

PHENOMENOLOGY 2005

1

SELECTED ESSAYS FROM ASIA

Part 1

Edited by

CHEUNG Chan-Fai and YU Chung-chi



13

*The Over-dominance of English in
Global Education:*

*The Contemporary Relevance of Leibniz's
Notion of "Language Care"¹*

KWAN Tze-wan (關子尹)

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Archive for Phenomenology & Contemporary Philosophy

*"Die Gewalt einer Sprache ist nicht, dass
sie das Fremde abweist, sondern, dass sie
es verschlingt." (Goethe, Maximen und
Reflexionen)*

ABSTRACT: It is a commonplace that the English language has over the past century become the dominant *lingua franca* of our increasingly globalized world. In face of this dominance of English, peoples of the world can hardly afford to underestimate the importance of English, in whatever walk of life, if they do not want to be marginalized by the global community. Yet, while the dominance of English today is unavoidable, the world is now facing an additional challenge—the *over-dominance* of English. By the "over-dominance" of English, I mean the danger of individual languages being self-estranged through an overemphasis

The copyright on this essay belongs to the author. The work is published here by permission of the author and can be cited as Phenomenology 2005, Vol. I, *Selected Essays from Asia*, ed. CHEUNG Chan-Fai and YU Chung-Chi (Bucharest: Zeta Books, 2007); available in printed as well as electronic form at www.zetabooks.com. Contact the author here: twkwan@cuhk.edu.hk

on English at the cost of the mother tongue. While dominance is an externally imposed challenge, over-dominance is largely a self-inflicted endangerment of their mother tongue by peoples of various linguistic communities. In addition to widely discussed issues of language policies and language planning, the paper makes a detour via some German experience while introducing the notion of "language care," which was proposed by Leibniz at a time when the prospect of German as an academic language was heavily overcast by the dominance of French. In the main section, this paper reflects on the various background factors and consequences of this socio-linguistic phenomenon of the over-dominance of English and proposes some "glocal" responses for the consideration of the global educational community.

Introduction: English as a Global Language

In the course of human history, language has played a remarkably important role. Intellectually speaking, language constitutes the core of the mental activities of humankind. It is the formative force of human consciousness and culture, and the means of individual expression and interpersonal communication. As a social institution, language unites as well as divides, integrates as well as segregates. Language has much to do with the identity and solidarity of a people; it is at once the subject matter and the carrier of cultural traditions. On the other hand, languages compete with each other and can be a source of conflict. In the age of globalization, these aspects of language have become more complex than ever with the rise of English as a truly global language.

Historically speaking, mankind has witnessed the coming and going of many *lingua francas*, which flourished in different times and in different geographical areas. In the West, there was Greek in antiquity, Latin in the Middle Ages, and French and to some extent German in modern times. In the East, there was Chinese,

especially in its written form. In Africa, there was Swahili and in South America Quechua and Spanish, to mention just the most prominent examples. However, in terms of scope and impact, it seems that it is English that has become the truly first global *lingua franca*,² "global" not merely in a geographical sense, but in the sense that the spread of English has become an inseparable part of what we now call globalization. It is for this reason that Philipson and Skutnabb-Kangas, two prominent scholars in research on linguistic human rights, have coined the term "englishisation," which they define as "one dimension of globalization."³

From a pragmatic point of view, the world has always been in need of a *lingua franca*. In fact the term *lingua franca*, originally referring to "language of the Franks (Europeans)," was invented in the European Middle Ages, when there was a need for different peoples in the Mediterranean region and throughout the Middle East to have a common language that could be used "freely" to facilitate multilateral trade, diplomacy, and to some extent scholarly exchange. In our globalized world today, the urgency of the need for international communication has reached an unprecedented level. Think of the various world/regional economic summits, of organizations such as the United Nations or UNESCO, of the multitudes of international academic conferences held from day to day around the globe. Nowadays, peoples of the world can hardly afford to disregard the importance of English, in whatever walk of life, if they do not want to be marginalized by the global community.

I. Dominance versus Over-Dominance

Language is power. This much-expressed dictum⁴ takes on a new meaning with the upsurge of English as a global language. Like many *lingua francas* in history, including Greek and Latin, the power of English was first backed up by military and economic

force. In addition, the power of English has a significant bearing on the social level as well. Whether we like it or not, proficiency in English has become in many societies not only a matter of practical competence, but also a yardstick of social prestige, or “cultural capital” as depicted by Bourdieu.⁵ Finally, the power of English expanded greatly when English became the most important carrier of new knowledge.⁶ It is also through this means that the dominance of English poses a challenge to global education. Whoever wants to be well-informed, whoever wants to be globally heard or read, finds reading or publishing in English a necessity.

Yet, while this dominance of English is today unavoidable, the world is now facing an additional challenge—the *over-dominance* of English. By over-dominance of English, I mean the danger of individual languages being self-estranged through an overemphasis on English at the cost of the mother tongue. While dominance is an externally imposed challenge, over-dominance is largely a self-inflicted endangerment of the mother tongue through a kind of self-neglect and self-degradation by people of various linguistic communities. In education, one serious consequence of the over-dominance of English is the “crowding out”⁷ of the native tongue from school curricula and from higher education, a scenario that is not uncommon around the globe today.

One reason we need to draw a distinction between the dominance and over-dominance of English is that the two issues allow for different sorts of reactions. As a result of globalization, the dominance of English is a brute fact that some nations are benefiting from and others have to tolerate. It is a global issue that is now under the direct control of no nation. As a danger to native languages, however, the over-dominance of English is a matter of domestic language policies or attitudes, which are under the control of members of the respective linguistic communities, whether

government policy makers, university administrators, or the general public. The present essay seeks to stimulate reflection on, and constructive responses to, this problem.

II. The German Experience: Leibniz's Reflections on the German Language

To exemplify how far-reaching the problem of “over-dominance” can become, let us examine the experience of the Germans. In terms of influence, the German language was at its prime probably for the whole of the nineteenth century, reaching its pinnacle just before the outbreak of the First World War. During that period, German was the most important scholarly language for academic disciplines ranging from astrophysics to art history, from mathematics to sociology, and from economics to philosophy. But before and after this heyday, the situation was quite different.

Although a language with a traceable history, German was in the time of Leibniz and Bach very much neglected, not merely internationally, but by Germans themselves. One remarkable story is that of Frederick the Great, who, when introduced to J.S. Bach, tried to speak to him in French. Another story relates that Voltaire felt so at home in the Prussian court that he wrote to his countrymen, saying, “It is just like in France, people here just speak our language, German is used only when they are talking to soldiers and horses.” And this *schwärmerei* for French was not confined to the royals or nobles alone. Peter von Polenz, a famous historian of German, tells us that, at the turn of the eighteenth century, it was common for middle-class German families to require their children to speak French to their parents and to their friends, while German was spoken only to the helpers or maids.⁸ In academia, German had at that time a very low status. We only need to recall that most

of Leibniz's own writings were either in Latin or in French, the two leading *lingua francas* at that time.

