the ideology dominated the Discourse of the Anglo-Saxons particularly in the Victorian era. The 'white man's burden' is the idea that white English people has an important mission to transplant their superior civilisation, religion, language, culture, institution etc. to the uncivilised and inferior savage people in non-European countries. The notion of 'civilising mission' and the image of barbarous non-European people are two sides of the same coin (Touda, 1996). Note that Queen Victoria called the white people 'man' yet the black people 'tribe'. It can be said that Anglo-Saxons see non-whites as something infra-human whereas they celebrate themselves as providentially superior people.

'English as the world language' Discourse has its origins in British colonialism. Britain's expansion overseas dates back to 1607 when an expedition arrived in Chesapeake Bay. This first permanent English settlement in America was called Jamestown and the area Virginia. Then in 1612, the British East India Company, which first came to India in 1600, established its first trading station at Surat. Thus the English language began to be spread to America, India and gradually to other areas such as Africa, Asia, and Oceania by oppressing the native people and languages. English became a weapon of British imperialism.

Generally the economic, political, military and ideological power possessed by those who speak a language makes the language become dominant in society. This does not mean the

language itself is linguistically superior to other languages. Nevertheless, those who speak the dominant language very often have an illusion that their language and culture are the absolute worthiest. In the colonial period, numerous mistaken arguments about the Anglo-Saxon's racial, cultural and linguistic superiority were propagated which inevitably reflected Anglo-Saxons' drastic discrimination against other races such as native Americans and Indians. Such imperialistic arguments became the ideology which justified slavery, exploitation and conquest in the colonial period.

**“I [Robinson Crusoe] was greatly delight with him [Friday], and made it my Business to teach him every Thing, that was proper to make him useful, handy and helpful; . . . [he was] so pleased, when he cou'd but understand me (Defoe, 1719, 210)”**

As alluded above, in the process of expanding the British Empire, condescending Anglo-Saxons taught English to the colonised rather than learning the indigenous language, considering that they were just doing the right thing as a civilising mission. In the following section, by focusing on how people and languages in India in particular are defined within the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons, we intend to reveal how unreasonably the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons has discriminated against other races and languages.

After the East India Company was instituted, the Company's influence grew in India, and in 1765 it even took over the revenue management of Bengal. During the period of British sovereignty, from 1765 until 1947 when India gained independence, English became the medium of administration and education throughout the country. It may sound surprising that the early policies of the Anglo-Saxons in India, which is often referred to as the 'Orientalist' ideology, encouraged the colonial officers and administrators to develop a better understanding of Indian political structure, language and culture in order to establish a sound basis for British rule and administration. For example, the College of Fort William was established in 1800, the aim of which was to educate East India Company officials in Indian languages, culture and legal systems (Pennycook, 1994). The British authorities were often very reluctant to provide education in English, arguing that education in English would divert the development of indigenous literature.

However, in the middle of the nineteenth century, there were important shifts in colonial policy. With the rapid industrial progress, earlier forms of colonialism started to be taken over by imperialism. Along with that, Britain's educational ideology began to shift from the Orientalist ideology to the Anglicist one. The Anglicist ideology is the ideology in favour of

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

education in English rather than that in the vernacular. The education in English was becoming the moral imperative within the imperial Discourse of Anglo-Saxons.

**“[T]he dialects commonly spoken among the natives of this part of India, contain neither literary nor scientific information, and are, moreover, so poor and rude that, until they are enriched from some other quarter, it will not be easy to translate any valuable work into them. It seems to be admitted on all sides, that the intellectual improvement of those classes of the people who have the means of pursuing higher studies can at present be effected only by means of some language not vernacular amongst them (Macaulay, 1835, 721-2).”**

No one other than a historian and politician T. B. Macaulay could be more influential in the establishment of British educational policy in India. On his arrival in India, Macaulay, who was appointed as President of the Committee of Public Instruction, found an existing controversy over the education policy in India between advocates of the Orientalist and Anglicist ideologies. He addressed the Minute on Indian Education in 1835, in which he scorned the Parliament Act of 1813 which intended to support Arabic and Sanskrit education, and instead he proposed the introduction of the education in English. As this famous Minute seems to be the most typical representative of the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons in the imperial period, we shall be looking at it in detail. The imperialistic and racist ideology defined the native languages in India just “poor and rude”, and education by means of “some language” rather than vernacular was proposed in the Minute. Thus the usual practice of the dominant people is to create and recreate the negative images of the languages and culture of the dominated in order to perpetuate the hegemony. “Some language” here clearly meant the English language as Macaulay asserted that:

