GURT '87

Language Spread and Language Policy:

Issues, Implications, and Case Studies

Peter H. Lowenberg
editor

**Georgetown University Round Table
on Languages and Linguistics 1987**

**Language Spread
and Language Policy:**
Issues, Implications, and Case Studies

Peter H. Lowenberg
editor

Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTICE

Since this series has been variously and confusingly cited as: **Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics**, **Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics**, **Reports of the Annual Round Table Meetings on Linguistics and Language Study**, etc., beginning with the 1973 volume the title of the series was changed.

The new title of the series includes the year of a Round Table and omits both the monograph number and the meeting number, thus: **Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987**, with the regular abbreviation **GURT '87**. Full bibliographic references should show the form:

Joshua A. Fishman. 1987. Language spread and language policy for endangered languages. In: **Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987**. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 1-15.

Copyright © 1988 by Georgetown University Press
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 58-31607
ISBN0-87840-122-9
ISSN 0196-7207

To Henry and Renée Kahane

CONTENTS

Welcoming Remarks James E. Alatis Dean, School of Languages and Linguistics	ix
Introduction Peter Lowenberg Chair, Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987	xiii
 Language spread and language policy: An overview	
Joshua A. Fishman Language spread and language policy for endangered languages	1
Henry and Renée Kahane Language spread and language policy: The prototype of Latin and Greek	16
 Language spread, variation, and change	
John R. Rickford Language contact, variation, and diffusion: Microlevel community perspectives	25
Henrietta Cedergren The spread of language change: Verifying inferences of linguistic diffusion	45
Carol Myers Scotton Code switching and types of multilingual communities	61

**Language spread and language policy:
Research and applications 1**

Einar Haugen	
Variation as language policy: A unique national case	83
Shana Poplack	
Language status and language accommodation along a linguistic border	90
Charles A. Ferguson	
Standardization as a form of language spread	119
Sidney Greenbaum	
Language spread and the writing of grammars	133

**Language spread and language policy:
Research and applications 2**

Robert L. Cooper	
Planning language acquisition	140
Roger W. Shuy	
Changing language policy in a bureaucracy	152
Patricia C. Nichols	
Language policy and social power: Gender and ethnic issues	175
Ralph Fasold	
Language policy and change: Sexist language in the periodical news media	187

The spread of English: Diversification and standards

Braj B. Kachru	
The spread of English and sacred linguistic cows	207
Sir Randolph Quirk	
The question of standards in the international use of English	229

Language spread and intelligibility

Eugene A. Nida	
Intelligibility and acceptability in verbal communication	242
Kari Sajavaara	
Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural intelligibility	250
Larry E. Smith	
Language spread and issues of intelligibility	265

Language spread, language policy, and the nonnative speaker

John J. Staczek	
Particular treasures: On being and becoming a speaker of English	283
S.N. Sridhar	
Language variation, attitudes, and rivalry: The spread of Hindi in India	300
Peter Stevens	
Language teaching contributes to and is influenced by the spread of languages	320
G. Richard Tucker	
Educational language policy in the Philippines: A case study	331

Language spread and creativity: Variation in English literature

Henry G. Widdowson	
Language spread in modes of use	342
Edwin Thumboo	
The literary dimension of the spread of English: Creativity in a second tongue	361

viii / Contents

Closing Remarks

James E. Alatis

Dean, School of Languages and Linguistics

402

WELCOMING REMARKS

James E. Alatis

Dean, School of Languages and Linguistics
Georgetown University

As Dean of the School of Languages and Linguistics and the host of Georgetown University, I am delighted to announce that this 38th Annual Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987 is dedicated to two of the most distinguished scholars of our profession, Renée and Henry Kahane, and the proceedings will so indicate. The influence of these two eminent scholars upon my own career has been so great that I find it difficult to talk about them, and the contributions they have made to the language profession, without actually talking about myself and the institution I represent. Professor Kachru points out that he once asked Henry Kahane how he had won his fight for forming a Department of Linguistics at the University of Illinois, and the answer was: 'It was very simple. I made it a point to visit the Dean every week and stress the importance of a Department of Linguistics on this campus. He would throw me out the door and I would come back through the window.

Well, of the education of deans there is no end! Some are more educable than others. There are good deans and bad deans. I like to believe that I am a good dean; if so, it is only because Henry Kahane got to me in my early formative years.

I met the Kahanes more than 25 years ago in Greece, where I was teaching English at the University of Athens as a Fulbright scholar. Later, I came to know them even better in professional circles, including several of their consultantships to the U.S. Office of Education when I was directing the research program under the National Defense Act (NDEA). I have been personally and professionally in regular contact with these two distinguished scholars. I have

never known them to refuse an invitation to serve. Service to their profession has been their watchword. Henry Kahane has served as an evaluator of Georgetown's languages and linguistics program and as a speaker at the Georgetown University Round Table. Their book, Spoken Greek, which I use to teach Modern Greek to American students, has been the source of much joy to me.

Anyone who knows Renée and Henry personally will attest to the fact that 'friendliness'--love of humanity--is the creative source of their many intellectual productions. In meeting the Kahanes as persons, one immediately begins to enjoy an experience of the highest intellectual level, and while reading their scholarship, one is acutely aware of their warmth and friendship. 'Applied friendship,' therefore, seems to be a more accurate description of the Kahanes than 'applied linguistics.' It is, indeed, this humanistic quality of the Kahanes as linguists which appeals to me most because it makes them intellectually and professionally relevant to the educational institution with which I am associated.

The eminence of both Drs. Kahane as scholars and teachers is well known to the entire field of languages and linguistics, which is itself a great credit to them because they have risen above controversies, absorbed the essentials, and continued their meticulous scholarly work in a broad range of languages even into retirement. I must say a word about this latter statement. Although he technically retired in 1971, Dr. Kahane has been kept in service since then, as acting head of six departments, including Linguistics, French, Romance Languages, Bilingual Education, English as a Foreign Language, and Humanities. He has also served as the President of the Linguistics Society of America.

There are very few scholars with the academic breadth and depth of the Kahanes, who really must be looked upon as a team, for they have collaborated throughout their lives as one. The Kahanes have a quality of intellectual curiosity and the desire to face new challenges which exceeds that of their more youthful colleagues. The Kahanes' wide-ranging scholarship is demonstrated in the fact that they have not only been concerned with matters having to do with linguistics--both theoretical and applied--with linguistic analysis and methodology, with historical as well as contemporary themes, with synchronic as well as diachronic considerations, but they have also been concerned with

literature and literary history and criticism as well. They are the consummate scholarly team.

It is therefore with a feeling of pride that we dedicate this Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987 to Renée and Henry Kahane. I would like to grasp this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for their constructive impact upon my scholarly development, their distinctive influence on the activities of the Georgetown University School of Languages and Linguistics, and for their many contributions to the field of language scholarship in general.

INTRODUCTION

Peter H. Lowenberg, Chair

Georgetown University Round Table 1987

Language spread and language policy: numerous issues, varied implications, and diverse case studies--all swirling about in deep hidden currents no less than in strident surface squalls--need the serenity which Joshua Fishman and Henry and Renée Kahane provide in their overview, which reminds us that the struggle for language dominance (and the obverse side of the coin, the struggle for language maintenance) represents no less than a profound human concern for the stability of quite fundamental social and cultural institutions. Their tempering of the 'language engineering' approach with compassion, although echoed by many of their colleagues' remarks on other matters, is all too rare in contemporary linguistics.

This return to what Henry and Renée Kahane have earlier termed 'humanistic linguistics' (Kahane and Kahane 1983) not only prompts examination of other dimensions of language spread but provides fresh glimpses of language change. Ultimately, it motivates reexamination of several basic constructs of linguistics. Thus, John Rickford and Henrietta Cedergren question the empirical parameters of 'speech community' and address as a methodological problem how to measure linguistic change most accurately. Similarly, Carol Myers Scotton and Shana Poplack, in their discussion of the language contact which inevitably accompanies language spread, both make proposals to distinguish the often fuzzy distinction between 'code switching' and 'borrowing'.

Einar Haugen, Charles Ferguson, Robert Cooper, and S.N. Sridhar, each from a slightly different perspective, address the manner and degree to which language spread can be manipulated intentionally by language policy. Each of these papers suggests, as an important area for further research, the identification of those strategies of policy implementation

which are most effective for particular objectives in specific sociolinguistic contexts.

Roger Shuy, Ralph Fasold, and Patricia Nichols examine aspects of language planning in the United States. This site is significant as a setting where, in the absence of an official language planning agency, responsibility for language policy falls on institutions controlling, or at least influential in, domains of language use. This is the hidden area of those whom Nichols calls 'unofficial authorities', the area of newspaper style sheets, the area governed by the policies adopted by government agencies for official correspondence, the area of those who produce dictionaries, handbooks of usage, and public school textbooks.

Sir Randolph Quirk and Braj Kachru discuss the problems concerned with language standards. When a former colonial language is retained as a medium of instruction in the schools (as occurs frequently with both French and English), should the linguistic norms for language usage and instruction remain the norms of the now geographically distant native speakers, or should these traditional norms be replaced by new, local norms which have developed among nonnative speakers as a result of widespread contact with local languages in non-Western sociocultural contexts? The answer to this question is not without implications for the task of the descriptive linguist, as Sidney Greenbaum carefully shows.

Although not discussed in detail in these papers, the policy adopted in such situations can also have significant implications for linguistic theory. For if these nonnative norms are adopted, what are the consequences for the assumption long accepted in linguistics, at least in the United States, that the usage of the native speaker is the ultimate determinant of grammaticality in a language and that a native-speaker model is always the desired target of nonnative acquisition of that language? Moreover, in the more casual styles of communication among multilinguals, where intrasentential code shifts often become the norm, can we still speak of 'languages', or is it rather the case, as proposed by Dell Hymes (1984:44), that 'the abilities of individuals and the composite abilities of communities cannot be understood except by making "verbal repertoire", not "language", the central scientific notion'?

A more immediate and practical question raised by Kachru's 'polymodel' approach--and a subject which Larry Smith

investigates empirically--concerns the parameters of intelligibility that determine whether linguistic diversity resulting from adopting nonnative norms impedes cross-cultural communication any more than diversity in the norms of the native-speaker varieties. Related issues pertaining to intelligibility and acceptability are explored by Eugene Nida and Kari Sajavaara.

Equally practical aspects of language spread and policy are criteria and consequences of language choices made in the schools. Peter Strevens focuses on the potential benefits of recent methodological advances, while John Staczek and G. Richard Tucker analyze the impact on bilinguals, at the individual and societal levels, respectively, of language choices in educational systems.

Henry Widdowson and Edwin Thumboo contribute two papers on a theme not usually associated with language spread: the significance of literature in language variation and change. In light of their cogent arguments, one may wonder if linguists can continue, as is generally the case in the United States, to consider 'Language' and 'Literature' such distinct phenomena. This is really a false dichotomy, and linguists could profit from the insights of their literary colleagues.

The final paper, by Dr. James E. Alatis, Dean of the Georgetown University School of Languages and Linguistics, is in response to a provocative panel discussion held in conjunction with the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987, concerning a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution which would make English the sole official language of the United States. This panel was chaired by Dr. Braj B. Kachru, University of Illinois, and included Mrs. Gerda Bikales, Executive Director of U.S. English, an organization favoring such an amendment. Other members of the panel were Congressman Mathew G. Martinez, California; Dr. Geoffrey Nunberg, Stanford University; and Senator Steven D. Symms, Idaho.

I have dedicated this volume to Henry and Renée Kahane precisely because of the broad range of language phenomena and issues that the volume includes. The Kahanes have worked in all of these fields and have had a marked influence on several generations of language specialists. On behalf of Georgetown University, I am honored to thank the Professors Kahane, as well as their distinguished fellow

contributors to this anthology, many of whom have benefited, as I have, from the Kahanes' encouragement, support, and guidance.

I wish to express my gratitude both to the participants and to the many colleagues and students of the Georgetown University School of Languages and Linguistics who generously assisted the conference presentations. Special among these was Dean James E. Alatis. I also wish to thank my wife, Rachel, for her patience and support. Finally, I wish to thank my two assistants, Paula Kalaja and Katherine Langan, who coordinated every facet of this project from conception to conclusion, and without whose incredible resilience and resourcefulness GURT '87 simply would not have happened.

References

- Hymes, Dell. 1984. Sociolinguistics: Stability and consolidation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 45:39-45.
- Kahane, Henry and Renée Kahane. 1983. Humanistic linguistics. *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 17(4):65-89.