But the most interesting thing about Leibniz was that he did write a few short essays in German, two of which dealt precisely with the future prospect of German as an academic language. The titles of the two essays are as follows:⁹

1. "Unvorgreifliche Gedanken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der deutschen Sprache" [Some unanticipated thoughts concerning the practice and improvement of the German language] (1697/1704/1709)
2. "Ermahnung an die Deutschen, ihren Verstand und ihre Sprache besser zu üben, samt beigefügtem Vorschlag einer deutschgesinnten Gesellschaft" [Warning to the Germans, to better exercise their understanding and their language, together with a proposal for a German-minded society] (1682/83)

Although both of the above papers were published posthumously (in 1717 and 1846 respectively), manuscript research suggested that the theme behind them have been drawing Leibniz's attention for decades. Despite his own preference for French and Latin in his scholarly work, Leibniz was in fact quite concerned about the neglect of the German language on German soil due to the dominance of French, which had become a mode after the Thirty Years' War. In the above mentioned essays, Leibniz was in fact making proposals to his fellow Germans to bring about some changes so that the German language might have a better future. Among other views, Leibniz suggested two important notions related to the use of the German language, namely "*Sprachpflege*" (language care)¹⁰ and "*deutschgesinnte Gesellschaft*" (German-minded society)¹¹.

The concept of language care is quite akin to the concept of language planning (*Sprachplanung*), for both concepts suggest that we should take measures regarding our native language so that it may

develop in a favorable direction. The difference is that language planning is more or less a matter of governmental policy, whereas language care has to do mainly with the duty of members of the linguistic community. And Leibniz's idea of a German-minded society refers precisely to this need of "caring" for the German language through its active use by the German people so that the strength and vitality of the language may develop and prosper.

Out of great concern for the future of the German language, Leibniz gave a brief account of German very similar to what we call SWOT analysis nowadays. According to Leibniz, the German language exhibited its strength in having a rich vocabulary for sensible and technical objects (metallurgy, mining, etc.), but suffered from a shortfall in terminology in two specific areas—that of "the expression of the emotions" (*Ausdrückung der Gemütsbewegungen*) and that of "abstract and subtle cognitive expressions, including those used in logic and metaphysics." In other words, Leibniz thought German was weak in the areas of literature and philosophy.¹²

III. Leibniz's Underestimation of the German Linguistic Tradition

For today's admirers of German culture, this "diagnosis" of Leibniz is hardly comprehensible. In fact, if we take a closer look at the history of the German language, it is not hard for us to discover that it was precisely in the two specified areas that the track record of the German language up to Leibniz's time was indeed not a bad one. First of all, there was on the one hand a long tradition of medieval and baroque German poetry, starting from Walther von der Vogelweide (c.1170 - c.1230), Wolfram von Eschenbach (c.1180-1220), Martin Opitz (1597-1639), Andreas Gryphius (1616-1664), Friedrich von Spee (1591-1635), Paul Gerhardt (1607-1676), to Angelus Silesius (1624-1677). Through the sus-

tained efforts of this tradition, the poetic sensitivity and emotional complexity precipitated in the German tongues must have become so considerable that they even have inspired people like Bach and Heidegger.¹³

Then, there was on the other hand an equally remarkable tradition of German schoolmen and mystics, including Notker von St. Gallen (c.950-1022), Hildegard von Bingen (1098-1179), Meister Eckhart (1260-1327), and Jakob Böhme. All this started with Notker von St. Gallen, also known as Notker the German, who has, through his translation of Aristotle and Boethius into Old High German (OHG), in a sense laid the foundation of philosophical German.¹⁴ In the German mystical tradition founded by Hildegard von Bingen, Meister Eckhart had no doubt the greatest impact on the German language. It is commonplace that Luther has in the sixteenth century standardised modern German which is easily readable even nowadays, but it is much less well known that Meister Eckhart has, two centuries before Luther, coined a subtle philosophical terminology which is used even in modern and contemporary German philosophy, including expressions such as *"sinnlichkeit," "manicvaltekeit,"* or *"verstendikeit,"* which were later used by Kant, and expressions such as *"warheit," "weltlicheit,"* and *"zitlicheit,"* which were inherited by Heidegger.¹⁵ Besides building up new German terms, Eckhart also contributed to the germanization of a host of Latin philosophical expressions, as, for instance, *form, formieren, materie, fundieren, nature, natürllich, übernatiurlich, person, persönlich, personlichkeit, transformieren,* etc.¹⁶ Jakob Böhme on his part has further developed the German mystic legacy, and has in this way also contributed to philosophical German. Böhme not only influenced German Romanticism, but has also inspired philosophers like Hegel,¹⁷ Nietzsche and Ernst Bloch.¹⁸

Therefore, Leibniz's assessment of the German language as being intrinsically weak in emotional-poetic and abstract-philosophical expressions was arguably the result of his underestimation of his own linguistic heritage.¹⁹ And the fact that an academic as serious as Leibniz could also make such a mistake seems to indicate clearly, that the German people of his time, with few exceptions²⁰, must have lost confidence and esteem in their own language and must have given up on its "care" to the extent that they could even have become unaware of its previous glamour. In any case, with the proposal of the concepts of "language care" and of a "German-minded society," Leibniz did point to the direction along which the German language might experience a resurrection.

Within 100 years after Leibniz's "warning," the German language eventually did make enormous progress in both literature and philosophy. In the hands of such literati as Goethe and Schiller and such philosophers as Kant and Hegel, the German language experienced a kind of rebirth. Through the work of these intellectual giants, the German language reclaimed all its lost territory, becoming one of the most powerful and expressive academic languages of modern Europe.

After another century of development, the power of German reached its climax just before the First World War. With the rapid rise of English during the interwar period, however, the influence of German was significantly checked, and during and after the Second World War, German suffered further due to the negative image and inhumane deeds of the Nazis.²¹ Culturally and politically, the situation in present-day Germany is very similar to the Germany of Leibniz's lifetime: First, the Holy Roman Empire's significant weakness for some fifty years following the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648),²² finds a parallel in the overhang felt in present-day Germany of the country's defeat in the Second World War

some fifty years ago. Second, while Leibniz's Germany came under the Western influence of the language of France, the final winner of the Thirty Years' War, the same sort of "West-influence" is felt by today's Germany, the difference being that this time the West wind comes not from France but from the further shores of the U.S.A. With the upsurge of English (or better, American English), the future of the German language, which once burdened Leibniz, seems to have become a matter for alarm again.

IV. Repercussions of Leibniz's Concern in Today's Germany

Out of their great concern for this issue, a group of German university professors (37 in number) wrote an open letter on 24 June 2001, addressed to the Ministers of Culture, of Science, and of Education of all 16 German states (*Länder*).²³ This open letter bears the caption "Protection and development of German as national academic language."²⁴ In this letter, the authors brought the world's attention to two noticeable trends regarding the usage of German on German soil: First, an increasing number of international conferences in Germany are using English as the only official language, even when the main target audience is German laypeople. Second, an increasing number of publications in Germany accept only English contributions, and many basic university courses are now offered in English rather than German. Seeing the gravity of the issue, the authors made the alarming statement that "[t]he three undersigned together with the 34 countersigned, coming from the most disparate disciplines, observe with great concern how the German language is being expelled from our country's academic enterprise by English. We most politely ask you to take issue with this problem. We also recognize the danger that the primordial language basis for our scientific thinking and for our social exchange of knowledge will be lost within the next five to ten years. This applies also to the significance of Germany as an independent country for

academic research (*eigenständigen Wissenschaftsland*)."²⁵ In the face of such a danger, the open letter suggested a number of measures to be taken, which include: a) political initiatives (following the example of France) towards designating German, in conjunction with English, the official language of international conferences held in Germany; b) using public money to translate specially compiled research materials into German to facilitate public access; and c) ensuring that course offerings in German in university undergraduate programs are not heedlessly suppressed in favor of English.