**“Whether we look at the intrinsic value of our literature, or at the particular situation of this country [India], we shall see the strongest reason to think that, of all foreign tongues, the English tongue is that which would be the most useful to our native subjects (ibid., 723).”**

He then dogmatized that:

**“English is better worth knowing than Sanscrit or Arabic; that the natives are desirous to be taught English, and are not desirous to be taught Sanscrit or Arabic**

**(ibid., 729)."**

The above statement that 'the colonised people are desired to learn English' is still a prevalent sort of argument. For example, Pennycook (1994) argues that it was the local elites who demanded English for gaining social and economic prestige rather than the colonists' enforcement. When we take this viewpoint for granted, we are trapped by the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons. We must now acknowledge that the linguistic demand of the colonised is in fact originally created and orchestrated by the coloniser, since the coloniser can exert power to make the colonised want English themselves as we argued earlier. Here let us point out the pejorative connotation embedded in the word "natives". The word means "a person born in a place, especially one who is not white and considered by visitors and those who have settled there to be inferior (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*)."

The use of the word essentially reveals the speaker's own belief that natives (=non-whites) are subhuman species. This belief is clearly expressed in the passage in which stating no reason, Macaulay asserted that, "the superiority of the Europeans becomes absolutely immeasurable (Macaulay, 1835, 722)."

Macaulay continued to represent the Anglo-Saxons' linguistic attitude towards the Indian languages. While he confessed that he had "no knowledge of either Sanscrit or Arabic (ibid., 722)", he stated that he had never found an British Orientalist,

**"who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia . . . . It is, I believe, no exaggeration to say, that all the historical information which has been collected from all the books written in the Sanscrit language is less valuable than what may be found in the most paltry abridgments used at preparatory schools in England (ibid., 722)."**

Macaulay's profound contempt against Indian languages and cultures may suggest that he was just "one of the more extreme Anglicists (Pennycook, 1994, 79)", however it should be noted that the imperialist viewpoint such as Macaulay's was commonly shared by the leading contemporaries of the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons such as J. S. Mill<sup>11</sup>. Moreover, as Macaulay claimed, even Orientalists are reported to have estimated the current situation of India severely in terms of, for example, science (Touda, 1996).

What the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons aimed to accomplish in India was:

**"to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we**

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

**govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect (Macaulay, 1835, 729)."**

It is worth noting that the Anglo-Saxon coloniser's purpose was to educate a small portion of the elite Indians who would become useful intermediates between the coloniser and the colonised rather than educating the whole society. Macaulay's Minute played an important role in making English become the medium of higher education and thereby function as a vehicle to colonial elitedom. The intermediates acted as the ruling class who took English superiority for granted and governed India on behalf of the coloniser who intended to maintain their socio-political hegemony. Thus the education in English has been succeeding in producing and reproducing the followers of the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons, or the members of the 'English as the world language' Discourse in India who internalised the Anglo-Saxon norms up to now. Let us look at the following words articulated by various English-writing Indian poets in answering to the question 'Why write in English? (Lal, 1969)'

**"Obviously, people [who do not write in English] are afraid of English. Or they are jealous (45)."**

**"'English' is now a world language (86)."**

**". . . anglophobia is a lower-class attitude (216)."**

**"I believe English is now an Indian language (411)."**

Not surprisingly, by the influence of English education, the above sorts of opinions which essentially imply self-depreciation of indigenous languages are said to be quite widespread in many periphery-English-countries in Asia and Africa, although certainly there are those who are critical of the dominant 'English as the world language' Discourse such as M. K. Gandhi who claimed that; "To give millions a knowledge of English is to enslave them (1958, 5)." However, we shall have to repeat here that the colonised people's arguments in favour of the domination of English are produced and orchestrated through the manipulation of their thoughts by the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons. In this way, the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons have been using English as a means of perpetuating the domination/oppression relationships in the colonies such as India where English is still, after independence, dominantly used within the legal system, government administration, secondary and higher education, the armed forces, the media, business and tourism as a guarantor as well as a symbol of political unity (Crystal,1997).