LANGUAGE SPREAD AND LANGUAGE POLICY FOR ENDANGERED LANGUAGES

Joshua A. Fishman
Yeshiva University

Having contributed, over the course of many years, to the study of language spread, on the one hand, and to the study of language maintenance/language shift, on the other hand, it has generally been clear to me--and, I suspect, to others as well--that these two topical concentrations generally deal with quite different macrolevel language situations. Language spread calls to mind the dynamic of English as an additional language, particularly in its role as the worldwide language of technology (both popular and advanced) and of huge chunks of youth culture in most modern and modernizing contexts; the dynamics of Russian as an additional language in the Soviet Union (particularly among minor Asian peoples who have no other means of access to the world of modern ideas and technology, but among all other Soviet peoples as well, for ideological and lingua franca purposes); the dynamic of Swahili as an additional language among many Anglophones (particularly young Anglophones) in Canada; of Spanish as an additional language among enclaves of Latin American Indians; of Mandarin/Potinhua as an additional language among non-Han peoples in Mainland China, etc., etc. Many additional examples of language spread can be given, particularly if we go back in history (e.g., to the spread of Latin--initially as an additional language--in the Western Roman Empire, and the partially contemporary and partially even earlier as well as later spread of Greek as an additional language for High Culture in Rome itself and throughout the Eastern Roman Empire). The common factor among all of these examples of language spread is that they focus upon contextually more powerful languages whose spread is (or was) facilitated precisely by the doors they can (could) open,

the broader vistas they can (could) provide, the more statusful roles they are (were) associated with (at least potentially or referentially if not immediately), the promise they hold (held) to change the lives of their new speakers (initially: understanders and, ultimately, perhaps also readers/writers) in desired directions.

The mood in language spread studies is generally an 'upbeat' one, precisely because it takes its point of departure from the perspective of the spreading languages themselves and their sponsors. If we care to glance below this surface, however, the efforts related to language spread are also full of open or hidden tales of personal dislocation, of social dislocation, and of cultural dislocation when viewed from the perspective of at least some of those to whom these languages spread. However, we tend to be so convinced that 'you can't fry omelettes without breaking eggs' that no other, less destructive metaphor occurs to us. We quickly, too quickly, place our hope in the ultimate beneficial effects of the sociocultural revolutions that necessarily accompany language spread. We all love winners and the study of language spread is replete with accounts of their prowess in bringing new products, technologies, ideologies, curricula, appreciations, opportunities (including creative opportunities) to the populations exposed to them (more quickly to elites and more slowly to masses). We tend to (or want to) forget that 'spread' is one of those anesthetic terms that numb us and lull us from feeling or even recognizing the multitude of pains and sins that they cover. If we add to our interest in 'spread' an interest in 'language policy', as I have been bidden to do in this paper, then we run the risk of overlooking another matter, namely, that spread not only involves conscious 'language policy', but unplanned spread as well, via Zeitgeist trends that can contribute as much or even more to spread than language policy per se. There is often a momentum to spread, a momentum to which social mobility aspirations contribute, as do the hungers for material and for leisure time gratifications, as does the apparent stylishness of the pursuit of modernity itself. All in all, it is the complex processes of culture contact, cultural diffusion, culture change, and culture conflict, and their dislocation of everyday life in all of its manifold activities, rather than language policy alone, that are involved in language spread. To reduce these manifold processes to the narrow parameters of language spread and language policy is, therefore, not only

to impoverish our understanding of the broader context in which these parameters are implanted but also to impoverish our understanding even of these parameters themselves.

If the affective tone surrounding the study of language spread is a triumphalist one, then the mood surrounding the study of language shift often becomes quite sombre. We now focus on the sorrows of the losers, on their endangered languages and on their anguish, trauma, and travail. We often sympathize with those whom history has defeated ('history' too, by the way, is a euphemism; otherwise we might have to admit that the cruel victors were flesh and blood, not only like us, but perhaps even our own forebears). However, as long as the vanquished are/were not flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood, we generally prefer to move on to less painful topics. Even the intellectualization of other people's pain (and intellectualization is the very heart of our enterprise, otherwise we may be taken for journalists or propagandists) is far from a happy or pleasant topic. There aren't many Nancy Dorians around who care to go back, time after time, to dying language communities, even for research purposes, although such communities contain the answers to many of the best, the most difficult and the most important questions: the questions of limits (of where and how to draw the line between dying and changing, between illness and health, between death and life). But, whether we attend to them or not, the endangered languages, i.e., languages with a large, sustained, and uncontrollable negative balance with respect to the discrepancy between their intergenerational influx and their intergenerational outflux of speakers, are there and their number is legion, as any reader of Cultural Survival Quarterly or Survival International News can plainly see, issue after issue, year after year.

Efforts to ameliorate the woes of endangered languages, to help them arrive at a *modus vivendi* (as opposed to a *modus 'morendi'*) with their more powerful competitors nevertheless go on, insufficient and thwarted though they may be. Often these efforts are in the hands of sociolinguistically untrained or only partially trained caretakers. Few language planning specialists read (or can read) what they write 'in those funny little languages of theirs,' and comparative studies or theories of assistance to endangered languages (i.e., language policy on behalf of endangered languages) are few and far between. However, it seems to me that if we are sensitive to the loss suffered by our collective 'quality of life' on this

planet when endangered animal species are further decimated, if we strain to do something on their behalf so that their natural habitats will be protected and their life chances improved (like holding off the repair and replacement of the West Side Highway in New York for over a dozen years because certain species of fish would never recover if their current breeding grounds were destroyed), then the need to look steadfastly and act affirmatively in connection with endangered languages should be even more obvious. Theoretically, there need be no conflict between language spread and language maintenance. Language spread may pertain to the acquisition of socioculturally new ('modern') functions, usually H-type functions, rather than to the displacement of speakers from their 'traditional' L-type functions. However, true though this may be theoretically, and I myself have testified many times to this theoretical truth, the complementary distribution of functions that it depicts is very often only an early and fleeting stage in a process which, if left unattended, easily develops into a subsequent stage in which that which is not theoretically necessary nevertheless, predictably, comes to pass: the spreading language initially associated with newer, more statusful roles and pursuits, soon competes with and also begins to erode the remaining functions originally allocated to the language(s) previously employed by the speech community. It is at this point that the danger begins.

The possibility of stabilization is there, of course. We call that possibility 'diglossia', namely, the copresence within an ethnolinguistic community of a widely implemented, generally accepted, and long-lasting complementary functional allocation of languages. We can all give examples of such consensual societal arrangements (even examples like Swiss German/High German, where no traditional religious props or social class advantages (like the monopolistic 'traditional' or premodern restriction of literacy) are available to provide the impetus for the continuation of such arrangements). But, after all is said and done, the diglossic solution to the problem of endangered languages is a very difficult one to arrive at under any circumstances, whether philosophically or empirically, all the more so under typically modern circumstances. And that brings me back to 'language policy'.

How can language policy be implemented so that endangered languages can find a safe harbor for themselves, tossed and battered as they soon are by the advancing

functional spread of competitor languages associated with far greater status rewards? I know that there are those who take the view that 'survival of the fittest' should prevail in the language arena, as it does in the jungle. I know there are those who declaim against language policy on behalf of endangered languages, considering it useless, seeing in it tendencies toward excess and toward fostering and exacerbating intergroup tensions, an interference with the rights of the majority to rule and an implicit vote of 'no confidence' in the inherent fairness of the majority if left to its own devices (i.e., without imposing laws requiring the protection of endangered languages). However, I happen not to agree with these folks. I do not really believe in the 'survival of the fittest', precisely because it is the law of the jungle and I have always tried to follow a higher law than that. Although I don't fully put my trust in princes in order to even the scales between the strong and the weak, I also do not expect much 'inherent fairness' toward lambs on the part of wolves. I know that my advocacy of endangered languages will be interpreted as reflecting a vested interest on my part (I admit it; I feel aggrieved that my own mother tongue is an endangered language and I have vowed to do what I can on its behalf); nevertheless, I feel that I can make as much claim for acting in the public good as can my opponents, and I suspect that they too must have a vested interest or two up their sleeves (interests which they insist on not disclosing and even on hiding) in championing a majority that really needs no support. So I return with unbowed head to my original question: given that language spread is not an unmixed blessing, leading in many cases to language shift and to endangering the very existence of smaller languages engulfed by the processes of sociocultural change in which language spread itself is a coparticipant, how can language policy be utilized on behalf of fostering a stabilized coexistence between the weak and the strong, between the lambs and the wolves?

Since considerable attention has already been directed at our meeting toward the English Official/English Only movement in the United States, a movement that seeks to utilize language policy on behalf of a powerful language (English in the United States) and against weaker languages in our country, I will attempt, at the particular request of our sponsors but hardly against my own will, to draw my examples from several other contexts that I have come to

know rather well over the past few years, namely, the cases of Basque, Frisian, Irish, and Yiddish, all of which raise in my mind questions of limits, i.e., are there stages of decline and conditions of endangerment beyond which the spread of a stronger competitor can no longer be contained? Or, to put it another way: can a better fit be engineered between language policy efforts on behalf of weaker languages and the particular functional circumstances in which such languages find themselves? In what follows, I ask you to keep in mind non-Western examples too, because although the specifics of my discussion will not apply to them, the general principles that I advance are, nevertheless, quite applicable.

The spread of endangered languages. If one examines the language status efforts on behalf of many endangered languages, one cannot help but be struck by the fact that they generally attempt to fight fire with fire. Faced by the progressive encroachment of a competitor within the gates of their own ethnolinguistic community, faced by the well-nigh complete control of the domains of power and modernity by this competitor, the loyalists to and the advocates of endangered languages commonly (all too commonly) lay plans to capture (or, in some cases, to recapture) 'the terrain of power and modernity'. Basque advocates work on terminologies for the natural sciences in higher education, because, presumably, that will advance the day when a unilingually Basque 'Basque Country' will arise again on both sides of the Pyrenees. Irish protagonists lay plans for governmental offices and agencies operating primarily in Irish, as befits 'the national and first official language' of their country. Frisian loyalists seek to conquer the secondary schools and the town councils, and Yiddish protagonists, from at least the time of the Tshernovits Language Conference of 1908 to this very day, are concerned with dictionaries and grammars, modern poetry and belles lettres, theatre and intellectual journals, and with corpus planning at least for purposes of popular science and intertranslatability with The New York Times. Although it is clear to those who adopt such policies for themselves, and to those who advocate them for others, that the time and effort invested in spreading their endangered language into the uppermost functions of modernity will (a) initially attract few who are both willing to and capable of using that language for these functions and (b) do little if anything to stem the

ongoing attrition with respect to the primary determinants of intergenerational language transmission (in Western or Westernized society: home, neighborhood, elementary school, work sphere, religious domain), nevertheless, such efforts continue unabated and represent major language policy decisions. Suggestions that a more modest target be aimed at, i.e., that the primary intergenerational arena be focused upon and shored up, are met with the scornful charge of 'folklorization', i.e., with accusations that such a narrower focus would be tantamount to surrendering the power- and status-related interactions of modern life (and, therefore, of language life) and of opting for trivialization via a focus on the rural past (old wives' tales and the folksongs and dances of a bygone age). The modern world, its genres and pursuits, has a tremendous fascination for language policy authorities, and understandably so, since they themselves are almost always modernized elites who have been fashioned in the crucible of modern tensions and aspirations.

The double 'approach-avoidance' dilemma. Actually, by the time a language is an endangered species, almost any proffered status planning solutions to its problems involve a high level of risk relative to the likely benefits to be gained thereby. Solutions that stress entry or reentry into modernization pursuits and interactions imply a policy of direct competition and confrontation with a stronger (and often increasingly stronger) competitor. Understandably, relatively few ordinary individuals are ready, either linguistically or philosophically, to embark on such a confrontation, particularly when the forces that foster it are primarily lingua-centric in nature. Studying (or teaching) astrophysics in Irish certainly proves that 'there is nothing deficient about our language; if we do not use it for astrophysics it is we who are at fault and not the language'. However, the huge amount of time, effort, and funds necessary in order to reach that goal (both in connection with perfecting the necessary terminologies and texts, and in connection with getting teachers themselves to learn and to use them) and the small number of individuals who will ever use Irish (or Xish) for that purpose, seriously raises the question of whether that is a wise policy or not, particularly when at the very time that astrophysics is being stressed, the attrition on the 'home front' is still going on among many, many more individuals than will ever hear of

astrophysics, let alone be enlightened by it. However, no sooner is the wisdom of pursuing such confrontational and multi-modern-functional priorities questioned and alternative emphases suggested focusing upon the family, the neighborhood, and the elementary school, i.e., upon the very domains and role relations that are at the core of socioculturally patterned language acquisition and, accordingly, upon the domains and interactions that are central to intergenerational ethnolinguistic continuity, no sooner are such emphases suggested than the bugaboo of 'folklorization' raises its head. If Frisian and Yiddish are to be related only or primarily to the vernacular intimacy of hearth and home, if they are to be denied meaningful roles in the world of modern concerns, aspirations, and statuses, then are they anything more than anachronistic spinning wheels and pious formulas in an age governed by computers, rockets, and the devil take the hindmost? Who wants spinning-wheel languages? Who needs them? Who stays with them after passing through adolescence and leaving home to find one's fortune in the big city? Isn't anything that might be won initially by this approach of shoring up the home front, ultimately lost in spades as the traditional and sheltered premodern world of parents and grandparents is left behind (even rejected) in a mad scramble to join the present and, better yet, the future?