Looking back at the heyday of Goethe and Kant, when the German language was so alive, it is hard to imagine that the same language now faces such a decline. The open letter concluded in a rather sad tone saying that what is aimed at is not the "upgrading anew of German to an international language for communication", but merely its "protection and development". Putting the whole case in Leibniz's words, what the open letter was complaining about was nothing but the Germans' own abandonment of "language care," which is precisely what should again be strengthened. What if the suggested measures are not followed? Of course, with so many speakers the German language will not easily die out. But it would be bad enough, as depicted in the open letter, if German higher education were to produce a class of "isolated elite" cut off from the rest of society and incapable of using German in academic writing, discussion, or even thinking!²⁶

V. How Should the Over-Dominance of English be Dealt With?

The above trajectory of the German language shows us clearly what challenges the globalization of English might entail for all other national languages. With the experience gained from this account, I will proceed to reflect on a number of topics in the hope that some key issues can be identified and clarified so that peoples

in the world may deal with the same problem in a more deliberate manner. In presenting an argument that is of practical relevance, I will unavoidably have to occasionally proceed from a "Chinese" perspective. This is necessary, as there are indications showing that major universities in China and in Hong Kong have considered or are considering major revisions of their language policy in favor of English. But I hope this "Chinese" perspective will not prevent us from seeing that what we are facing here is a challenge that the whole world is also facing. Given the global nature of this challenge, which inevitably will intensify in the time to come, some generic reflections might already be timely.

A. English as the Indispensable Key to the Global Community

After decades of self-seclusion, the opening up of China has become an issue of paramount importance both for the Chinese and for would-be partners. Propelled by the enormous opportunities that lie ahead for those who can communicate with people from outside China, it is perfectly understandable that a great interest has arisen among the Chinese population in learning the English language, which is regarded, not unjustifiably, as the key to the outside world, and obviously this interest will continue to grow. Besides economic interest, the acquisition of English is also educationally important for contemporary China, because English is now the most important carrier of new knowledge. For Chinese learners of most disciplines, the mastery of English is in this regard educationally much more cost-effective than the mastery any other foreign language. On the intellectual level, the influx of English in China will in the long run greatly benefit the Chinese population, because learning a foreign language enables the learners to realize that things can be described, formulated, or perceived from differ-

ent angles. With the correct approaches, obtaining a decent grasp of a foreign language can help us develop a more flexible and liberal mindset, which in turn will even help us to better appreciate our own culture, or be critical about it if necessary. Goethe once said, "whoever knows no foreign language, knows not even his own."²⁷ With the increased need for cross-cultural communication, China's further emphasis on English should in the first place be considered in a positive light, as it will indeed bring about positive "capital" for her. Therefore, for any country in the world, including China, tapping into a globalized language like English is clearly a matter of national interest.

B. The Need of the World to have an International Language

Taking a more cosmopolitan point of view, for a globalized world, which is the world we now have, there is unquestionably a high practical value in having a language that is globally understood. It is for this reason that I find expressions like "hegemony" or "imperialism" too emotional, as they very easily prompt us to indulge in historical animosities and distract us from the many positive roles a global language might play. These include, for instance, in areas such as international law and human rights, international rescues and amnesties, academic and scholarly exchanges, urgent medical consultancies, cross-cultural understanding, inter-religious dialogues, and so forth. The fact that English rather than French, German, or Esperanto has succeeded in assuming this dominant role should not prevent us from accepting this truth. Even less should it encourage us to take a "boycotting" attitude towards English, which would be against the interests of individual nation states as well as that of the international community. All in all, despite the critical stance I am going to take, I do not believe

that any country, including China, should undermine the importance of a global language like English. The question is only, given the inevitable need to strengthen the use of English, how should individual countries cope with its dominance while preventing its over-dominance?

C. Treating English as OFL and not as ENL

In dealing with language matters, one major rule of thumb is to take linguistic realities seriously. In any human society, the most important linguistic reality is the acquisition of the mother tongue, which is an undeniable fact that should be the starting point of all sensible language policies. While the learning and assimilation of English is culturally and politically inevitable, it remains debatable what attitude or strategy a nation state should adopt in dealing with English education. A major concern here is that a nation's strategy for English education can only be part of a more generic language strategy, which has to do mainly with policies regarding the native language, so that measures concerning the former must always be discussed with reference to those concerning the latter. It is in this light that we can conceptually differentiate between two strategies of treating English: "optimized foreign language" (OFL) on the one hand, and "emulated native language" (ENL) on the other. These two English education strategies require some explanation.

By "optimized foreign language," hereafter OFL, I mean fostering English education as a foreign language with all possible resources and measures while paying full attention to Mother Tongue Literacy (MTL) or the nurturing of the native tongue. Of course, the adoption of an OFL policy is not an easy matter, especially for nations (like China) whose language is typologically dissimilar to English. How under such circumstances can the learning of English be optimized is the task of research on teaching English as

a second (foreign) language (TESL/TEFL), which cannot be dealt with in this essay. What we need to emphasize is that, regardless of the extent of the resources a nation might inject into the promotion of English, all this has to be done in parallel with a solid education in the native tongue. If this condition is not met, the whole language strategy will cease to be one of OFL, and degenerate into one of ENL.

By ENL or "emulated native language" (an oxymoron), I mean the strategy of treating English "as if" it were a native language, to the extent that the true native language is severely jeopardized. ENL is so depicted ("emulated") because it looks away from the linguistic reality of the native tongue and presumptively assumes that, with enough resources, English can be taught and learned as well as if it were a "native language."²⁸ Of course, given unlimited resources, ENL is always theoretically possible. But taking into consideration the actual linguistic environment involved and the actual exposure of learners to English, the outcome of ENL is always limited while its price can be enormously high.²⁹ And the highest price involved here is not just a matter of money, but the alienation of learners from their authentic native tongue, which could have adverse consequences for their intellectual development. Bearing our earlier reference to Leibniz in mind, it is clear that one difference between OFL and ENL lies precisely in the different attitudes they embody toward "language care."

The distinction between OFL and ENL is meant to single out the former as the more viable and the latter as a self-delusive approach to English education. For a successful implementation of OFL, various issues have to be carefully considered: Besides TESL research as mentioned above, we might need to consider other issues including the integration of an "optimized" English curriculum into a basic scheme of mother tongue literacy, the full exploitation

of educational technologies, and strategies for the implementation of OFL in different phases of the educational system (primary, secondary, tertiary, graduate research, etc.).