## 6. “ENGLISH AS THE WORLD LANGUAGE” DISCOURSE

**“English is destined to be the next and succeeding centuries more generally the language of the world than Latin was in the last or French is in the present age. The reason of this is obvious, because the increasing population in America, and their universal connection and correspondence with all nations will, aided by the influence of England in the world, whether great or small, force their language into general use, in spite of all the obstacles that may be thrown in their way, if any such there should be (Adams, 1780).”**

It was J. Adams, then the U.S. diplomat in Europe and later the second president of the United States, who farseeingly predicted that the English would become the world language. In his letter to the congress dispatched in 1780, he suggested, like Defoe and Swift, the formation of an academy for refining, improving and ascertaining the English language preparing for the higher linguistic status the language may be attaining in future. As his enthusiasm for English was not shared by the contemporary Americans at that time, the proposal itself was rejected by the congress. However, it can be said that his prophecy was influential enough to produce and reproduce the ‘English as the world language’ Discourse in the succeeding centuries.

Indeed, the influence of French as a universal language began to decline with the military defeat by the British of French forces in India in 1757 and also in Canada in 1759 (Bailey, 1992). It is said that around the middle of the eighteenth century was a significant turning point for the English language, as it started superseding the French language which had flowered since about the fourteenth century (Nakamura, 1998). In the course of the nineteenth century, around 1830-1880 in particular, when Britain secured its position as the most preeminent industrialised nation in the globe, the optimistic and anglocentric notion that ‘English would become the world language’ began to flourish along with the imperialist ideology. The typical Discourses circulated were such as the following.

**“Ours [the English language] is the language of the arts and sciences, of trade and commerce, of civilization and religious liberty. . . So prevalent is this language already become, as to betoken that it may soon become the language of international communication for the world (Read, 1849, in Bailey, 1991, 116)”.**

The spread of English would be a matter of ‘destiny’ for proud Anglo-Saxons:

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

**“The English language is traveling fast towards the fulfilment of its destiny . . . running forward towards its ultimate mission of eating up . . . all other languages (De Quincey, 1907, 110-11)”.**

De Quincey praised English as having “the higher or intellectual qualities of a language (1897, 155)” while he showed contempt against the ‘savage’ languages:

**“It is philosophically impossible that the Gaelic, or the Hebrew, or the Welsh, or the Manx, or the Armonic, could at any stage have been languages of compass or general poetic power. . . [A] language of power and compass cannot arise except amongst cities and the habits of luxurious people (ibid., 159).”**

These Discourses succeeded in implanting the image of English language as a symbol of superiority and progress and that of other languages as inferior and uncultivated into people in the world as well as the contemporary Anglo-Saxons themselves. It was then natural that such confidence of Anglo-Saxons in their language was enthusiastically approved and certified by many foreign figures outside the British Empire. A British writer Trench quoted J. Grimm in *English Past and Present*, in order to confirm that the optimistic claims about English were not “the mere dream and fancy of patriotic vanity (1851, 28)”. Grimm, a German writer and linguist, announced in 1832 that English was “a surprisingly intimate union of the two noblest languages in modern Europe, the Teutonic and the Romance (ibid., 29)” and that it had acquired great strength and vigour. Grimm continued that:

**“the English language . . . may with all right be called a world-language; and, like the English people, appears destined hereafter to prevail with a sway more extensive than its present over all the portions of the globe. For in wealth, good sense, and closeness of structure no other of the languages at this day spoken deserves to be compared with it - not even our German . . . (ibid., 29)”**

In the meantime, Mori, who acted as a Japanese envoy to America and Britain, and later became the first Minister of Education in modernising Japan, proclaimed that:

**“The commercial power of the English-speaking race which now rules the world drives our people into some knowledge of their commercial ways and habits. The absolute necessity of mastering the English language is thus forced upon us. It is a**

**requisite of the maintenance of our independence in the community of nations. Under the circumstances, our meagre language, which can never be of any use outside of our islands, is doomed to yield to the domination of the English tongue, especially when the power of steam and electricity shall have pervaded the land (Mori, 1873, 266)."**

Mori's ambition to adopt English as the language of Japan did not gain popularity among Japanese contemporaries, and therefore he never expressed the idea again publicly after the publication of the above. The fact that people in non-colonies such as Germany and Japan became such ardent members of the 'English as the world language' Discourse suggests how influential the power of the prevailing Discourse is. They surrendered not through direct military dominance but through the discursive power of the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons. Such affirmation of English as the most superior language by intellectuals in periphery-English countries have helped to justify and reinforce the further perpetuation of the English language.