Clearly, endangered languages and their custodians are damned if they do and damned if they don't, no matter what it is that they do or don't do in the language policy arena. Whether they fight language spread fire with fire or whether they fight it with water, the risks are apparently equally great and the outcomes equally dubious. They are buffeted by the double dangers of folklorization, on the one hand, and Irelandization on the other hand, and the more they seek to avoid the one, the more they risk gravitating toward the other. What can and what should a sociolinguistically informed language policy effort on behalf of endangered languages do? Is there any way out of their impasse?

Reasonable and reasoned compromise in language policy for endangered languages. If it is erroneous to pretend that 'nothing can be done for them by the time they are endangered', it also does not help to pretend that 'it is never too late' to rescue endangered languages, for, indeed, it often is too late relative to the amount of social control

that the policy planners who labor on their behalf either can or should exercise. However, it is definitely not automatically too late (as some misinformed observers would have it) merely because the 'endangered' stage has been reached. Even in our modern age, when speech communities are so highly interrelated and interdependent, a judicious combination of direct community-building efforts (these are indispensable; no language should be dependent on direct language policy efforts alone), on the one hand, and direct language policy efforts, on the other hand, can (re)stabilize speech community networks and the borders between networks. However, as in the case of all 'emergency first aid', the hemorrhaging of the main arteries must be stopped first, well before major attention is devoted to poetry journals, to astrophysics, and to the world of international power politics or even middle level technology. However, the central domains of intergenerational mother tongue continuity must also not be defined too narrowly either; they include not only hearth and home but neighborhood (i.e., residential concentration), elementary schooling, work sphere, and, often, the religious sphere as well. Taken together, these are the societal foundations that one inherits, that define community, and that one hands on to the next generation on a societal rather than merely on an individual basis. Given the Euro-American focus that we have adopted for our discussion, these are the primary societal institutions, and when a language is safe within them it has at least a generation's worth of breathing time and space. These are the initial institutions that transmit values and, therefore, these are the ones that transmit the values, loyalties, ideologies, philosophies, and traditions out of which a sense of community arises and is maintained, from which the call to loyalty to the necessarily interpreted ethnolinguistic past (as interpreted by the language loyalists) and the call to custodianship vis-à-vis the desired ethnolinguistic future are derived, are inculcated, are reinforced, and are legitimated.

Material and materialistic beings though we be, we still have not totally lost either the capacity or the need to live for ideals, for loved ones, for collective goals. It is via the primary sociocultural institutions that language is first related to the verities that make life worth living and it is to these institutions that policy makers must turn if they are to reconnect language with those verities. Every language needs an idea--a goal and a vision above the mundane and

the rational--to keep it alive. The basic and minimally essential 'idea' is the imperative of remaining a separate ethnolinguistic entity, and a struggling language community must safeguard this idea before all others. In healthy languages the 'idea' need not even be consciously recognized by the bulk of the speakers; in struggling languages, consciousness of personal responsibility for the language (the symbolic integrator of all that is good and precious), needs to be developed early and stressed repeatedly. The family, the neighborhood, the elementary school, and the church need to be urged, instructed, rewarded, and guided to play their irreplaceable roles in this connection. There is no substitute for them, nor for the ideas that they can espouse from the very earliest and tenderest years and, thereafter, throughout the life span (ideas such as the inherent right to continue, the duty to continue, the privilege of continuing the language-in-culture association of any community's historic preferred collective self-realization), no substitute, certainly, if vernacular functions are to be stabilized. These social functions are absolutely necessary and they must be reconquered first, because without them there are no vernacular functions at all that are intergenerationally transmitted, not even if quite a large number of people study astrophysics in Basque. But the family, neighborhood, and elementary school are not enough. They are necessary but they are not sufficient, least of all for 'moderns'.

'Man does not live by bread alone', the Sayings of the Fathers teach us, but also 'If there is no bread there is no learning'. Just as corpus planning without status planning is an empty game of silly linguists, so mesmerization by hearth and home is a romantic infatuation of ethnic innocents. Even while home and neighborhood are being revernacularized (via language associations of parents active in neighborhood nurseries and kindergartens, via language associations related to shopping and to fishing, to knitting and to reading, via language-related local sports teams for toddlers and singing contests for adolescents, via prizes for language-championing essays at every grade level and prepaid vacations for language-insistent and language-successful parents, via recognition in church and recognition in school in the many ways that dedication, piety, and excellence are normally recognized by every self-respecting society, but in this context: in connection with language), at this very same time the work sphere--particularly the lower and entry-level

work sphere--must also definitely be staked out early for language-related recognition, rewards, promotions, raises, and preferences of all kinds. The serious world of work and careers starts here and the bulk of the citizenry spends the bulk of its time over the bulk of its years in this world. This is the first area of language spread into which formerly endangered languages must be enabled (nay, must be shelteringly engineered) to expand. For many, it will be the last significant language spread they will experience, particularly so if we count the world of mass entertainment (whether sports or performing arts) as normally falling within the secondary rather than within the primary institutions of language maintenance, i.e., within the institutional structures that are generally not societally or familially transmitted from one generation to the next, institutions with a weaker moralistic flavor and institutions that individuals generally enter only after adolescence.

The world of work has no limit. It goes from entry level 'all the way up' and it is more likely than not that the further up it goes, the more it will be dominated by the competing language of greater power. The weak are always more likely to be bilingual than the strong, and those from the endangered language community who have the ability and seek the rewards related to the upper work sphere will definitely need to show versatility in the intra- or intersocietally competing language of wider communication. There may, indeed, be room for a poetry journal or two in Yiddish or for an organic chemistry text in Frisian, but I seriously doubt whether these need to be priority concerns, until and unless we are no longer dealing with endangered languages but with communities of sufficient autonomy, above and beyond cultural autonomy, to provide the dynamics for language spread into many of the higher and more powerful reaches of society. In most cases, however, such autonomy is not only not a realistic early goal, but on the contrary, it is actually a counterproductive early goal for languages in the endangered state. To pursue the social and political policies that such a goal implies, when the language itself is still seriously struggling for its very existence and when the higher reaches of power and authority are still far outside its grasp, rather than actually or even nearly within it, is to confuse the essential with the visionary, the immediate with the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. It is also tantamount to providing ammunition to the opposition that is

always waiting exactly for such errors in judgment in order better to be able to shoot down the entire restoration effort. It is tantamount to not recognizing that a functionally dislocated language needs generations of quiet and stability in the primary domains of intergenerational language continuity, rather than more turmoil, more dislocation, and more disturbance of the intimate patterns of daily life which nurture both a distinctive ethnocultural pattern and its traditionally associated language.

The most important lesson to remember and, apparently, the most difficult one to learn initially, is the following one: the intimate domains are also the most sheltered; they nurture intergenerational continuity, even if these domains are not the major movers and shakers of the modern world. On the other hand, the most powerful modern domains are also the most exposed to the vicissitudes of power confrontation; they do not lay the foundations of community, precisely because their impact upon us comes developmentally later in life and their aim is higher and their grasp is of greater scope than that of the immediately experienced speech community. Endangered languages must assume control of the former--the intimate spheres of family and community--even though they may never attain control of the latter--the status spheres of supralocal power and authority. Assuming control of the home and community domains means (re)building those domains via the endangered language, becoming inseparably interpenetrated by them, inextricably associated with them. In short, it means community building, community policy, community well-being, community institutions, community life, community activity, rather than language policy alone, language policy ad nauseam, language fears and dreams and nothing more. Language always exists in a cultural matrix, and it is this matrix that needs to be fostered via policy rather than the language per se. Not even linguists live by and for language alone; ordinary mortals are ever so much less capable of doing so. Language policy must maintain a fine balance between directness and indirectness, between figure and ground, between vinegar and honey. 'Lingua sana in communitas sana' is the only realistic goal for endangered languages; they must not become fetishes; rather, they must be intimately tied to a thousand intimate or small-scale network processes, processes too gratifying and rewarding to

surrender, even if they do not quite amount to the pursuit of the higher reaches of power and modernity.

Conclusions. 'A man's reach must exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?', Robert Browning opined, but that is a counsel that is tailor-made for those who can afford to fall flat on their faces if they reach too high. At the outset, and it is particularly the enfeebled outset that I am stressing because it is the stage of greatest risk, language policy for endangered languages must be more circumspect than that, more cautious, more calculating along risk-benefit lines. At the outset, before they acquire a dynamic of their own, all language policies must be sensitively harmonized with the functional profiles and the most crucial functional prospects of the languages on whose behalf they are formulated. Among endangered languages the hemorrhages in the realm of home and immediate community must be stopped first and quickly. The danger of folklorization, if, indeed, it exists (as in the rare case of 'nativization' movements), can be coped with later and more leisurely than can the danger of losing the remaining thinning ranks of mother-tongue speakers. 'What profiteth it man to gain the world and lose his soul?' What profiteth it Irish or Basque to gain astrophysics and to lose the Gaeltacht or the casarias? The 'dangers of folklorization' become real only after the primary ethnocultural domains have been fully secured. Until such time, the dangers of Irelandization are infinitely greater than those of folklorization.

An exaggerated abhorrence of 'folklorization' (exaggerated, certainly, if this designation is pejoratively and indiscriminately applied to the necessity of giving priority to the pursuits of hearth and home, and of daily life more generally, for languages that are still threatened in these very functions) undercuts the very sense of uniqueness, the sense of ethnolinguistic authenticity and distinctiveness, that are at the experiential foundations of ethnolinguistic continuity. Our kith and kin, our neighbors and friends, our colleagues and clergy, our regular customers and employees, our child socialization patterns and our local collective memories, festivities, customs, and traditions--these are the ultimately irrational *raison d'être* and building blocks of separate ethnolinguistic existence. A computer and an atom smasher by any other name are really exactly the same thing, but an ethnically encumbered interaction (such as the

celebration of a festival, a birth, a birthday party or a marriage ceremony) in a language other than the historically associated one, signals a different family culture, a different everyday reality, a different interpretation of and involvement in the tangible past, and a different view of the future. In short, as I first indicated 20 years ago in my Language Loyalty in the United States (1966), and as I subsequently theoretically elaborated in my Language and Nationalism (1972): a different language in the ethnoculturally encumbered interactions is indicative of a differently realized and implemented ethnocultural identity, a differently enacted and expressed ethnoculturally contrastive context, even if the same ethnic label is still utilized due to the elements of continuity that remain even after language shift occurs.

Living cultures and languages are always changing, of course, but language shift is indicative of a culture's inability to control or significantly influence the rate and direction of its change. Efforts to foster endangered languages represent the will of endangered networks that are conscious of the dangers in which they find themselves and that are eager to influence yet other networks that are not yet conscious of those dangers, to hold on to and to increase the historically validated content of their lives, or some more traditional version and interpretation thereof, rather than just to their identity-metaphors devoid of such historically validated content, to significantly control, influence, or guide their intercultural relations rather than to be merely the playthings, the by-products, the targets and captives of such relations under the control of others. Few of us, even the most powerful, are fully masters in our own homes; but none of us willingly settle for being strangers in our own homes, servants, dispossessed ghosts. It is not an ethnic label that we seek, but an ethnic content that strikes us as befitting the label, that seems to us to harmonize with it, that fits it in accord with our own historic image of 'goodness of fit' rather than in accord with someone else's.

Language policy on behalf of endangered languages must assure the intimate vernacular functions first, and, if possible, go on from there, slowly building outward from the primary to the secondary institutions of intergenerational mother tongue continuity. The entry-level work sphere is a must; the more advanced work sphere is a maybe. Diglossia is a must (with safely stabilized spheres exclusively for the

endangered language); monolingual economic autonomy and political independence are maybes. Widespread reconquest of the vernacular intimacy functions is a must; language spread into the higher reaches of power and modernity is a maybe. The rationalization of language policy for endangered languages is a must; the maximization of results from such policies is, at best, a maybe, because under conditions of rapid social change and dislocation, there are always multiple other forces and other considerations to contend with, above and beyond language policy on behalf of such languages.