D. Medium of Instruction of the University Curriculum

For university education in non-English-speaking countries, the holding of conferences, symposia, lectures, and so forth in English as much as possible and the delivery of some courses in English are no doubt beneficial in increasing students' exposure to English. But introducing more English is one thing; changing the language of instruction to English completely or to any extent that might jeopardize the future prospects of the native tongue as an academic language is quite another. We must understand that the university lecture hall is the main platform of the "language care" of any nation state. It is often the place where the intellectual endeavors of the teacher reach their highest degree of consolidation and creativity. And, most importantly, university teaching is the device through which the culture, scholarship, knowledge, and values of a nation are transmitted from one generation to the other. In a word, as far as "language care" is concerned, university teaching in the mother tongue is a bulwark, which no nation can afford to give up without serious cultural and educational consequences.

Besides Germany, one might argue, there are many countries in Europe, such as the Netherlands and the Nordic states, that have started much earlier and gone much further in switching their language of instruction at the university level to English. But we must bear in mind that these countries have much smaller populations than Germany or China, which might have left them with little real choice in the matter.³⁰ It is well known that the people of these countries tend to speak English extremely well as a second language. Some even argue that for these peoples, English can be considered

to be a "second first language" rather than a "first second language." But the general success of these countries in English comes at a high price, for it is obvious that Dutch, Norwegian, or Danish belong to those national languages that have long been "over-dominated" by English, at least in academia.³¹ In recent years, there has been a strong tendency for universities in China to adopt more English in their teaching and learning activities, which is largely reasonable. But the crucial question is: how far should we go?

E. Language Care as an Unshirkable Duty of the Entire Linguistic Community, and of Academics in Particular

The German philosopher Herder was of the opinion that, if a language is to develop healthily, it has to be supported by a group of linguistic users (*Publikum*) who are well educated.³² For any nation state, university teachers and students are, so to speak, the cream of society. As intellectuals and academics, they all have a duty to learn new knowledge in their respective disciplines as much as possible. But whether the knowledge thus acquired can be successfully "retained" and transmitted to the school (secondary and primary) and public sectors depends to a large extent on whether these university people can use their native language to recapitulate, reflect on, criticize, apply, and debate the new knowledge gained. It is only through this channel that new knowledge from the outside world can be assimilated and internalized into the mother tongue of the nation, and eventually become a common intellectual asset of the nation and the basis for further conceptual innovation. For academia world-wide, it would probably be a great humiliation if progress in thought and scholarship can only be made in English!

Therefore, university academics, especially those who have acquired training abroad, should require themselves to publish at least occasionally in their own mother tongue (i.e., in addition to

English or other languages), despite a possibly smaller and localized readership. Here, I am referring to both the publication of advanced level research papers and to more basic-level educational materials such as textbooks. This is the most important way the abstract notion of “language care” can be realized.

F. The Role of Language in Natural Sciences and in the Humanities

The question regarding how much English and how much native language should be used in academic research has always been a matter of dispute. With regard to this problem, there has been much discussion on the need to treat natural science subjects and humanistic or social-scientific subjects differently. One general observation is that the natural sciences deal with universal phenomena that are quite independent of cultural identity of the researcher, and for that reason, English alone would best serve the purpose of providing a universal medium of communication. On the other hand, it has often been emphasized that for research on humanistic and social-scientific subjects, the objects and concepts of study are in fact not “objective” and “universal” in a natural scientific sense, but are significantly motivated by the cultural heritage from which they are derived. Thus, in handling humanistic issues, approaches from different linguistic formulations often provide important contrasts and nuances that lead to a deeper understanding of the issues.³³ It is for this reason that research in the humanities and social sciences should not be confined to or rely on one global language alone. It was along this line of thought that Wolfgang Frühwald, president of the *Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung* of Germany, once remarked that, “all cultural and human sciences (in a broader sense all theoretical sciences) have to do with language. Whereas the concept of science in modern natural sciences is a result-oriented (*ergebnis-*

orientierten) one, the concept of science in the human sciences is always process-related (*prozesshaft*). This means that the results of the human sciences are not lying there prior to the process of their description. They are bound to language and style and are therefore not readily (*ohne weiteres*) transferable to one *lingua franca*.”³⁴ By the same token, Maurice Godé, a famous French Germanist, once opined that “knowledge of the respective national languages is a basic prerequisite for meaningful study in the humanities.”³⁵

In short, humanities studies rely on linguistic diversity and on cultural traditions to a much greater extent than do the natural sciences. For the humanities in general and for philosophy in particular, proficiency in one single *lingua franca* is very often a sign of inadequacy, if not of impoverishment. While this might not apply to Kongzi or Plato, it is certainly true of today’s humanities scholar, for whom intercultural understanding and a global outlook have become necessary. As for researchers in the natural sciences, although they do not need a multiplicity of languages to operate, their countries and peoples do need them to fulfill the duty of “language care,” which should apply to all disciplines, although to various degrees.

G. Bargaining Power of Various Native Languages in the Face of English Dominance

Being “the” language of globalization, it is quite certain that the influence of English will keep growing in the foreseeable future. It seems also inevitable that many languages of the world will succumb to this dominance. The question of how far and how long individual languages can retain their identity and idiosyncrasies is a matter of cultural dynamics. Generally speaking, a host of factors are involved, of which two are the most crucial: 1) the size

of the linguistic community, which proportionally accounts for the multitude of linguistically active authors; and 2) the bulk of the cultural legacy of a language in history, which accounts for the overall attraction for the recurrent use of the language.³⁶ Taking these factors into consideration, we can give a rough approximation of the future of some languages. Take German as an example: In terms of the size of the linguistic community, there are about 95 million German speakers in Europe, which is considerable compared to other EU languages such as Dutch, Danish, Norwegian, or Swedish. In terms of cultural legacy, contemporary German differs greatly from the German of Leibniz's time because of the richness in literary, philosophical, and other disciplinary classics accumulated over the past two centuries, and this strength or "capital" might remain significant for many centuries to come. With this bargaining power, will German follow the examples of Dutch or Danish in becoming further marginalized? Or should Germany choose to actively resist such a path?

Take Chinese as another example. Needless to say, the bulk (over 1.3 billion in mainland China alone) and, to a lesser degree, the spread of Chinese speakers in the world are strengths that no one can ignore. As with cultural tradition, the nearly uninterrupted several-thousand-year legacy of Chinese literature, philosophy, art, and so on will obviously render the Chinese language extremely competitive into the distant future. In fact, people often think that while many languages will definitely be conquered or over-dominated by English, Chinese is probably among the very few (with Spanish or probably Arabic being two other such candidates) that might eventually be able to truly withstand the onslaught of English, or in the long run even compete with it. But is the future of Chinese really so assured, despite the great bargaining power it possesses?

While such wild guesses might have some point, they might not represent the complete picture. One most important thing we need to bear in mind is that, in addition to the two main factors mentioned above, there are other factors (see last footnote) that might complicate the picture, and among these factors we should never leave out two subjective but equally crucial factors: the perseverance of the government in maintaining consistent and favorable language planning policies, and the readiness of members of the linguistic community

H. What Should we aim at when Talking about the Future of a Language? Defending a Native Language as "Object Language" or as "Operative Language" to Contribute to "Language Care."