It is assumed that the climate, which sees English as becoming the world language, was established by the end of the nineteenth century when the British Empire was at its height and the United State was also extending its military power. In other words, the Discourse of 'English as the world language' and the notion of the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon language and culture embedded in the Discourse then became the taken-for-granted common-sense worldwide. That Discourse was solidified in the twentieth century as America, succeeding Britain, climbed its way to the top of the world as the king of military and economic power.

In the twentieth century, which is a time when most of inventions such as aviation, motion pictures, wireless telephone, mass communication and computer technology seem to be construed as a means to spread English (Bailey, 1991), the 'English as the world language' Discourse is chorused as an established fact. We may classify the current Anglo-Saxon Discourse about English into three patterns: The first are the arguments which praise the intrinsic value embedded in the English language such as simplicity of grammar, copiousness of vocabulary and even beauty, and which then assert that its god-given intrinsic linguistic superiority itself has made English the world language.

**"It must be a source of gratification to mankind that the tongue spoken by two of the greatest powers of the world is so noble, so rich, so pliant, so expressive, and so interesting (Jespersen, 1930, 229)."**

**"... to be born a heritor of the history and beauty of the English language was a**

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

**veritable gift of the gods - a gift that should be cherished equally by all whose mother tongue has practically become the world language - English, the Lingua Franca of to-day (De Witt, 1924, in Bailey, 1991, 118)."**

**"[English] is a good language with a simple grammar and a vast and highly flexible vocabulary (Laird, 1970, 480)."**

These arguments, which actually have been flourishing since the nineteenth century, are just reflections of the ancient Teutonic mania ideology and imperialist ideology that presuppose Anglo-Saxon's racial and linguistic superiority. Therefore they can be dismissed as nonsense, since theoretically there is no superiority or inferiority among languages. It should be noted again that a language does not gain power because of its intrinsic linguistic characteristics: The value of a language changes according to powers acquired by the speakers of the given language as English was once seen uneloquent but later suddenly became expressive.

The second are the arguments which emphasise the useful and efficient functions English has in terms of economy, culture, politics, education and the like in a global world. This includes the arguments over the alleged facts about English which we have rejected in the section two as just grasping things from the particular perspective. Others are:

**"Nowadays, no one would overlook English in making even the shortest possible list of the chief languages, because in political, social and literary importance it is second to none. . . (Jespersen, 1930, 228)"**

**"[English is] a gateway to better communications, better education, and so a higher standard of living and better understanding (Makerere Report, 1961, 47)."**

These arguments, needless to say, are reflections of the ideology of imperialism and that of 'white man's burden' or 'civilising mission'. These arguments often deceptively demonstrate English as just a neutral tool.

**" . . . since no cultural requirements are tied to the learning of English, you can learn it and use it without having to subscribe to another set of values . . . English belongs to everyone or to no one . . . (Wardhaugh, 1987, 15)"**

Language is never a neutral tool for communication, so it is impossible to 'just learn a language'. Anglo-Saxons seem to be fully aware of that, for the following manifesto by the British Council suggests the teaching of English is an ideological act which eventually benefits Britain itself:

**“The Council’s aim is to create in a country overseas a basis of friendly knowledge and understanding of the people of this country, of their philosophy and way of life, which will lead to a sympathetic appreciation of British foreign policy, whatever for the moment that policy may be and from whatever political conviction it may spring (Annual Report, 1940-1941, in Phillipson, 1992, 139).”**

By stressing that English is the useful and yet neutral tool for communication, the 'English as the world language' Discourse has made ideological aspects of learning English invisible to its learners.