And of what value is this entire exercise for all of those, and, probably, for most of us, who may actually be more interested in English and in French, in Latin and in Greek, in Spanish and in Potinhua, in Swahili and in Hindi? Is talk of minor, endangered languages which have a meager chance of surviving and even less chance of spreading) a fitting way to start off a conference on the unlimited horizons for language spread and language policy? Indeed it is, for just as illness teaches us about health, and just as psychopathology teaches us about what is normal in everyday mental life, so the problems of endangered languages teach us about the extreme delicacy of language policy and the extreme complexity of language spread. And while it behooves us to help these languages because they need our help most, because by doing so we become more human, we should also note that our involvement with them will also benefit us by making us more sensitive, more humble and more cautious language policy researchers and language policy implementers as well, researchers and implementers more likely to realize that for every gain there is a loss; for every self-satisfied smile, a despondent tear; for every glorious triumph, a tragic defeat. And that, I hope and believe, is certainly a fitting note on which to start our explorations of the next two days.

LANGUAGE SPREAD AND LANGUAGE POLICY: THE PROTOTYPE OF GREEK AND LATIN

Henry and Renée Kahane

University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign

The process of language spread, both unplanned and planned, is beautifully prefigured in the case histories of the two classical prestige languages, Greek and Latin. The adage by Heraclitus (Fragment 53), the pre-Socratic philosopher, that 'War is father of all, making some slaves, others free,' proved to be true also of language spread, when such spread occurred as a feature of colonization. Greek spread with the campaigns of Alexander the Great just as Latin spread with the Roman legions whenever, wherever they expanded the imperium. The linguistic implications of the military feats were complex.

The conqueror's language was not a unified one: it spread on two levels. On the one hand, the Greek soldiers spoke different and quite varied dialects; the Roman legionnaires came from linguistically different areas. The soldiers communicated among them by means of, respectively, a Greek or Latin *lingua franca*, that language with a minigrammar, and the conqueror and the conquered must have talked to each other in the same way. On the other hand, the colonial administration and the education of the upper classes brought the conqueror's official language into the area, and the coexistence of the creolized and the official language yielded a new standard known in the Hellenic East as the *Koiné*, and in the Roman West as *Vulgar Latin*. Certain typically creolistic features remained, such as, in both Greek and Latin, the reduction of the inherited Indo-European case system, or in Latin, the substratum feature known as Celtic Lenition, i.e., the voicing of intervocalic voiceless stops. Yet, a certain amount of restructuring restored various features of the grammatical system.

With the fourth and fifth centuries, the period of the disintegrating imperium, the chasm between the spoken and written forms of Latin grows ever wider. The lower classes, no longer free to move and thus bound to their piece of land, unlearn their modest (to begin with) practice of Latin. The cleric, forbidden to read the classical authors, turns into a social worker and loses his knowledge of 'good' Latin. The seventh and eighth centuries represent the nadir of Western culture, if we define culture in terms of the classical heritage. But then an incisive revival of Latin set in, promoted by a new role bestowed on the old language. Greek declined as the language of Christianity and Latin filled the gap, and by the fifth century it was unchallenged in the West in that function. The barbarian setting in the Roman Empire provided to Latin a new function: the social assimilation of the new powers was hastened by linguistic conformity. Latin was for the various Germanic kingdoms, which had settled in the various territories of the former empire, the vehicle of international acceptance. But which variety of Latin could satisfy the powers, church and state, in their search for a language?

The answer to our question is to be framed within the context of the dying imperium romanum, which was succumbing to the invasions of the Germanic tribes. In those areas of the empire from which the Roman legions were called back by the fourth century, the native language remained dominant (as in Germania, Britannia, and Africa) and Latin functioned as a superstratum. But where the legions remained (as in the provinces of Western Europe), Latin, then lingua franca of the empire, became dominant, and the native language, say Celtic in Gaul and Iberian in Hispania, functioned as the substratum. This situation produced two kinds of speakers of Latin: those whose native language was related to Latin, i.e., was Romance, and those whose native language was not. This obvious fact turns into the cardinal feature of our story on language policy. As Löfstedt (1965:81) remarked, the untrained Italian or Spaniard of those 'dark ages' wrote bad Latin; the untrained Irishman could write no Latin at all. If the speaker of Celtic and Germanic dialects wanted to gain access to the Scriptures, he had to devote special study to Latin. This educational situation explains the central role which Irish and British schools played in the foundation of medieval Latinity. As Vivien Law (1982) points out, the insular Latin grammarians

had to adapt pagan grammars of Roman antiquity for use by Christian pupils of a Celtic or Germanic mother tongue. The fusion between classical language doctrine and ecclesiastical usage represented a new pedagogical genre: the foreign language textbook. The insular grammars introduced not only the Christians of the British Isles but also the newly converted Germanic tribes on the continent to the language of the church. The form of grammatical presentation which they developed consisted of copious paradigms and examples, with only incidental attention to syntax and none to phonology, and it remained unchallenged in foreign language teaching until this century, our century.

Learning as a cultural task passed, in the seventh century, from Ireland into Northumbria, the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of North Britain. There, its most renowned practitioner was the master of the School of York, Alcuin. By fusing classical scholarship and Christian education, he became Britannia's star teacher. His fame spread and on a visit of his to Italy in A.D. 781, Charlemagne induced him to move to the land of the Franks, to reorganize the broken-down Merovingian education, and in 782 Alcuin settled in Aix-la-Chapelle, as the master of the Palatine School. His arrival became a turning-point in the history of Western diglossia.

Alcuin's ideal was 'an Athens in the Land of the Franks', i.e., a culture of the Seven Arts with integration of the Holy Spirit. Stimulated by such impulses, Charles issued, in 787, his famous capitulary, the first charter of education for the Middle Ages. The voice, it has been said, was that of Charles, but the hand was Alcuin's. The capitulary centered on language, and language, of course, meant Latin. The postulates: Impart order and grace to your sentences. Utterances should be free of errors. An unlettered tongue is unable to express thoughts aright. A lack of writing skills diminishes the power of understanding the Scriptures. The Scriptures contain images, tropes, and similar figures of speech: the better your learning, the better will be your understanding of the text, i.e., of the 'spiritual sense'.

Edelstein (1965) has well reconstructed from Alcuin's letters the educational goals of this perhaps most influential language planner of all times. As a creation of the so-called Carolingian Renaissance aiming at a Christian society, the ideas involved have sociological functions, yet through their tie to the Latin language synchrony is linked to diachrony: Latin is the embodiment of continuity and represents the

onus of tradition. The hyperonym of the semantic field which circumscribed Alcuin's educatio was, revealingly, eruditio, literally 'the freeing from rudeness'. This conviction reappears in various forms: thus, in the phrase 'to instruct the ignorants' or in the tenet 'a crowd of wise men means the health of the people'. With eruditio as the true target of education, those responsible for the task, i.e., the doctores, the teachers, are of a particular concern to Alcuin: mundus sine doctoribus salvus fieri non potest 'The world cannot become healthy without teachers.'

Erudition evolves as a composite of wisdom, health, and reading, which underlines the central function of the book, and in the so-called Carolingian Culture of the Book, reading has a theological meaning: it refers to the reading of the Scriptures. One aspect of the Culture of the Book that Alcuin emphasizes is relevant, indeed, in the context of the Carolingian revival: Traditiones in libris inveniuntur 'Traditions are found in books.' Traditions transmitted through writing can only be absorbed by reading, which presupposes the knowledge of Latin. Alcuin organizes its teaching: grammar, epistolography, the reading of pamphlets, and on the highest level, the sancta scriptura. Wisdom, to him, is the knowledge, thus acquired, of divine and human matters. The sociological effect was far-reaching: a class system based on the ability to read Latin. The rudis is on one side, the vir doctus is on the other. The rudis is incultus; the vir doctus is peritus rerum and peritus litterarum, familiar with facts and familiar with letters. The imperitum and indoctum vulgus is perceived as the antithesis of the privileged and more or less hermetic minority marked by their scolastica eruditio rooted in Latin.

With the creation of the Western national states around the sixteenth century, the national standard languages grew in pragmatic and symbolic significance. With printing expanding fast, education spread. With the insistence of the intolerant Renaissance humanists on correctness, Ciceronian correctness, Latin fell in disgrace with the bourgeoisie. Latin, as a living language, receded rapidly, and by the eighteenth century it was essentially gone.

Yet, its impact remained and was extraordinary. Medieval Latinity had contributed not only to Western social structure. Classical education, systematically carried on for centuries all over Europe, led to that linguistic conformity subsumed in Benjamin Whorf's acronym, SAE, Standard Average European.

SAE involves, above all, our style of writing, our abstract lexicon, and our metaphors. And this is, of course, the juncture where Greek comes in.

In mere terms of chronology the spread of Greek, that other superlanguage of ancient culture, preceded of course the expansion of Latin. Yet, the impact of Greek is intertwined with that of Latin, particularly within the frame of our remarks, so that the story of Latin functions as the channel of the Greek legacy.

In a social structure fragmented into city states with their particular regional dialects, the cultural and geographical center, Athens, provided the bond: the prose style of the fourth century Athenian authors, labelled Atticism, evolved as the common language of education, thereby corresponding, as much as possible, to what we understand by 'planning'. Atticism turned into the written language of Hellenism. And as such it became the language of colonial administration in Alexander's Empire and the Hellenistic monarchies of the diadochi. Interestingly, Atticism gained truly in force when Greek culture and letters and language spread in Rome during the Augustan Age. To the foreigner, the learner of Greek as 'a second language', it was a lingua scholastica 'school language', taught by purists according to rules. It was primarily a written, not a spoken language: imitation was expected; creativity, rejected. The fact that the Greek language came to life in Rome, i.e., in an exocentric environment, reminds us of the similar birth of medieval Latin. As we saw, the great push for Latin had its roots in Ireland and the Anglo-Saxon culture, where Latin was an unrelated and truly foreign language.

In the far-flung Hellenic world, Atticism took root in the cities whose role in the spread of Hellenization was paramount. Outside the cities, the various indigenous languages had a stronger vitality reflected in the development of the common spoken language, the Koiné, the Greek counterpart of Vulgar Latin. The grammarians of the new territories, guardians of a normative linguistic policy, were quite aware of the chasm between the two levels, Atticism and Koiné, and they expressed it by the two verbs and ἑλληνίζειν 'to speak like a Greek' and βαρβαρίζειν 'to speak like a barbarian'.

By the time of Christ's birth, under Roman domination, a largely unified prestige language existed in the entire eastern half of the Mediterranean, Egypt, Palestine, Syria,

Mesopotamia, Armenia, Asia Minor. Greek was used in daily talk, in the chancelleries, and in literary prose. To exemplify: In Coptic Egypt, the Greeks represented the upper class and Greek remained the language of administration under the Romans; about one-fifth of the indigenous Coptic lexicon consisted of Grecisms. Palestine, too, represented such bilingual culture: Aramaic was the language of the family, Greek the standard language of the country. Hebrew, of course, remained the language of religion, and a rabbi who rejected Aramaic is quoted as saying, 'Either the holy language or the Greek language' (Rosén 1980:226, n. 20).

But the Greek world of the East went largely down under the hammerblows of history: the expansion of Islam in the seventh century and the invasion of Byzantine Asia Minor by the Seljuks in the eleventh century. Greek continued to exert an extraordinary impact lasting into our days in the West. Linguistically, the gestalt of this influence is most interesting: it went through the medium of another language. Our experience of Greek is vicarious. We are dealing with the phenomenon labelled by Paul Friedlander 'the Greek behind the Latin'.

During the six centuries from the third B.C. to the third A.D., the educated Roman was bilingual--able to speak, read, and write Greek in addition to Latin. The two languages had their distinct roles: the ideal Roman, as Toynbee (1973) notes, had to know Latin in order to participate in the world's government, and Greek in order to participate in the world's cultural life. Greek was a status symbol. The Greek tradition was stable among the aristocracy and the upper bourgeoisie, in Rome as well as in the provinces. With the expansion of Latin in the papal chancellery, Greek began to lose ground and by the sixth century Greek as a living prestige language was gone. But just as, a millenium later, the standardization of the Western languages resulted from a blending of the respective vernacular and the Latin heritage, so in the final stage of the ancient world the standard resulted from a blending of Vulgar Latin and the Greek heritage. The Latin Bible translation, for example, rested on a high degree of Hellenization. Coseriu 1971 sees in the Greek impact the central problem of Vulgar Latin, i.e., the foundation of the Romance languages. For Bonfante 1960, Italian is a synthesis of Latin and Greek.