In our discussion on the likelihood of a nation defending its language in an "englishized" globe, we left out a very important aspect of the issue, namely that a native language can be defended merely as an "object language," or also as an "operative language." By "object language," I mean the language in which intellectual objects such as poetry, philosophy, and history are recorded. By "operative language" I am referring to the language in which we operate when dealing with whatever issues require our attention. Obviously, classical Greek, Latin, or Sanskrit were great languages, but they are nowadays only objects of study because, except for very few users, people no longer operate in them. A pure object language, thanks to the "jewels" it carries, might be "safe" from immediate extinction, but as long as it does not "operate," it is not vital and will never grow. In this regard, Wilhelm von Humboldt was perfectly correct when he said, "[L]anguage is one of the fields whence the general mental power of man emerges in constantly active operation."³⁷

Of course, when we talk about using a language to “operate,” we might understand operation loosely to embrace everyday usage. But if it is the future academic status of a language that we care about, then we should know that a language might remain in use by a sizable population, but lose its esteem as an academic language that is intellectually operable. So we have to know what we are defending!

All of these reckonings are important insofar as they have much to do with the language policies of universities in Germany and elsewhere, including China and Hong Kong. Let me explain this, taking German again as an example: Up to the present moment, German is obviously still both an object language and an operative language, because Kant, Schiller, Weber, or Simmel are now still being discussed in German by scholars in Germany and elsewhere. But in case the Germans themselves were to decide to stop using German to lecture or to publish, what would happen, say in fifty years, or even ten? The truth is very simple: If an academic language stops operating vigorously, it will degenerate quickly into a mere academic object. And this was exactly the warning carried in the open letter to the German politicians.

I. Language as not merely a Tool of Expression but the Key to Intellectual Development. Relevance of the Mother Tongue

Advocates of English-only policies often adopt a very biased conception of language, which can be called an instrumental view, or the view that language is nothing more than an instrument for expression of what a person already clearly has in mind. But a closer look at the development of modern general linguistics will show, that contrary to this “instrumental” view, linguists are increasingly adopting a “*Bildung*-conception” of language, or the

view that language is not merely an instrument for the expression of clear, ready-made ideas, but a formative medium through which human intelligence and consciousness can at all take shape and gradually develop. In other words, for many modern linguists, including Humboldt, Saussure, and Jakobson, language competence and intellectual capacity are equiprimordial and inseparable. If language indeed has such an important role in the development of human intelligence, then the part played by the mother tongue should also be accorded special importance, because the mother tongue is precisely “the” language medium through which all human individuals actually acquire their basic intelligence. Since the acquisition of the mother tongue is a process that is irreversible and inevitable, fostering the learning of English at the cost of the mother tongue (as in the case of ENL) is like building an edifice on a sand dune or developing a view from nowhere, which is pedagogically problematic and intellectually against the best interests of the learner. This explains why the over-dominance of English is such an important problem. It is along this line of thought that some Neo-Humboldtian researchers on language have studied the role of the mother tongue, which they think is the very basis for human intellectual existence as well as the very link to our social life-world and to our cultural heritage.³⁸

J. Multilingualism

Having underlined the importance of the mother tongue for the cultivation and development of human intelligence, it is also important for us to limit this emphasis to prevent this position from degenerating into provincialism or ethnocentrism. In fact, we should note that all of the philosophical justifications that support the primary importance of the mother tongue also lend support to the advantage of supplementing mother tongue learning with the learning of foreign

languages. As we suggested at the outset, the learning of a foreign language is beneficial since it helps to broaden the linguistic-intellectual horizons of learners by providing contrasts in perspectives, formulation strategies, conceptual networks, and so forth. In general linguistics and in philosophy of language, many major theoretical positions are in fact closely related to this issue, for instance, the concept of linguistic value, lexical field theory (*Wortfeldtheorie*), world-picture (*Weltansicht*), the fusion of horizons (*Horizontverschmelzung*), etc. All of these add up to the suggestion that as far as education is concerned, the more languages one learns, the better. Emperor Charles V's dictum: "How many languages one speaks, so many times is he a man"³⁹ is a most drastic formulation of this position. Naturally, with limited time and resources, there are limits to what can be achieved in the area of multilingualism in education. In order to strike a balance, therefore, I would suggest that, while bilingualism should be a minimum for pre-university education, education from the undergraduate program onwards should at least aim at trilingualism, which should even be made a requirement at the graduate level. Just one word on the concept of "trilingualism": Instead of being a mere numerical compromise, many linguistic and philosophical studies have pointed out that the learning of at least three languages exhibits the intellectual advantage of "triangulation," i.e., the prevention of premature antagonism or bipolarity in conceptual comparisons, enabling the learner to thus be more receptive to complexities of our world and better prepared for multi-lateral discourses.⁴⁰

K. Towards a Glocal Language Policy in the Age of Globalization

Having underlined the importance of English as a global language, but warned of its over-dominance in local language policies, one general position we arrive at is the adoption of a language policy that is "glocal" in nature. What is a glocal language policy? In short,

it is a language policy that is locally rooted but globally perspectivized. In practical terms, it is the combination of the MTL (Mother Tongue Literacy) and OFL (Optimized Foreign Language) strategies. While the significance of MTL is programmatically self-explanatory and pedagogically fundamental, we must note that OFL should not be confined to mere TESL or English learning, but should include the teaching and learning of any "foreign" language relevant to one's respective disciplines. With the dominance of English, it is understandable that English will remain globally the most popular "foreign language," but this dominance of English should not lead to monopolization in the world linguistic arena, especially not in academia. Given available resources, foreign languages other than English should never be excluded, for they can and do make contributions of their own to global civilization. In other words, they are valuable cultural "capital" awaiting fruitful investment from every global citizen. If this "glocal" language policy is adopted consistently by a considerable number of nations with the support of their major universities, then every individual language will have a better future, both locally and internationally. How popular individual languages can become depends naturally on their "bargaining power." So why should not Chinese scholars, depending on their disciplinary needs, learn alongside English some Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, German, French, Tibetan, Japanese, or even Tokharian in order to get the most intellectual benefit? Alternatively, Chinese is obviously a good candidate for all other peoples in the world.⁴¹ Wilhelm von Humboldt once underlined the idiosyncrasies of the Chinese language with the wonderful remarks that Chinese and Sanskrit, despite their antipodal structures, represent the two "fixed extremes" or "end points" of linguistic perfection,⁴² and that the Chinese script has "in a certain manner embraced philosophical work within itself."⁴³

Educationally speaking, as long as one learns a foreign language seriously enough, whether English or another language, one will

be able to get a great deal from the effort. But whatever the combinations, the most important thing is that in any glocal language program the native tongue should always be in place, for without a solid educational foundation in one's native tongue, which is the fountainhead of human intelligence and thus the "true" key to the outside world, all other linguistic maneuvers will become pointless and ineffective. For any country, any attempt to achieve a "better" standard in a foreign language (say, English) at the expense of the native tongue is intellectually and pedagogically unwise and culturally and politically suicidal.