Third arguments emerged especially after 1970s when America initiated the computer development. The arguments in this category often equate one's fluency of English with one's intelligence, and thereby threateningly urge people to learn English. One of the most provocative statements is such as the one declared by Burchfield:

**“English has also become a lingua franca to the point that any literate, educated person on the face of the globe is in a very real sense deprived if he does not know English. Poverty, famine, and disease are instantly recognised as the cruellest and least excusable forms of deprivation. Linguistic deprivation is a less easily noticed condition, but one nevertheless of great significance (Burchfield, 1985, 160-61).”**

Burchfield is one of the editors of *The Oxford English Dictionary* whose utterance about English will become extremely influential within the 'English as the world language' Discourse. He mistakenly correlates linguistic deprivation with ignorance of English. This can be challenged, since there are many millions of highly literate people in the world who are ignorant of English (Phillipson, 1992). However, this kind of equation is typical and taken for granted in recent 'English as the world language' Discourse which implies that having no knowledge of English is a disgrace.

After having scrutinised these kinds of Discourses, we now understand that the 'English as the world language' Discourse has in fact no convincing ground. The notion of English as the world language and that of English superiority over other languages seem to have been there as if they were the natural premise. However, as we have seen, these notions are

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

absolutely not true but ideologically constructed in history through the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons.

These Discourses such as the above have contributed to making people rush into learning English. Especially since the twentieth century is a period when the ideology of 'globalism' tends to predominate rather than direct military dominance, language education therefore plays a crucial role in spreading English. Under the name of globalism, which in fact is the ideology to advance English monolingualism, the British and Americans have been very eager to promote the teaching of English through organisations such as the British Council and other governmental and private institutions. English became an essential and valuable 'commodity' in the global capitalist market, which people in the periphery-English countries eagerly bought into in order to catch up with the global world. 'English as the world language' Discourse has been transmitted through textbooks and native English teachers into the people in periphery-English countries. These people have then become members of 'English as the world language' Discourse, and consequently they have reproduced more and more members who also uphold and promote the Discourse. What we should never forget is that the situation in which many people in the world learn English vastly serves the national interests of Anglo-Saxon countries economically, politically, culturally and ideologically.

While Anglo-Saxons endeavoured to share English worldwide, they did not forget to create another ideological apparatus perpetuating their dominance. As the population of English speaking people in the world increases, varieties of the language have also emerged. Anglo-Saxons then orchestrated the myth of standard English: the myth was said to be originally formulated in the mid to late nineteenth century, and was consolidated in the period between the two world wars, especially with the publication of *the Oxford English Dictionary* in 1928. The commonly accepted concept of standard English is the language spoken by men who had been educated in the public schools of the south Britain (Pennycook, 1994). This creation of the myth is inevitably linked with the construction of hegemony by privileging one particular form over others. Thus, the varieties spoken by non-Anglo-Saxons became the objects of condemnation: They are defined as the mere deviations and threat to standard. For example, regarding the Black English, Burchfield argues that:

**“If it is possible to see a variety of English as a threat to the acceptability of the language handed down to white Americans from the seventeenth century onward, this [Black English] is it. Its dislocation of normal syntax, its patterned formulas showing disregard for the traditional shape of sentences make it at once deeply impressive and overtly threatening to currently agreed standards (Burchfield,**

**1985, 164).”**

Once having diffused English in the world, Anglo-Saxons orchestrated new ideological apparatus, or the standard English for the purpose of making people believe that the Anglo-Saxon variety is the best and thereby maintaining the Anglo-Saxon (middle-class male) dominance. Condemnation of other varieties of English have been newly added on to Anglo-Saxons' discrimination against other languages. Thus as long as English is regarded as the world language, linguistic discrimination continues in some way or another: Those who speak languages other than English are discriminated against because they cannot speak English. Even those who can handle English are discriminated against unless they can speak standard English perfectly. The 'English as the world language' Discourse has trapped us again within such a vicious circle.