The Greek heritage hides everywhere behind the Latin word. Bartoli 1925 senses in the phenomenon of borrowing by translating, usually named 'calque', a fusion of spirito greco and materia latina. 'Greek spirit', in a lexicological context, pinpoints the great Greek contribution: the ability to grasp abstract concepts by expressing them in terms of concrete experience, i.e., through metaphorization; and Greek metaphorization went traditionally in a chain of translations from Greek through Latin into the modern languages.

Three adjectives referring to qualities of the mind may exemplify the hundreds of metaphorizations which are part and parcel of our daily language (Thomas 1891:s.vv). Gr. λαμπρός 'bright, radiant' was metaphorized to 'illustrious'; it influences synonymous Lat. clarus 'bright, shining' in its use as 'celebrated', which in turn stimulated both Eng. bright (N.E.D.:s.v., 6) and Germ. glänzend to mean 'illustrious'. Gr. βαθύς 'deep' (i.e., 'extending far down') was metaphorized as 'wise', a process echoed in Lat. profundus, with secondary echoes in Eng. deep and Germ. tief. Gr. κωφός 'blunt, dull, obtuse' leads to the metaphor 'dumb'; the shift is imitated in Lat. obtusus and hebes 'dull-witted', and then is copied in Eng. dull and Germ. stumpf, stumpfsinzig 'not sharp of wit'.

To sum up: We were asked to read the linguistic concepts 'planning' and 'spread' in the context of the two classical prestige languages, Latin and Greek. Viewed from this specific angle, as the effect of language policy, vital features of our Western linguistic culture found, we believe, their evident and convincing explanation. Let us emphasize four aspects of the complex problem.

1. Ferguson's formula of H and L provides the basic idea of a class structure resting in education. The Carolingian revival of Latin as the language of the imperium reborn institutionalizes language as the dominant criterion for more than a millenium.

2. Whorf's formula of SAE, 'Standard Average European', summarizes the idea of a Western Sprachbund unified, essentially, through its shared Latinistic heritage.

3. Metaphors are a common possession of Western civilization to such a degree that Weinrich (1976) speaks of a 'European metaphorical community'. Yet, the creative spirit behind the metaphors was primarily Greek: many of them reached us through a chain of translations.

4. The greatest and most lasting impact of the ancient heritage did, not, however, exert itself through opposition

between, but through fusion of, the two levels, the language of the book and the language of the street. Latin was nativized and played its weighty but covert role, and our modern standard languages were born. The Middle Ages were over; the modern times were at hand, and language is a weighty criterion of the march of history.

References

Various aspects of the topic at hand have been stimulatingly treated in Pisani 1960, Reichenkron 1965, and Zgusta 1980. We drew, furthermore, on several studies of our own: Kahane 1979, 1980a, 1980b, 1986.

- Bartoli, Matteo. 1925. Introduzione alla neolinguistica. Biblioteca dell'Archivum Romanicum, ser. II, vol. 12.
- Bonfante, Giulio. 1960. Les rapports linguistiques entre la Grèce et l'Italie. In: *Hommages à Léon Herrman*. Collection Latomus 44. 171-82.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1971. Das Problem des griechischen Einflusses auf das Vulgärlatein. In: *Sprache und Geschichte: Festschrift für Harri Meier*. Edited by E. Coseriu and W.-D. Stempel. München: Fink. 135-47.
- Edelstein, Wolfgang. 1965. *Eruditio und sapientia: Weltbild und Erziehung in der Karolingerzeit. Untersuchungen zu Alcuins Briefen*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach.
- Ferguson, Charles. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15.325-40.
- Friedlander, Paul. 1943-44. The Greek behind Latin. *Classical Journal* 39.270-77.
- Kahane, Henry. 1986. A typology of the prestige language. *Language* 62.495-508.
- Kahane, Henry and Renée. 1979. Decline and survival of Western prestige languages. *Language* 55.183-98.
- Kahane, Henry and Renée. 1980a. Humanistic linguistics. In: *Contemporary studies in Romance linguistics*. Edited by Frank H. Nuessel. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club. 159-92. (Reprinted in: *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 17 [1983].65-89.)
- Kahane, Henry and Renée. 1980b. Paideia, a linguistic subcode. In: *Wege zur Universalienforschung: Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler*. Edited by G. Brettschneider and Chr. Lehmann. Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 145. Tübingen:

- Narr. 509-20. (Reprinted in: *Language change*. Edited by I. Rauch and G. F. Carr. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 175-91.)
- Law, Vivien. 1982. *The insular Latin grammarians*. Studies in Celtic history 3. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Brydell Press.
- Löfstedt, Bengt. 1965. *Der hibernolateinische Grammatiker Malchasanus*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Latina Upsaliensia 3.
- Neumann, Günter, and Jürgen Untermann. 1980. *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit*. Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher 40.
- Pisani, Vittorio. 1960. *Storia della lingua greca*. In: *Enciclopedia classica*, II:5, vol. 1. Torino: Soc. Editrice Internazionale. 1-132.
- Reichenkron, Günter. 1965. *Historische latein-altromanische Grammatik*, I. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz.
- Rosén, Haiim. 1980. *Die Sprachsituation im römischen Palästina*. In: Neumann and Untermann (1980:215-39).
- Thomas, Robert. 1891. *Zur historischen Entwicklung der Metapher im Griechischen*. Diss. Erlangen: Univ. Buchdruckerei.
- Toynbee, Arnold. 1975. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his world*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Weinrich, Harald. 1976. *Münze und Wort: Untersuchungen an einem Bildfeld*. In: *Sprache in Texten*. Stuttgart: Klett. 276-90.
- Whorf, Benjamin. 1941. *The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language*. In: *Language, culture, and personality: Essays in memory of Edward Sapir*. Edited by L. Spier et al. 75-93. (Reprinted in: *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings*. Edited by J. B. Carroll. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 1956. 134-59.)
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1980. *Die Rolle des Griechischen im römischen Kaiserreich*. In: Neumann and Untermann (1980:121-45).

LANGUAGE CONTACT, VARIATION AND DIFFUSION: MICROLEVEL COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES

John R. Rickford
Stanford University

Fifteen years ago--during my first year as a graduate student at the University of Pennsylvania--I sat in this very hall for my very first Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. The theme of that conference was 'Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects,' and I remember the heady excitement of meeting and listening to people I had known previously only from their works, and of trying to decide which of the fascinating interest groups I would attend. Although I had been specializing in sociolinguistics since my undergraduate days, that 1972 Georgetown University Round Table convinced me that there was no more exciting subject in the entire world, and nothing else that I would rather do. In the light of current emphases on formalism and abstract structure, students specializing in sociolinguistics don't always feel that way. But you need that sense of subject and self-worth to pull you through the pressures of graduate work and dissertation writing. And so I wish to begin by thanking the organizers and participants of GURT 1972, somewhat belatedly, for helping to fire me with that passion for sociolinguistics, and I also wish to express the hope that those of us involved in GURT 1987 may be able to do something similar for others.

The study of languages and dialects in contact--and of the variability and diffusion that accompany such contact--is potentially important to linguists of virtually every specialization (grammarians, historical linguists, psycholinguists, sociolinguists, applied linguists), but to each in somewhat different ways. In this paper, I will adopt the perspective of sociolinguistics, my primary interest.

From the perspective of the development of sociolinguistic theory, the study of languages in contact is significant as the focus of some of the earliest work in modern sociolinguistics--for instance, McDavid's (1948) study on the spread of unconstricted /-r/ in South Carolina. This paper was clearly an inspiration to Haver Currie, who referred to it at some length in the (1952) paper in which he proposed a field of study attending explicitly to the 'social functions and significations of speech' (p.28), and coined the term 'sociolinguistics' for it. Throughout the 1950s, Haugen, Weinreich, Ferguson, Fisher, Gumperz, and others began to construct modern sociolinguistics through their descriptions of and theoretical generalizations about multilingual contact situations of various kinds. And although the methodologies and conceptualizations introduced by Labov and others in the 1960s and 1970s represent obvious advances for sociolinguistics, one cannot help remarking (when one takes the trouble to go back and read it, at least) how much of that early contact-based literature remains relevant.

From the perspective of current sociolinguistic theory, the study of languages and dialects in contact (as against their study in isolation--idealized or actual) is important for our understanding of the mechanics of and motivation for synchronic variation and diachronic change. It is perhaps no accident that sociolinguists from very diverse strands are all currently engaged in the study of contact and diffusion issues: Labov and Trudgill, for instance, on the diffusion of urban dialect features; Cooper, Fishman, and Kachru on the spread of English and other languages; Giles, Le Page, and their colleagues on sociopsychological aspects of interspeaker accommodation and identity; Alleyne, Bickerton, and others on substratal versus universal factors in creole genesis.

However, I believe that our understanding of how and why language contact and diffusion occur would be particularly enriched (and sociolinguistics would benefit accordingly) if more of us concentrated on small, relatively self-contained communities and drew on ethnographic observation, interviewing, and reconstruction to explore the social and linguistic milieu in which particular instances of diffusion or nondiffusion occur. Although this approach is by no means original to me (it's what the pioneers of the forties and fifties were doing, after all), it might be useful to characterize it here as the microlevel community perspective, to emphasize that it is different from but

complementary to other approaches which others have fruitfully been adopting: for instance, the macrolevel study of spread across nations or continents or more abstract deductive theorizing about relevant parameters.¹

From this point on, I wish to review briefly a few recent studies of past and current contact situations which take this microlevel community perspective, attempting to demonstrate that each adds something valuable (sometimes small, but always valuable) to our understanding of why and how spread or decline occur--new facts or insights or hypotheses, or confirmations and extensions of earlier ones. Although I agree with Weinreich (1953) and Labov (1966) that it is equally important to attend to internal as well as external factors, I will give rather more attention to the external (sociopsychological) ones, partly because I think these are vital to the theoretical issues we face (contrary to the assumptions of many formal linguists), and partly because much of the significant recent microlevel work on diffusion (for instance, Trudgill 1986) concentrates on internal constraints.

Former contact situations. Pidgin-creole studies is one subfield in which issues of how and why new varieties arise and spread are crucial, but often addressed through thought-experiments and unconstrained speculation about the past. There are some valuable exceptions, however, including the sociohistorical studies of Rens (1953) on Sranan in Suriname, Le Page (1960) on Jamaican Creole, and Baker (1982) on Mauritian Creole.

One microlevel study which falls within this sociohistorically informed category--one as yet relatively unknown--is Zenk's (1984, in press) work on the conditions under which Chinook Jargon rose to prominence on the Grand Ronde reservation in western Oregon which was established by the United States government in 1856. His documentary research reveals that the various Indian tribes forcibly brought together there spoke at least nine different languages, none numerically dominant (see Table 1), and that a number of other factors conspired to ensure that Chinook Jargon rather than any of those languages would become the medium of communication and integration within that community. One such factor was the Native preference for local exogamy. From a compilation of 117 husband-wife pairs between 1856 and 1907, Zenk (1984:109) found 49 cases in which both

spouses' tribal affiliations were recorded; in only four of these (8%) were husband and wife from the same tribe.

Table 1. Languages and tribes represented in Grand Ronde in 1877 and 1887, expressed as fractions of total population (not tabulated: Canadian French). Adapted from Zenk (in press).

Languages	Government tribal designations	1877	1887
Molala	Molala	.07	.08
Upper Chinookan	Clackamas, Oregon City	.13	.16
Northern Kalapuyan	Tualatin, Yamhill	.13	.13
Central Kalapuyan	Santiam, Luckiamute, Mary's R.	.17	.20
	('Calapooia')	.04	.01
Southern Kalapuyan	Yoncalla		.01
Umpqua Athabaskan	Umpqua	.17	.19
Takelma	Rogue River, Cow Creek	.20	.13
Shasta Shastan	Shasta	.09	.05
Others			.04

Drawing on his own interviews with elder members and former members of this community as well as historical and other sources, Zenk is able to provide other quantitative and qualitative details about Jargon use in this community. For instance, through collations of information about 151 individuals to whom various degrees of Jargon use could be attributed, he is able to trace the decline in the knowledge of tribal languages, the rise of Jargon, and the eventual displacement of Jargon by English over successive generations. He also shows that even after community members were capable of communicating in English, they often preferred to use Jargon for workaday functions because of its

symbolic associations with their Indian identity, and they also reserved it for certain literary-aesthetic functions (see Hymes and Zenk, in press).