Conclusion

The dominance of English is the result of a long historical process that can hardly be reversed. It is a basic fact that no nation and no government can ignore. Unless a nation does not want to connect economically, politically, intellectually, and culturally with the world, strengthening the use of English is unavoidable. Yet, coming to terms with the dominance of English as an international language is one thing; tolerating its over-dominance or allowing English to intrude into domestic language matters is quite another. As we have explained, the over-dominance of English amounts to the encroachment and endangerment of other native tongues, but whether or not this scenario should be allowed to prevail is to a large extent in the hands of members of individual linguistic communities, whether government policy makers, university administrators, professors, students, or the general public. What we are dealing with here is our very linguistic human rights, which we might all-too-easily forsake, if the over-dominance of English is accepted without reflection. In this regard, Leibniz's notions of "language care" and of the establishment of a "[mother-tongue]-minded society" are obviously of great heuristic value.

Bibliography

- Apel, Karl-Otto, "Noam Chomsky's Theory of Language and Contemporary Philosophy: A Case Study in the Philosophy of Science," *Towards a Transformation of Philosophy*, translated by G. Adey and D. Frisby, Routledge, London: 1980, pp. 180-224.
- Ammon, Ulrich, *Ist Deutsch noch internationale Wissenschaftssprache?* de Gruyter, Berlin: 1998.
- Ammon, Ulrich (ed.), *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on Other Languages and Language Communities*, Mouton - de Gruyter, Berlin/New York: 2001.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Language & Symbolic Power*, translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, Polity Press, Oxford: 1991.
- Calvet, Louis-Jean, *Language Wars*, translated by Michel Petheram, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford: 1998.
- Cassirer, Ernst, *Zur Logik der Kulturwissenschaften*, 2. unveränderte Auflage, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt: 1961.
- Coulmas, Florian (ed.), *A Language Policy for the European Community. Prospect and Quandaries*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 1991.
- Crystal, David, *English as a Global Language*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 2003.
- Eucken, Rudolf, *Geschichte der philosophischen Terminologie im Umriss* (1879), Olms, Hildesheim: Reprint 1964.
- Graddol, David and Ulrike H. Meinhof (eds.), *English in a Changing World*, AILA, London: 1999.
- Greenberg, Joseph Harold, *Language, culture, and communication*, Stanford UP, Stanford: 1971.

- Greenberg, Joseph Harold, *On Language*, Selected Writings of Greenberg edited by Keith Denning and Suzanne Kemmer, Stanford University Press, Stanford: 1990.
- Holenstein, *Kulturphilosophische Perspektiven*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main: 1998.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von, *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Translated by Peter Heath with an introduction by Hans Aarsleff, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 1988.
- Kwan, Tze-wan, "Wilhelm von Humboldt on the Chinese Language," *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, Vol. 29, No. 2, Berkeley: 2001, pp. 169-242.
- Kwan, Tze-wan, "Leibniz and the Development of Modern German: On *Sprachpflege* and the Fate of National Languages" (in Chinese), *Journal of Tongji University*. Social Science Section, Vol. 16, No. 1, Tongji University, Shanghai: 2005, pp. 1-11.
- Leibniz, G.W.F., *Unvorgreifliche Gedanken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der deutschen Sprache* (Zwei Aufsätze), Reclam, Stuttgart: 1983.
- Muir, Christian (ed.), *The Politics of English as a World Language. New Horizons in Postcolonial Cultural Studies*, Rodopi, Amsterdam/New York: 2003.
- Ostler, Nicholas, *Empires of the Word. A Language History of the World*, Harper-Collins, London: 2005.
- Philipson, Robert, *English Imperialism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford: 1992.
- Polenz, Peter von, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, de Gruyter, Berlin: 1977.

- Saussure, Ferdinand de, *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Ch. Bally and A. Sechehaye in collaboration with Albert Riedlinger; translated with an introduction and notes by Wade Baskin, McGraw-Hill, New York: 1972.
- Schierholz, Stefan J. (ed.), *Die deutsche Sprache in der Gegenwart*. Festschrift für Dieter Cherubim zum 60. Geburtstag, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/Main: 2001.
- Scholten, Dirk, *Sprachverbreitungspolitik des nationalsozialistischen Deutschlands*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/Main: 2000.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Robert Philipson (eds.), *Linguistic Human Rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*, Mouton - de Gruyter, Berlin/New York: 1994.
- Weisgerber, Leo, *Das Menschheitsgesetz der Sprache als Grundlage der Sprachwissenschaft*, 2. neubearbeitete Auflage, Quelle & Meyer, Heidelberg: 1964.
- Witt, Jörg, *Wohin steuern die Sprachen Europas?* Stauffenburg Verlag, Tübingen: 2001.
- Wolff, Gerhard (ed.), *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*, Reclam, Stuttgart: 1984.

Endnotes

- 1 This article is a longer version of a paper presented at the Ninth East-West Philosophers' Conference. *Educations & Their Purposes: A Philosophical Dialogue Among Cultures*, held May 29 - June 10, 2005, at the East-West Center, the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu. While the original paper will be included in the official proceedings to be published by the University of Hawai'i Press, this paper here is included in *Phenomenology 2005* with the consent of Professor Roger Ames, convener of the conference. Also with the consent of Professor Ames, another abridged version of the paper was included in Wm. Theodore de Bary's book *Confucian Tradition and Global Education: Essays in Honor of Tang Junyi*, Columbia University Press, New York: 2006. In the course of writing this paper, the author has had the benefit of discussing the issue with his colleagues at the CUHK as well as with scholars abroad, including Roger Ames, Gerhold Becker, W. T. de Bary, Elma Holenstein, Lao Sze-Kwang, Sun Zhouxing, etc.
- 2 See David Crystal, *English as a Global Language*, second edition, CUP, Cambridge: 2003.
- 3 See Robert Philipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, "Englishisation: one dimension of globalization," pp. 19-36, in Graddol and Meinhof (ed.), *English in a Changing World*, AILA, London: 1999.
- 4 For proponents of this saying, see *inter alia*, Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, edited by Colin Gordon, Pantheon, New York: 1980. See also a recent book by John Honey, *Language is Power: The Story of Standard English and its Enemies*, Faber and Faber, London: 1997.
- 5 Pierre Bourdieu, *Language & Symbolic Power*, Polity Press, Cambridge: 1991, p. 61; see also Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," in J. Richardson, *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, Greenwood Press, New York, Connecticut, London: 1986, pp. 241-258.
- 6 See relevant charts in Minoru Tsunoda (1983), "Les langues internationales dans les publications scientifiques et techniques," *Sophia Linguistica*, 13, Sophia University, Tokyo: 1983, pp. 144-155, quoted in Ulrich Ammon (ed.), *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on Other*