## **7. CONCLUSION**

We have historically examined how the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons has orchestrated the 'English as the world language' Discourse by revealing various ideologies behind it. Up to the late sixteenth century, when Britain was incidental to intellectual and economic life in Europe, Anglo-Saxons despaired with no confidence in their own barbaric language. No one would have dreamt of exporting their language. From the late sixteenth century onwards however, as Britain gradually gained a national power, the Anglo-Saxon's linguistic confidence emerged. Their linguistic and racial confidence was endorsed by the Teutonic mania ideology in the seventeenth century, and consequently the people began to think that English was at least as good as other languages. The eighteenth century saw the Industrial Revolution which Britain predominated over other European countries. The optimistic and farseeing argument that English might become a world language was articulated by some in the late eighteenth century. Britain became the most preeminent industrial country in the globe and also gained the strongest imperial power in the nineteenth century. The linguistic and racial confidence of Anglo-Saxons became even firmer, then along with the imperialist ideology Anglo-Saxons chorused that they should spread English as a 'civilising mission'. In the twentieth century when the U.S. became the leading economic and military power in the globe, Anglo-Saxons demonstrated that English was the essential vehicle for development, modernity, efficiency, civilisation and hope. In the postwar era especially, Anglo-Saxons became eager to sell English under the name of globalism declaring that English is the world language therefore everyone in the world should learn English lest they should get left behind in the global world.

「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

Since the late sixteenth century up to now, the Discourse of Anglo-Saxons has continuously asserted and reasserted the notion of Anglo-Saxon's racial and linguistic superiority and scorn for other races and languages, and in so doing it has succeeded in implanting the notion into many people all over the world including the Anglo-Saxons themselves. Although the 'English as the world language' Discourse appears to be rooted as the undoubted common-sense today, it is necessary to be aware that this common-sense has in fact been fabricated through ideological discursive practices of the Anglo-Saxons supported by the national power of Britain and later the U. S. The 'English as the world language' Discourse eventually benefits English speakers and the Anglo-Saxon race, but indirectly exploits other language speakers and other races culturally, socially and economically. The Discourse of Anglo-Saxons has functioned to make these problems invisible by utilising various ideologies such as Teutonic mania, imperialism, civilising mission or the white man's burden, racial discrimination and globalism as we have seen. Hopefully we have revealed how and why people in the world have been ideologically directed to believe that English is the world language. So we now must become critical of the common-sense Discourses, since we understand that any so-called common-sense contains certain ideologies. Rather than accepting common-sense Discourses uncritically, we should contemplate from now on who would gain the most advantages with the spread of a particular Discourse.

## NOTES

- 1 See Mizokami (2000).
- 2 For more discussion about 'Discourses', see *ibid.*
- 3 See *ibid.*
- 4 'Vernacular' is a loaded term meaning 'rootedness' and 'abode' (Phillipson, 1992).
- 5 Regarding the estimates of the English speaking population, see Crystal (1997), Graddol (1999).
- 6 It may be improper to use the word 'only' for the 'half'. However, here I would like to emphasise that it is just 'half' compared with 'all'.
- 7 See for example, Jones (1953), Bailey (1991), Nakamura (1989).
- 8 After Wales (1536 & 1542), England closed the Act of Union with Scotland in 1707, and with Ireland in 1801. It is reported that with the wave of the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century, English spread all over Britain (Nakamura, 1989).
- 9 See for example, Nakamura (1989).
- 10 For example, an advisory panel to the prime minister recommended an effort to launch a national debate on making English an official second language of Japan in 2000 (Mainichi Daily News, Jan. 22, 2000).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Adams, J. [1780], 'Proposal for an American Language Academy', in J. Crawford (ed.) *Language Policy Web Site & Emporium*, <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/home.htm>.
- Anstre, G. (1979), 'Four Rationalisations for Maintaining European Languages in Education in Africa', *African Languages*, 5/2: 10-17.
- Ascham, R. [1570] (1967), *The Scholemaster*, Facsimile, English Linguistics 1500-1800, no. 20, Menston: Scholar Press.
- Bailey, R. (1991), *Images of English: A Cultural History of the Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, R. & M. Gollach (eds.) (1982), *English as a World Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolton, W. F. (ed.) (1966), *The English Language: Essays By English and American Men of Letters 1490-1839*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryson, B. (1990), *Mother Tongue: The English Language*, London: Penguin.
- Burchfield, R. (1985), *The English Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Camden, W. [1605], 'The Languages', in W. F. Bolton (ed.) (1966), 22-36.
- Crystal, D. (1987), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997), *English as a Global Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Defoe, D. [1697], 'Of Academies', in W. F. Bolton (ed.) (1966), 91-101.
- Defoe, D. [1719] (1972), *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, Mariner*, ed. J. D. Crowley, London: Oxford University Press.
- De Quincey, T. (1907), *Reminiscences of the English Lake Poets*, ed. J. E. Jordan, London: J. M. Dent & Sons.
- De Quincey, T. (1897), 'The English Language', in D. Masson (ed.), *The Collected Writings of Thomas De Quincey*, vol. XIV, London: A. & C. Black.
- Foucault, M. (1970), *L'Ordre du Discours*, Gallimard: Paris.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1958), *Evil Wrought by the English Medium*, ed. R. K. Prabhu, Ahmedabad: Navajivan.
- Gee, J. P. (1996), *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*, 2nd. ed., London: Taylor & Francis.
- Graddol, D. (1999), *The Future of English?*, trans. K. Yamagishi, Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984), *A History of English Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jespersen, O. (1930), *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, 6th ed., Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johnson, S. [1755] (1963), *A Dictionary of the English Language*, ed. E. L. McAdam, Jr. & G. Milne, New York: Pantheon Books.