Dutton's (1983) sketch of two pidginized versions of native languages in the Gulf of Guinea--based on contemporary sources as well as interviews with the descendants of former pidgin speakers--is also like a breath of fresh air, in part because it takes us away from the beaten track of European pidgins and creoles, and in part because it enriches pidgin-creole theory. The languages he describes are pidginized versions of Eleman and Koriki used by the Motu people from around Port Moresby (see Map 1) when they sailed several hundred kilometers to the west on hiri or trading expeditions. On these hiri, which continued up until recent decades, the Motu would exchange their pots for the Eleman and Koriki peoples' sago and canoe logs. The Motu crew of each such voyage, comprising about 29 members, would spend two months or more in the village of their Eleman or Koriki hosts, which numbered from several hundred to two thousand people and were known for cannibalism and savagery. Not surprisingly (and in line with what we know of the relation between power asymmetry and choice of lexical base in other contact situations), the trade languages were lexically based on Eleman and Koriki rather than on Motu.

Dutton's paper provides a relatively detailed linguistic description of these contact varieties, but also includes information about the social context which goes beyond what those speculating about pidgin-creole formation have been able to dream up: for instance, the fact that women and girls in the Eleman/Koriki villages knew little of these languages because they were not directly involved in the trade and because familiarity between visitors and host village women was discouraged (p.83); or the fact that trade partnerships were handed down from father to son in both the Motu and Eleman/Koriki villages, so that kin-like relations developed between them over time (p. 85). Most interesting, however, is Dutton's hypothesis that the necessary and sufficient conditions in which contact languages of this type arise are twofold: '(a) both sets of traders must speak different languages; and (b) one set of traders has to be placed in a vulnerable position vis-à-vis the other' (p. 100). The Motu were vulnerable, not only because they were outnumbered far from home, but also because their canoes were actually

dismantled and rebuilt during the visit to accommodate the return cargo. Dutton finds this hypothesis confirmed in all but one case in Papua New Guinea (that of Mailu, where vulnerability existed but no trade language developed; see Dutton 1978). It is worth consideration more generally.

Map 1. Sketch map of languages of the hiri area, Papua New Guinea (source: Dutton 1983:78. Used with permission of Karoma Publishers, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich.).

This content has been removed due to copyright restrictions. To view the content on p.30, please refer to the print edition of this work.

Finally, there is Warner-Lewis's (1982) dissertation on the decline of Yoruba in Trinidad, which brings to mind Dorian's celebrated (1981) account of the death of East Sutherland Gaelic. In both cases the study is based on interviews conducted over many years with the last generations of

speakers of the waning language, most of whom do not survive the completion of the study, embodying and actualizing the metaphor of language death. Warner-Lewis's speakers are second and third generation descendants of Yoruba indentured laborers brought to Trinidad in the late nineteenth century (along with Indians and other ethnic groups), after the abolition of slavery. Here is an example of their language--a lament uttered by the husband of one of the informants when he awoke in hospital (Warner-Lewis 1982:73):

(1) Ara'lé o o	'People of my household,
sé ni mo mà jí ire?	Is it true that I have woken well?
sé ni mo mà jí ire?	Is it true that I have woken well?
Kò sẹ' bi a bí'mọ ni	This is not the place that I was born.'

Warner-Lewis deals most extensively with the lexico-semantics, morphosyntax, and phonology of this Yoruba, which shows 'monostylism and shrinkage in syntactic range' (p. ii), much as reported by Dorian (1981) and Dressler (1982) for language death in Europe. But in a rich chapter on 'The sociolinguistic context of Trinidad Yoruba' (chap. 3), she provides valuable documentation of the dislocation of values and relationships within the family domain which, as Joshua Fishman reminded us at the opening session of this Round Table, is the other side of language spread, the side we see only when we consider the displaced language. For instance, she notes (p. 66) that, given the multiple infringements of the law to which lower-class people in general and African immigrants in particular were wont (squatting on crown lands, defaulting on mortgages, drumbeating at unauthorized hours, the practice of obeah), Yoruba served as a concealment language for its in-group: Olókpa m bò wá 'The policeman is coming' was a well-known secret code.¹ But, she continues, 'as the African communities declined, not only law officers, other African nationalities and Creoles in general were treated as outsiders, but even the creole relatives of the Africans.' Such creole or locally born relatives, suffused

with the Eurocentric prejudices of the new environment (in which Creole French and English were spoken), sometimes made fun of the tonal characteristics of the older people's Yoruba, described it with epithets like 'hog,' 'pig', and 'coarse' (p. 90), and in some cases even forbade the older people from using it in the household. In reaction, the first generation Yoruba were poignantly defiant of their right to their own language ('I sell with the language,' one declared, 'so let me dead with it'), but for fear of being betrayed, refrained from passing it on to their children and grandchildren. As Warner-Lewis eloquently puts it (p. 68), they were 'caught in a vise between the cultural instinct to perpetuate their culture on the one hand, and to withhold the vehicle of that information on the other.' Thus we see the forces of language spread and retreat, although originating in the external environment, eventually becoming internalized, as the Yoruba contributed to their own language's demise for their own self-preservation and integrity.

What this study adds to our knowledge, among other things, is a heightened awareness of the conflict and poignancy which can accompany the nontransmission of ancestral languages in immigrant situations; the words and life stories of individual 'survivors' take us deeper into the ambience of this harsh language death situation and help us to compare its ecological and ethological/emotional (Whinnom 1971) dimensions with other known cases. It is significant, for instance, that Dressler's (1982:325) skeleton flow-chart of the 'necessary (but not sufficient!) causes' of language decay, although constructed on the basis of European cases, applies equally well to Trinidad Yoruba: social subordination --> negative sociopsychological evaluation --> sociolinguistic restriction --> linguistic decay↑↑.

Current contact situations. When we turn to existing contact situations, we of course have even better opportunities to pinpoint the nature of linguistic diffusion between groups and to understand the ecological and ethological dimensions of their social contact. But taking full advantage of such opportunities again involves the selection of microlevel units (neighborhoods rather than nation-states), and the willingness to search for answers in ethnographic observation and interviewing within the community itself. Several studies have already established

the value of this approach: the work of the Université du Québec à Montréal group on variation in Montreal French (see Sankoff 1986 for several recent reports); the work of Gal (1979) on the spread of German at the expense of Hungarian in Oberwart, Austria; the work of the Milroys in Belfast, particularly their (1985) paper on the importance of weak network ties in the diffusion of linguistic change; the work of Labov and his colleagues (Labov and Harris 1986, Ash and Myhill 1986) on the relations between black and white vernaculars in Philadelphia; and the work of Eckert (1986) on high school Jocks and Burnouts and the spread of linguistic change in suburban Detroit. Here I report briefly on some recent and ongoing studies of my own in this category, noting some points of contact with these other studies.

My (1985) study of the diffusion of vernacular features across ethnic boundaries on a South Carolina Sea Island (population around 100) indicated that several phonological variables were treated similarly by blacks and whites, but not so grammatical ones (such as plural and possessive marking and the passive). As I tried to understand how black Mrs. Queen and white Mr. King could fail to share more after living on a small island for over 80 years, it became clear from observation and oral history that they rarely had the close face-to-face interaction and personal associations which seem to promote convergence elsewhere. As Labov and Harris (1986:20) note, 'linguistic traits are not transmitted across group boundaries simply by exposure to other dialects in the mass media or in schools,' but through interpersonal interaction.

In my (1979) work on sociolinguistic variation in Cane Walk, Guyana, I was particularly intrigued by the sharp linguistic stratification between the community's two primary social classes, the estate class cane cutters and field workers (=working class) and the nonestate class shopowners, clerks, school teachers and contractors (=lower middle class). The sociolinguistic difference is obvious in the following samples.

The first is a description of a game, 'Sal', by Derek, a 14-year-old estate class member:

- (2) An if de nak yu, yu out. an if yu ron out til outsaid
 an yu kom bak an halo "saal out!," do miin yu pardno
 no--wo get out--hii kon kom in bak di geem. bot if

yu o wan kyaptin an yu ge nak, di hool said out. (SI 52)

'And if they knock you, you're out. And if they run all the way out and come back and holler, "Salt out!," that means your partner isn't--the one who'd been out--he can come back in the game. But if you're a captain and you get knocked, the whole side is out.'

Note the many creole features in his speech, including lax open vowels in pronominal yu and de (his laxing frequency in 127 such cases is 72%), the creole indefinite article (wan kyaptin), the absence of copula is or are (yu out).

The second is a description of a Kali Mai ceremony at which evil spirits are cast out, provided by 14-year-old Katherine, a nonestate class member who lives on the same street as Derek, one block away. Like (1), this is an extract from a longer text in Rickford (1987a):

- (3) laik diiz piipl, rait? dee fain dir sik, rait? ... deed say wel, dee teek yu tu dis leedi imself, rait? di see dot shiiz di--am--di kalii mai, rait? shiiz hi modo ov di ooshon. (SI 94)

'Like these people, right? They find they're sick, right? ... They'd say well, they take you to this lady herself, right? They say that she's the--am--Kali Mai--right? She's the mother of the ocean.'

Although Katherine's speech here is about as casual as she gets anywhere in the interview, it is obviously closer to the standard English or acrolectal pole of the continuum, including tense or long pronominal vowels (as in dee; in 122 tokens, her overall laxing rate is only 32%, compared with Derek's 72%) and the English copula (dir sik, shiiz di modo).

Table 2. Location of occupations and best friends of 24 Cane Walkers.

Dimension	Estate class	Nonestate class	Chi square	Sig. level
No. who work in Cane Walk	12/12	5/12	9.88	.01
No. of best friends in Cane Walk	42/47	23/55	24.80	.001

Now we can relate these dramatic linguistic differences between Derek and Katherine to a number of factors having to do with their social networks and orientations and the social history of the village. When asked to name five best friends, four of those named by Derek were from Cane Walk, but none of Katherine's was. As Table 2 shows, this was in line with a more general pattern by which estate class members' occupational activities and friendship networks were locally based, and those of the nonestate class members located outside the village, particularly in the nearby capital city of Georgetown. Compare Milroy (1980) on the relationship between local network strength and vernacular usage in Belfast.

Ultimately, however, both these language use and network differences are symptoms of something more fundamental: a difference in sociopolitical orientations and values. Cane Walk itself is linked historically with plantation culture, and the retention of creole language by estate class workers and their families is to some extent a symbolic assertion of that link (and defiance of Georgetown's middle class values--see Edwards 1983) by those who walk the same dams and do the same work their immigrant forefathers did. By contrast, Georgetown, the capital city, is the historical seat of government, and site of the 'best' schools (one of which Katherine attends) and much of the country's middle class; the nonestate Cane Walkers have by definition broken off from the estate occupations and culture of their forefathers. Although they still live in Cane Walk, these nonestate class members often seek upward social mobility through jobs and friendship networks with higher status Georgetown groups, and through the use of language varieties closer to Standard English.

My final piece of data is from a study we have just started into the relations between black and white Vernacular English in East Palo Alto (EPA), California, a city of 18,000 which (according to the 1980 census) is 61% black and 11.5% white. When complete, our sample will consist of equal numbers of blacks and whites from both sexes and three age levels; interviewers are generally drawn from the community and matched to subjects by sex and race. We are still very much at the data collection stage, but some preliminary results on copula absence and invariant be from a few of the adolescents and preadolescents in our sample are worth reporting.

The extract which follows is from an interview with Foxy Boston, a 13-year-old black girl from East Palo Alto.²

- (4) "Shoot, I know I do, cause I be wakin' up an' I be slurpin' (?), I be goin',"DANG, THA'S SERIOUS!" Guess who I had a dream about, y'all!" (Laughs) An' I go to school, I'll go, "Guy! Y'all guys--" When I get on the school bus--when I get on the city bus in the mornin'? All our frien's be comin' to pick me up, an' I go pick--we be all meet at the bus stop? Then they be sayin', "Guess what, girl! I's somp'n serious happen yesterday," they tellin' me. Then we be--I would break out (?), "Guys! Guess what?! Somp'n SERious HAPPen girl! Guess who I had a dream about?! Tha's serious, man! Guess who I dream bout?! DANG, THA's SERIOUS!" They be goin', "Who? Who you have a dream for?" An I tell 'em, they go, "THA's SERIOUS! DANG, THA'S SERIOUS!" (EPA 7)

Table 3 shows the use of invariant habitual/durative be in Foxy's tape-recorded speech (the interview lasted approximately one and a half hours), and compares it with data from other sources.³

Table 3. Invariant (habitual/durative) be usage by black speakers in various parts of the United States.