- Languages and Language Communities*, Mouton-de Gruyter, Berlin/New York: 2001, pp. 343-362, especially p. 344, 346.
- 7 I am borrowing this expression from Richard J. Alexander, "Global Languages Oppress But Are Liberating, Too: The Dialectics of English," in: Mair: 2003, p. 91.
 - 8 See Peter von Polenz, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, de Gruyter, Berlin: 1977, p. 108.
 - 9 The two essays are now available in, Leibniz, *Unvorgreifliche Gedanken... (Zwei Aufsätze)*, ed. Uwe Pörksen, Reclam, Stuttgart: 1983.
 - 10 The German term "Sprachpflege" was part of the general title "Von deutscher Sprachpflege" which was appended by Walter Schmied-Kowarzik to Leibniz's essay "Unvorgreifliche Gedanken..." when he was editing it for inclusion in a volume published by Felix Meiner Verlag in 1916. However, the very notion of Sprachpflege itself is definitely ascribable to Leibniz. In a letter written in Latin to his friend Gerhard Meier, Leibniz himself referred to the essay "Unvorgreifliche Gedanken..." as "dissertationunculam meam extemporaneam de linguae Germ. cura" which means "a casually written short work of mine on the care of the German language" (See Leibniz, *ibid.*, p. 79). Here the trailing expression "de linguae ... cura" is where the term Sprachpflege (language care) is from. On a side note, when "Unvorgreifliche Gedanken..." was published posthumously for the first time in 1717, the title of the essay was already furnished with the Latin subtitle (in parenthesis) "De linguae germanicae cultu" (See Leibniz, *ibid.*, p. 103).
 - 11 The expression "*deutschgesinnt*" has to be understood with great care because before and after Leibniz this expression has been used with a strong nationalistic flavor, which was not in line with Leibniz's largely cosmopolitan standpoint. In fact, as early as 1642/43, when Leibniz was still an infant, a certain "Deutschgesinnte Genossenschaft" was founded in Hamburg by Philipp von Zesen. Whereas the purpose of this cooperative is the prevention of the influx of foreign linguistic terms into the German language to keep the language's "purity," Leibniz's idea of a "German-minded society" is advocating only the "care" for German rather than the repulsion of external language elements. [See Goethe's dictum cited later in this paper.] Furthermore, the notion "*deutschgesinnt*" acquired codified meaning additionally expressing "patriotism" through the political use

- of the term during the times of Bismarck and the Nazis. In this paper, Leibniz's notion of "deutschgesinnte Gesellschaft" is understood solely in regard to his appeal to the German nation for more language care.
- 12 Leibniz, op. cit., pp. 8-10.
 - 13 Bach has used many of Gerhardt's verses for his highly religious vocal music (See his *Geistliche Lieder und Arien aus Schemellis Gesangbuch*). Heidegger, in his "tautological stage," was very much inspired by Angelus Silesius' poems (See his *Der Satz vom Grund*, Neske, Pfullingen: 1971, p. 68ff).
 - 14 See Anna A. Grotans, *Reading in Medieval St. Gall*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 2006.
 - 15 Rudolf Eucken, *Geschichte der philosophischen Terminologie im Umriss*, Olms, Hildesheim: 1964, (Reprint of 1879), pp. 118-122. Eucken quoted no less than 100 terms used by Eckhart, including 50 terms bearing the suffix "-heit(keit)," as, for instance, *demüetikeit, geistekheit, inwendikeit, manicvaltekeit, vernünftekeit, vollekommenheit, warheit, weltlicheit, würrklicheit, zitlicheit*, etc. (Please note that all spellings and cases are according to Eucken)
 - 16 Eucken, *ibid.*, pp.121-122, again, all spellings and cases are according to Eucken.
 - 17 See, inter alia, Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*, III; *Werke* Band 20, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt: 1970, Here, Hegel described Böhme as "the first German philosopher" and that "the content of his philosophizing is authentically German" (p.94); he also depicted his philosophy as "profound and intimate to the highest degree" (p. 118).
 - 18 Ernst Bloch, *Zwischenwelten in der Philosophiegeschichte*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main, 1977. See chapters on "Jakob Böhme" (pp. 227-241) and on "Mystik und Laienbewegung" (pp.135-163).
 - 19 For a fuller account of this prehistory of the German language, see Tze-wan Kwan, "Leibniz and the Development of Modern German: On *Sprachpflege* and the Fate of National Languages" (in Chinese), *Journal of Tongji University*. Social Science Section, Vol. 16, No. 1, Tongji University, Shanghai: 2005, pp. 1-11.

- 20 Considering Leibniz's philosophical contemporaries, notably Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694), Christian Thomasius (1655-1728), and Christian Wolff (1679-1754), it can be said that during this period Latin was indeed the predominant academic language for this generation of German scholars, among which Leibniz has used the least German. It is worth mentioning that Thomasius was the first one who used German in giving lecture at the university (in 1687), and that he published in German not only a major work *Lehrbuch des Naturrechtes* in 1687, but also a more casual German journal *Monatsgespräche* in 1689, in which some influential papers including his "Über die Nachahmung der Franzosen" appeared.
- 21 On this issue, see George Steiner, "The Hollow Miracle," *Language and Silence: Essays on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman*, Atheneum, New York: 1967, pp. 101-109.
- 22 The Holy Roman Empire, characterized since 1512 CE as *Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation*, was indeed a weak conglomeration of predominantly German ethnic groups before the unification of Germany. Since the 'Thirty Years' War was fought mainly on German soil, German territories experienced much destruction. More importantly, the Treaty of Westphalia which concluded the war obliged the Holy Roman Empire to cede land and pay indemnity to Sweden and France as well as make concession of constitutional rights to the constituent German states.
- 23 The open letter was initiated by Professors Dieter, Simonis, and Vilmar, and was countersigned by 34 other professionals from various disciplines (including the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and technology). The letter was published on 24 July 200 and triggered a series of discussions. Related papers are now still available at URL: <http://bibliothek.wz-berlin.de/pdf/2001/p01-003.pdf>, (latest access on 26 May 2005).
- 24 The full wordings of the caption were: "Sicherung und Ausbau von Deutsch als nationale Wissenschaftssprache – I. auf internationalen Tagungen in Deutschland, II. in wissenschaftlichen Publikationen und in der Lehre."
- 25 See document <http://bibliothek.wz-berlin.de/pdf/2001/p01-003.pdf>, op. cit., p.5
- 26 The same scenario holds, for example, for Denmark, one of the most "englishized" countries in Europe. Robert Philipson reported that the

- editor-in-chief of a major Danish national encyclopedia has written that some contributors who are natural scientists are unable to communicate their scholarship in Danish for a Danish audience. See Graddol and Meinhof, *ibid.*, p. 28.
- 27 Goethe, *Maximen und Reflexionen*, in *Werke* (Berliner Ausgabe), Band 18, Aufbau, Berlin: 1960, p.492. "Wer fremde Sprachen nicht kennt, weiss nichts von seiner eigenen." See also a similar dictum usually ascribed to Rudyard Kipling: "What do they know of England who only England know?"
- 28 Of course, for peoples in some countries, for historical, linguistic-typological or whatever reasons, English might appear to them as a second first language rather than a first second language. But this will not apply generally to the Chinese is quite obvious.
- 29 Because of previous colonial influence, the English teaching policy in Hong Kong has been exhibiting strong ENL tendencies for decades, with the great abundance of so-called English Secondary Schools being the most characteristic outcome. With a Chinese population of more than 95%, the linguistic ecology for running ENL in Hong Kong is of course not very favorable one.
- 30 The populations of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and the Netherlands in 2005 are 5.43m, 4.62m, 9.04m, and 16.30m respectively, compared to Germany's 82.69m and China's 1,315.84m. See the United Nations' World Population Prospects: The 2004 Revision Population Database. URL: <http://esa.un.org/unpp/p2k0data.asp>.
- 31 In 1999, Philipson and Skutnabb-Kangas reported on the situation in Denmark, relying on questionnaires returned by 83 academics. See Graddol and Meinhof, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-29.
- 32 Johann Gottfried Herder, *Briefe zu Beförderung der Humanität* (1793-97), 5. Sammlung, § 57, *Herders Werke*, Band 5, Aufbau-Verlag, Berlin: 1982, pp. 108-144, especially, 112f, 134f.
- 33 Regarding the objectivity and universality of objects and concepts in the humanities, see the incisive reflections in Ernst Cassirer, *Zur Logik der Kulturwissenschaften* (1942), Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt: 1961, especially the first and third chapters.