## 「英語 = 世界語」ディスコースはどのように造られたか？

- Jones, R. F. (1953), *The Triumph of the English Language: A Survey of Opinions Concerning the Vernacular from the Introduction of Printing to the Restoration*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1986), 'The Power and Politics of English', *World Englishes*, vol. 5, 2/3: 121-140.
- Kachru, B. B. & R. Quirk (1981), 'Introduction', in Smith, L. E. (ed.), *English for Cross-Cultural Communication*, Wellingborough: Macmillan.
- Knoflech, A. (1890), *Sound English: A Language for the World*, New York: G. E. Stechert.
- Laird, C. (1970), *Language in America*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Lal, P. (ed.) (1969), *Modern Indian Poetry in English*, Calcutta: Writers Workshop.
- Macaulay, T. B. [1835], 'Indian Education: Minute of the 2nd of February, 1835', in G. M. Young (ed.) (1952), *Macaulay: Prose and Poetry*, London: Rupert Hart-Davis.
- Mainichi Daily News, January, 22, 2000.
- Makerere Report (1961), *Report on the Conference on the Teaching of English as a Second Language*, Entebbe: Commonwealth Education Liaison Committee.
- Mizokami, Y. (2000), 'Literacy' and its Function of Regulating our Thoughts: Rethinking 'Literacy' from a Critical Perspective', *Aichi Konan Tanki Daigaku Kiyo*, 29: 187-199.
- Mori, A. [1873], 'Education in Japan', in T. Okubo (ed.) (1972) *Mori Arinori Zenshu*, vol 3, Tokyo: Senbundo.
- Mulcaster, R. [1582] (1925), *The First Part of Elementarie Which Entreateth Chiefe of the Right Writing of Our English Tung*, ed. E. T. Campagnac, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nakamura, K. (1989), *Eigo wa Donna Gengo ka : Eigo no Shakaiteki Tokusei [What Language is English?]*, Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Nakamura, K. (1998), "English/Eigo" o meguru Teigi to Gensetsu [Definitions and Discourses concerning English], *Seijyo Bungei*, 161: 45-62.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, (1995), 5th ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1994), *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*, New York: Longman.
- Phillipson, R. (1992), *Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swift, J. [1712], 'A Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue', in W. F. Bolton (ed.) (1966), 107-23.
- Touda, M. (1996), *Daiei Teikoku no Ajia Imeji [British Images of Asia]*, Tokyo: Minerva.
- Trench, R. C. (1851), *English Past and Present*, London: J. M. Dent & Sons.
- Ueno, C. (1998), *Nashonarizumu to Jenda [Engendering Nationalism]*, Tokyo: Seidosha.
- Wallis, J. [1699] (1972), *Grammar of the English Language*, trans. and ed. J. A. Kemp, London: Longman.

Wardhaugh, R. (1987), *Languages in Competition: Dominance, Diversity and Decline*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Yamada, T & H. Yoshii (1991), *Haijo to Sabetsu no Ethnomethodology : <Ima-Koko> no Kenryoku Sayou o Kaidoku suru [Ethnomethodology of Exclusion and Discrimination]*, Tokyo: Sinyousha.