Foxy Boston	EPA (n=150)	__NP 2%	__Adj 9%	__Loc 13%	__V+ <u>ing</u> 76%
Texas children*	(n=111)	__NP 7%	__Adj 5%	__Loc 16%	__V+ <u>ing</u> 72%
Detroit adults**	(n=93)	UMC 2	LMC 2	UWC 21	LWC 69

* Data from 20 lower class children, 12-13 years old, Brazos Valley, East Central Texas (excluding 6 miscellaneous cases), as reported in Bailey and Maynor (1986:13-14).

**Data from 48 adults, as reported in Wolfram (1969:198).

The fact that Foxy by herself has more tokens of this distinctive Black English Vernacular (BEV) feature than occur in the entire Detroit or Texas samples is proof-positive that she is a vernacular speaker, and that BEV is alive and well on the outskirts of Stanford and Silicon Valley.⁴ The fact

that Foxy is female makes her data even more interesting, for much of the literature on BEV is based on the language of black males.

Foxy's data is similar to Bailey and Maynor's adolescent data insofar as be occurs three-quarters of the time before Verb+ing. Noting that this is not the case with their older folk speakers, who use be only 23% of the time before Verb+ing,⁵ Bailey and Maynor hypothesize that structural change has taken place/is taking place in this area of the BEV grammar, with the youngest generation using be more as an auxiliary than a copula. Since we have not examined comparable be from EPA adults, we cannot as yet confirm or reject this hypothesis.

Table 4. Copula absence (no is or are) among black speakers in various parts of the United States.

	<u>NP</u>	<u>Adj</u>	<u>Loc</u>	<u>V+ing</u>	<u>Gonna</u>	Total
Foxy	55%	94%	84%	100%	93%	86%
Boston, EPA	(31)	(79)	(19)	(24)	(14)	(167)
Texas	12%	25%	22%	74%	89%	28%
children	(373)	(200)	(98)	(78)	(53)	(802)
Detroit WC adults*	47%	37%	44%	50%	79%	?
NYC Cobras**	14%	72%	31%	59%	78%	?
LA adults**	32%	56%	33%	62%	72%	?

N's in parentheses, where available.

*For preceding pronoun only; Wolfram (1969:172).

**For is absence only; Baugh (1979:180-81), Labov (1982:189).

Table 4 provides comparable data on copula absence.⁶ Again, Foxy has higher frequencies of the vernacular variant (zero) in every category than the BEV speakers in the other studies; in fact, her overall zero copula rate is close to categorical, and is actually so before progressives (Verb+ing).⁷ Her data is comparable to that of the other groups insofar as a following NP is least favorable to copula absence,⁸ but

unlike them in exhibiting no statistical difference between the locative,⁹ adjectival, and gon(na) environments (chi square = 0.74).¹⁰ These are like the progressive in being essentially categorical copula absence environments; Foxy's output represents variable copula absence taken to (virtual) completion.

Table 5 provides comparable data on copula use among two other EPA girls, nine years old (almost 10), both students at an overwhelmingly black private Lutheran school in the area. Elsie Shane is the only white person in her class. Martha Huff, her best friend (they were interviewed together), is black, and is indignant at the 'reverse racism' which Elsie encounters in school. What Table 5 demonstrates dramatically is that Elsie has not only NOT absorbed copula absence from her environment, but that her black friend Martha seems to have accommodated to her (Giles and Smith 1979) rather than vice versa, deleting only four copulas overall, although these are appropriately distributed in V+ing and gonna environments.¹¹ Neither speaker used a single invariant habitual/durative be.

Table 5. Copula absence (zero is, are) among two EPA friends.

	(n)	<u>__NP</u>	<u>__Adj</u>	<u>__Loc</u>	<u>__Ving</u>	<u>__Gonna</u>	Total
Elsie Shane, white (43)		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Martha Huff, black (66)		0%	0%	0%	8%	43%	5%

Elsie's case to some extent recalls that of Carla, the 13-year-old white girl in a black Camden (New Jersey) neighborhood who sounded black but turned out on closer inspection not to have copula absence and other core BEV grammatical features (see Hatala 1976, Labov 1980, but also Butters 1984). Both cases--and this is also true of my white Sea Island speaker (see Rickford 1985)--support Labov and Harris's (1986:20) observation that the linguistic influence that takes place when a dominated and dominant dialect are in contact is asymmetrical: speakers of the former acquiring the latter but not the reverse. We have reservations about their additional observations (*ibid.*, 21) that 'abstract linguistic structure has little or no social impact on members

of the community,' and that 'social networks have little explanatory value for differences in individual rule systems' (social history being more significant), but we will be in a better position to address these issues as our familiarity with the community as a whole and with individual speakers increases. We are using a relatively new method of tracing personal networks (McAllister and Fischer 1978) which allows us to go beyond the naming of three or five best friends common in earlier network research. And, in order to assess the full range of speaker's competence in the verbal repertoire of the community and the symbolic significance of what they display in performance, we plan to explore several other variables and to draw on repeated interviews with different interviewers and more direct questioning than is usual in sociolinguistic surveys (see Rickford 1987b for discussion).

Summary. The study of language contact, variation and change has been important to sociolinguistics from its very beginnings, and continues to be so today. I have suggested, through brief discussions of work on three contact situations from the past and three from the present, that we can understand a good deal about the nature of linguistic variation and diffusion and its sociopsychological constraints if we focus on small-scale communities and depend on documentary and primary research, including ethnographic observation and interviewing wherever possible. Deductive theorizing about 'who adopts what, when, why, and how?' (Cooper 1982:31) is essential. And the answers provided by those who work at the macrolevel with census and survey data (for instance, Fishman et al. 1985) are invaluable. But the microlevel community perspective helps to confirm and extend our understandings in particularly rich ways, and for the sake of understanding language spread and developing sociolinguistic theory, it should be encouraged and more extensively adopted.

Notes

I am grateful to Angela E. Rickford for the writing time and support which made the completion of this paper possible. It is a pleasure to thank the Urban Studies Program at Stanford for funding the research, and Faye

McNair-Knox, Keith Denning and Marilyn Sherzer for assistance in conducting the interviews and/or tabulating the results reported in this paper.

1. See Cooper (1982) for valuable papers in both categories.

2. Foxy Boston, like all speakers' names in this paper, is a pseudonym.

3. Foxy's numbers in Tables 3 and 4 are higher than those reported in the handout distributed at the GURT 1987 meeting, and some of the relative frequencies are also different, because careful rechecking of the tapes (using two retabulators for increased reliability) yielded several new examples.

4. It should be noted that Foxy's interviewer, Faye McNair-Knox, is herself black and a resident of East Palo Alto (for the past 24 years). Faye's daughter, a schoolmate and acquaintance of Foxy's, was also present during the interview. These factors undoubtedly contributed to the spontaneity of the recording session and the vernacular speech which emerged therein.

5. The full distribution of be for Bailey and Maynor's folk-speakers, by following environment (n=35, excluding 4 miscellaneous cases) is: ___NP: 23%, ___Adj: 23%, ___Loc: 31%, Ving: 23%.

6. As in other studies of copula absence (see Wolfram 1969:165-67), a number of potential tokens were excluded from the count because they represent categorical copula presence environments (e.g. the past tense, first person present tense am), because their analysis is indeterminate (i's, tha's, wha', tokens preceded or followed by a sibilant), or because they need to be considered in relation to other variants (e.g. negative tokens, which need to be considered in relation to ain't). Foxy's copula absence frequencies for is versus are, shown below, indicate that the bulk of her variability in Table 4 is borne by her is usage, since are absence is categorical in her speech everywhere except before NP. For this reason, one might want to consider her copula absence in relation to is alone, as Labov and Baugh do for their New York City and Los Angeles data on independent grounds.

	<u>NP</u>	<u>Adj</u>	<u>Loc</u>	<u>V+ing</u>	<u>Gonna</u>	Total
<u>Ø is:</u>	40% (20)	88% (41)	57% (7)	100% (4)	88% (8)	74% (80)
<u>Ø are:</u>	82% (11)	100% (38)	100% (12)	100% (20)	100% (6)	98% (87)

7. The distributions of the inflected copula and invariant habitual be are semicomplementary, the former most common where the latter is least common (before NP), and least common where the latter is most common (before V+ing). This pattern holds to some extent in earlier studies as well, and extends also to person-number distributions (see Bailey and Maynor 1986): the inflected copula least common when it is are, invariant be most common with second person singular and plural subjects, that is, in potential are environments. (In Foxy's data, be tokens in this environment = 55% of the total, compared with 20% in third singular or potential is environments and 27% in first singular or potential am environments.) The interlocking relations between the inflected copula and invariant be in VBE grammar deserve further exploration.

8. The Detroit sample, of course, differs from all the other groups insofar as the least favorable environment for copula absence is a following adjective rather than noun phrase, but this may be due to the fact that only pronoun subject tokens were considered.

9. The locative environment is closer to the NP environment--as it is in preceding studies--in Foxy's is absence distributions given above in note 7.

10. Foxy's gonna environment falls short of 100% copula absence because of a single is in a phrase which is repeated slowly and deliberately: 'in three weeks sompn--somp'n--somebody gon die. In three weeks, somebody is gon die.'

11. Martha is the mirror image of Foxy with respect to copula absence. Whereas Foxy only retains the copula with any regularity in the least favorable environment for copula absence (the latest or lightest environment in the terminology of Bailey 1973), Martha only deletes the copula with any regularity in the rule's most favorable (earliest, heaviest) environment. In dynamic terms, one might say that Foxy's copula absence rule has virtually gone to completion, while Martha's has barely begun. However, before accepting such a statement as anything more than a convenient metaphor, we need to know more about each speaker's copula usage in different styles to determine whether their

performance in the initial interview accurately reflects the limits of their competence. The reinterviews which we propose to do (Martha with a black interviewer, Foxy with a white one) should shed light on this issue.

References

- Ash, Sharon, and John Myhill. 1986. Linguistic correlates of inter-ethnic contact. In: Sankoff, ed. (1986:33-44).
- Bailey, Guy and Natalie Maynor. 1986. Decreolization? MS. submitted to: *Language in Society*.
- Baker, Philip. 1982. On the origins of the first Mauritian and the creole language of their descendants. In: *Isle de France Creole*. Edited by Philip Baker and Chris Corne. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Karoma. 131-259.
- Baugh, John. 1979. Linguistic style-shifting in Black English. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Butters, Ron. 1984. When is English 'Black English Vernacular'? *Journal of English Linguistics* 17:29-36.
- Cooper, Robert L. 1982a. A framework for the study of language spread. In: Cooper, ed. (1982:5-36).
- Cooper, Robert L., ed. 1982b. *Language spread: Studies in diffusion and social change*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press (in cooperation with the Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.).
- Currie, Haver C. 1952. A projection of socio-linguistics: The relationships of speech to social status. *Southern Speech Journal* 18:28-37.
- Dorian, Nancy C. 1981. *Language death: The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1982. Acceleration, retardation and reversal in language decay? In: Cooper, ed. (1982:321-36).
- Dutton, Tom E. 1978. Language and trade in central and southeast Papua. *Mankind* 11.3:341-53.
- Dutton, Tom E. 1983. Birds of a feather: A pair of rare pidgins from the Gulf of Guinea. In: *The social context of creolization*. Edited by Ellen Woolford and William Washabaugh. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Karoma. 77-105.
- Eckert, Penelope. 1986. Adolescent social structure and the spread of linguistic change. MS. submitted to: *Language in Society*.