- 34 See Wolfgang Frühwald, "Sprachen öffnen die Welt. Zur Funktion der Nationalsprachen als Sprachen der Wissenschaft," lecture delivered in Budapest, Hungary, in Beijing, China, etc. in 2001. See URL: <http://www.humboldt.hu/HN19/fruhwald.htm> (accessed on 24 May 2005). I am indebted to Professor Feng Jun, Vice-President of Renmin University of China, for bringing Frühwald's lecture to my attention. The English text is my translation of the German text.
- 35 See a report on Godé's speech at the Universitätstage Heidelberg-Montpellier on 14.01.2004: "...so drohe die Gefahr einer pragmatischen Sprachverarmung und damit einer noch stärkeren Dominanz des Englischen. Für die Naturwissenschaften sei dies per se kein über Gebühr problematischer Prozess. 'Es sieht aber ganz anders aus bei den Geisteswissenschaften, bei denen man die jeweilige Sprache nicht für ein neutrales gleich-gültiges Medium halten darf,' betonte Godé. 'Die Kenntnis der jeweiligen Landessprache ist eine Grundvoraussetzung für ein sinnvolles Studium in den Geisteswissenschaften.'" [URL: http://www.innovations-report.de/html/berichte/bildung_wissenschaft/bericht-24766.html, viewed on 14 May 2005].
- 36 Besides these two factors, other important factors determining a language's potential to withstand the over-dominance of English include: the prestige of a language in the eyes of other nations; the degree of self-esteem of native speakers for the language; the amount of new knowledge carried by a language; the average level of literacy of the respective linguistic community; the abundance of educational materials in the respective language, etc. But these factors will not be discussed in this paper. For some stimulating thoughts on related issues, see Elmar Holenstein, "Ist die viersprachige Schweiz ein Modell für plurikulturelle Staaten?" *Kulturphilosophische Perspektiven*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main: 1998, pp. 11-43. Besides this essay, Holenstein has been highly involved in discussing various linguistic-educational issues with me over the past year, either through email or elaborately in person during my visit to Yokohama in the summer of 2005.
- 37 See Wilhelm von Humboldt, *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts* (1835) (widely cited as *Kawi-Schrift*), now included in: *Werke in Fünf Bänden*, Band III. *Schriften zur Sprachphilosophie*, Andreas

- Flitner and Klaus Giel (eds.), Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, Stuttgart: 1963, p. 391. English translation by Peter Heath, *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 1988, p. 27. Elsewhere, Humboldt made the related statement, "The intellectual merits of language therefore rest exclusively upon the well-ordered, firm and clear mental organization of peoples in the epoch of making or remaking language..." (*Kawi-Schrift*, German, p. 464/English, p. 81).
- 38 Among many Neo-Humboldtians, Leo Weisgerber had in the fifties proposed the so-called "humanistic law of language" (*Menschheitsgesetz der Sprache*), which comprises the following three constituent laws: the law of linguistically conditioned human existence, the law of linguistic community, and the law of the mother tongue. Although Weisgerber's theory long ago sank into oblivion due to his over-concentration on German when citing linguistic examples, it seems that the theoretical profile and the basic insights of his work are still highly relevant to our concern today with the over-dominance of English and the need to consciously nurture one's mother tongue. See Weisgerber, *Das Menschheitsgesetz der Sprache als Grundlage der Sprachwissenschaft*. Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage, Quelle & Meyer Verlag, Heidelberg: 1950, 1964.
- 39 Quoted from Arthur Schopenhauer, *Parerga und Paralipomena* (1859), II, Zweiter Teilband, Diogenes, Zürich: 1977, p. 616. "So viele Sprachen Einer kennt, so viele Mal ist er ein Mensch."
- 40 For the linguistic and philosophical justification of trilingualism, see *inter alia* the following three texts: 1. Elmar Holenstein, "Ein Dutzend Daumenregeln zur Vermeidung interkultureller Missverständnisse," *Kulturphilosophische Perspektiven*, op. cit., pp. 288-312; English translation, "A Dozen Rules of Thumb for Avoiding Intercultural Misunderstandings," *Polylog*, URL: <http://them.polylog.org/4/ahe-en.htm> (2 Nov 2004). 2. Joseph H. Greenberg, *On Language*, Selected Writings of Greenberg edited by Keith Denning and Suzanne Kemmer, Stanford University Press, Stanford: 1990, especially the chapters on typology and language universals. 3. William Theodore de Bary, "Asian Classics and Global Education," lecture delivered in January 2005 on the occasion of the Tang Chun-I Visiting Professorship, organized under the auspices of the Philosophy Department of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. In this

- paper, de Bary made the following statement: "At least two other general principles seem applicable to this educational pattern or approach. One is that it is best, if at all possible, for the process to extend to more than one culture other than one's own, so that there is always some point of triangulation and a multicultural perspective predominates over simplistic we/they, self/other, East/West comparisons."
- 41 Owing to the growing popularity of Chinese, an examination scheme for Chinese proficiency known as *HSK* (Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi, nicknamed the "Chinese TOEFL") is now in operation in 33 countries (more than 80 cities) around the world. For related information, see the HSK main site <http://www.hsk.org.cn/>, or http://www.hsk.org.cn/test_arrangement/gw.asp for the complete list of international examination points.
- 42 See Wilhelm von Humboldt *Kawi-Schrift* (1835), op. cit., p.676. English translation by Peter Heath, op. cit., p. 232. For further discussion, see Tze-wan Kwan, "Wilhelm von Humboldt on the Chinese Language," *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, Vol. 29, No. 2, Berkeley: 2001, pp. 169-242.
- 43 See Wilhelm von Humboldt, "Lettre à Abel-Rémusat sur la nature des formes grammaticales en général et sur le génie de la langue chinoise en particulier" (1827), Librairie Orientale de Dondey-Dupré, Paris: 1827; German translation, by Christoph Harbsmeier, *Brief an M. Abel-Rémusat. Über die Natur grammatischer Formen im allgemeinen und über den Geist der chinesischen Sprache im besonderen*, which was included in Harbsmeier (1979), *Zur philosophischen Grammatik des Altchinesischen im Anschluß an Humboldts Brief an Abel-Rémusat*. (Stuttgart: Frommann). p.81. "...weil die dort entwickelte Schreibweise schon in sich in gewisser Weise eine philosophische Arbeit beweist."