- Edwards, Walter F. 1983. Code selection and shifting in Guyana. *Language in Society* 12.3:295-311.
- Fishman, Joshua, Michael H. Gertner, Esther G. Lowy, and William G. Milan. 1985. *The rise and fall of the ethnic revival: Perspectives on language and ethnicity*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language shift*. New York: Academic Press.
- Giles, Howard, and P.M. Smith. 1979. Accommodation theory: Optimal levels of convergence. In: *Language and social psychology*. Edited by H. Giles and R. St. Clair. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hatala, Eileen. 1976. *Environmental effects on white students in black schools*. Master's essay, University of Pennsylvania.
- Hymes, Dell, and Henry Zenk. (in press) Narrative structure in Chinook Jargon. In: *Pidgin and creole languages: Essays in memory of John E. Reinecke*. Edited by Glenn Gilbert. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Labov, William. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, William. 1980. Is there a creole speech community? In: *Theoretical orientations in creole studies*. Edited by Albert Valdman and Arnold Highfield. New York: Academic Press. 369-88.
- Labov, William. 1982. Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science; The case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor. *Language in Society* 11.2:165-201.
- Labov, William, and Wendell A. Harris. 1986. De facto segregation of black and white vernaculars. In: Sankoff, ed. (1986:1-24).
- LePage, Robert B. 1960. *Jamaican Creole*. London: Macmillan.
- McAllister, Lynne, and Claude S. Fischer. 1978. A procedure for surveying personal networks. *Sociological Methods and Research* 7.2:131-48.
- McDavid, Raven I., Jr. 1948. Postvocalic *-r* in South Carolina: A social analysis. *American Speech* 23:194-203.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1980. *Language and social networks*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. 1985. Linguistic change, social network and speaker innovation. *Journal of Linguistics* 21:339-84.
- Rens, L.L.E. 1953. *The historical and social background of Surinam's Negro English*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

- Rickford, John R. 1979. Variation in a creole continuum: Quantitative and implicational approaches. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Rickford, John R. 1985. Ethnicity as a sociolinguistic boundary. *American Speech* 60.3:90-125.
- Rickford, John R. 1987a. Dimensions of a creole continuum. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rickford, John R. 1987b. The haves and have nots: Sociolinguistic surveys and the assessment of speaker competence. *Language in Society* 16.2:149-77.
- Sankoff, David, ed. 1986. Diversity and diachrony. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1986. Dialects in contact. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Warner-Lewis, Maureen P. 1982. The Yorùbá language in Trinidad. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. Languages in contact. Publication no. 1, Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Whinnom, Keith. 1971. Linguistic hybridization and the 'special case' of pidgins and creoles. In: *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. Edited by Dell Hymes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 91-115.
- Wolfram, Walter A. 1969. A sociolinguistic description of Detroit Negro speech. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Zenk, Henry. 1984. Chinook Jargon and native cultural persistence in the Grand Ronde Indian community, 1856-1907: A special case of creolization. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Zenk, Henry. (in press) Chinook Jargon and the speech economy of Grande Reservation, Oregon: An ethnography-of-speaking approach to an historical case of creolization in progress. In: *Sociolinguistics and pidgin-creole studies*. Edited by John R. Rickford (=International Journal of the Sociology of Language 71, 1988).

THE SPREAD OF LANGUAGE CHANGE: VERIFYING INFERENCES OF LINGUISTIC DIFFUSION

Henrietta J. Cedergren
Université du Québec à Montréal

1. Introduction. The systematic study of linguistic variation has successfully demonstrated that phonological variation assumes systematicity when elements of the social and linguistic contexts are considered in the analysis. Among other things, the quantitative study of variation has demonstrated that relationships of more or less are as much a part of language as the traditional concepts of obligatory or complementary relationships. More importantly, however, this line of research has opened a window permitting the direct observation of linguistic evolution, that is, the study of change in progress. Although the traditional methods of historical linguistics have permitted researchers to extrapolate genetic relationships from linguistic data sets, these analytical methods do not provide the necessary evidence for elucidating effectively how any system passes from state X to state Y. I call this the transition problem.

In this paper we are directly concerned with the 'transition problem' as it relates to the identification of linguistic change in progress within both social and geographical space.

Studies of change in progress have generally used the notion of 'apparent time' as a means for identifying the evolutionary tendencies implicit in a synchronic data set. This methodological procedure depends crucially on the hypothesis that the grammar of individual speakers becomes stable some relatively short time after the end of the language acquisition period or some time during adolescence. It is assumed that except for minor lexical changes the phonetics and phonology of individuals do not undergo major restructuring during their lifetimes. If this hypothesis were not true, one would have to assume that age group differences that are discovered in synchronic data sets

reflect ontological evolution or rather stable age gradation within a community.

The Gauchat/Hermann study of Charmey is a classic point of reference, for it clearly documented the need for the use of comparative data to substantiate inferences about diffusion. When Hermann revisited Charmey in 1929, his investigation revealed that two of the six variables previously hypothesized as undergoing change by Gauchat (1905) would be more adequately explained as cases of age gradation.

Several strategies for resolving the dilemma implicit in the use of inferences based on apparent time distributions have been reported in the literature.¹ One type of control available to investigators working in communities with long research traditions is the use of previous descriptions of the same speech community as a real-time baseline for establishing the existence of temporal related differences in the data. In this way, any reported differences between both time periods can reasonably be interpreted as the result of an intervening process of change affecting the grammar of the community. These data are generally sparse for they may correspond to brief remarks made by other observers who might not have concentrated on the crucial evidence needed to establish a reliable comparative base.

Most studies of variation in urban communities that were carried out during the 1960s and 1970s did not benefit from data of previous surveys, and may not ever benefit from matched comparative studies in the future because of the scarcity of human linguistic resources.

In this paper I will present evidence from two linguistic communities which directly answer the question of the use of comparative data to substantiate claims about change in progress. I have explored this approach in order to verify hypotheses about evolutionary tendencies in the Spanish of Panama City and the French of Montreal. In both instances I have used data from two linguistic surveys, one in the recent past and the other in the recent future from the date of the original studies to verify inferences about linguistic diffusion processes.

I will discuss two putative phonetic changes: first, the emergence of velar [R] in Montreal French; second, the lenition of CH in Panama City Spanish, and its geographical diffusion.

2. **The story of R: A chapter in the evolution of Montreal French.** The project on linguistic change in Montreal French established the existence of several variables at different stages of diffusion within the development of the community.² Among these we suggested that the norm for the phonetic realization of R had recently changed. Two earlier articles provide information on the status and the pronunciation of R in the province of Quebec. Vinay (1950) demonstrated that Montreal was situated within a dialect zone, covering the west of the province, where an alveolar variant for /R/ predominated; the author was very careful in stating that the distinction was not based on categorical distributive differences, but rather on quantitative differences. Each dialect zone used predominantly one of the two variants: an alveolar or a dorsal-velar /R/. The Vinay study found that 68% of the Montreal speakers interviewed used predominantly an alveolar /R/. Further, R. Charbonneau in 1955 suggested that it was not necessary to recommend the acquisition of velar /R/ to students, for

Le [r] apical (sans battements exagérés) employé par la très grande majorité des canadiens français dans la région de Montréal est facilement acceptable (1955:98).

'Apical [r] (without exaggerated flaps) employed by the great majority of French Canadians in the region of Montreal is easily acceptable.'

This quotation, I believe, confirms that in the 1950s in Montreal the use of alveolar [r] was not subject to normative censure.

The data now presented result from the analysis of two linguistic surveys carried out in the city of Montreal in the recent past. The first data set is the Sankoff-Cedergren corpus gathered in 1971 which consists of a socially diversified sample of 120 speakers representing several dimensions of variation in the city. The second data set consists of 29 speakers chosen from the Bibeau-Dugas survey of Montreal in 1963.

The principal goal of the analysis was to establish empirical data on the distribution of alveolar vs. velar or dorsal variants of /R/ in the Montreal community. Earlier studies by Santerre (1979) and Clermont and Cedergren (1979) revealed that a change in the community norm concerning

the realization of /R/ had apparently taken place and was rapidly spreading throughout the community at the same time that Vinay and Charbonneau had published their remarks about /R/.

Figure 1 shows the mean values for velar /R/ in the Sankoff-Cedergren corpus of 1971, where the curve reveals that the proportional distribution of alveolar vs. velar /R/ variants is a major function of the age of the individual speakers, therefore suggesting that the time window³ established by the 1971 survey captured a synchronic picture of a new and vigorous change spreading through the Montreal community.

Figure 1. Distribution of velar /R/ by age groups in 1971 corpus.

The age distribution reveals three characteristic behaviour patterns: (1) a first pattern represented by speakers 45 years and over where the norm for /R/ is the alveolar variant; (2) a second pattern revealed by the 21- to 45-year-old speakers where we can perceive a fluctuation in the old norm and a definite tendency towards the demise of the alveolar variant; and (3) finally, a third type which emerges with the younger speakers, where the alveolar variant does not correspond to more than 10% of the production and where we perceive the emergence of a new community norm for the realization of /R/.

A regression analysis of these data revealed that the single most important factor underlying the alternation in the data set was the speakers' age, followed by social class membership, sex, and educational level of attainment. It appears, therefore, that the introduction of a velar phonetic variant of /R/ in Montreal French is associated with the upper middle class, female speakers, and postsecondary education. In summary, the data from apparent time reveal that the spread of the velar variant is the product of a prestige change from above in the social hierarchy of the community.

We were fortunate to have access to another corpus which had been gathered approximately 10 years before the Sankoff-Cedergren corpus of 1971; this was the Bibeau-Dugas corpus established in 1963. This was particularly important for although the external evidence provided by the Vinay study in 1950 and the comments by Charbonneau in 1955 suggest that we had effectively captured a picture of linguistic change spreading through the community, access to another data set could furnish comparative evidence which would strengthen inferences drawn from apparent time distributions. The question we chose to answer was the following: would survey data from a previous point in time assume the same distributional pattern furnished by apparent time data?

Figure 2 reveals the average distribution of the velar variant by age group in the 1963 corpus. Each informant had been chosen to correspond to the age divisions already established for the 1971 survey. The single most important fact which emerges from an examination of the pattern assumed by the data when one controls for age differences is the remarkable similarity between the two representations, even though Figure 2 is based on data taken from a much smaller corpus. The linear pattern which emerges strongly suggests that on both occasions we were fortunate in capturing a synchronic picture of change spreading through the social fabric of the community.

Further, if one strongly assumes stability in the grammars of the individual speakers with respect to the velarization of /R/ and adjusts the speaker ages of the earlier corpus to correspond to the ages they would have had in 1971, then a superimposition of both distributional patterns confirms their similarity, as revealed in Figure 3.

Figure 2. Distribution of velar /R/ by age groups in 1963 corpus.

Figure 3. Distribution curves showing the incidence of velar /R/ by age groups in 1963 (■) and 1971 (□).

A regression analysis of both data sets reveals that the incidence of alveolar /R/ diminished by an average of 0.76 per decade during the temporal time span covered by the ages of the speakers in the Sankoff-Cedergren sample, while for the 1963 sample the regression rate is that of 0.70 per

decade. We therefore conclude that both data sets confirm the emergence of a new community norm.

In summary, the techniques and methods of quantitative sociolinguistics permitted us to observe linguistic change spreading through a community; they further allowed us to identify the social mechanisms underlying the diffusion process and the rate associated with the reversal of community norms. In this case the temporal window which apparent time allows us to focus on the linguistic life of a community was sufficient to capture a picture of change in progress.

I now proceed with a discussion of CH lenition in Panama.

3. CH lenition in Panama: Age gradation or change in progress. Our original study of the interplay of social and linguistic factors in the phonological variation of Spanish spoken in Panama City revealed that of the five phonological variables analyzed, two appeared to be associated with age differences in the community; and we then proposed that both were incidences of change in progress in the community norm⁴. However, and contrary to the situation in Montreal, we could not recur to earlier descriptions of the speech patterns of the city which would give a real-time comparative note on which to strengthen any inferences about diffusion patterns inherent in the data.

In what follows I present the results of our quantitative analysis of CH lenition in Panama City Spanish. First, I discuss the results of an analysis carried out on tape-recorded data gathered in Panama in 1969. Next, I examine data collected half a generation later in 1982-84 which would constitute a comparative time period subsequent to the main results of 1969.

By CH lenition is understood the alternation of a fricative palatal [ʃ] with the standard affricate form [tʃ]. This phenomenon is not an exclusive dialectal feature of Panamanian Spanish. However, only in Panama has the feature assumed community-wide status.⁵

Our analysis revealed the importance of two parameters of differentiation relevant to any discussion about the relationship of extant variability and the diffusion of linguistic processes in time and space. First, the analysis indicated that the fricative variant served to distinguish speakers sharply in the sample according to age group. Speakers 35 years and younger, along with female speakers,

were strongly associated with the use of the fricative variant. Second, when speakers were distinguished in terms of community membership, that is, whether they were born and raised in the city or if they had arrived in the city as linguistic adults, it appeared that natives of Panama City or informants who had arrived in the city as children emerged as strong contributors to the use of the fricative variant, while speakers who had arrived there either as adolescents or adults were predominantly associated with the use of the affricate variant. On the socioeconomic dimension, what emerged was a curvilinear distribution revealing that the middle social groups were at the forefront of the lenition tendencies. Finally, on the basis of these distributional patterns we advanced two related hypotheses about the temporal and spatial dimensions associated with the synchronic variability in the realization of CH. First, we concluded that CH lenition was a recent phonetic change spreading within the community. Second, we proposed that given the importance of local origin in determining the occurrence of lenition, we could postulate that the process was of urban origin and could conceivably spread outward toward the rest of the country.

Both hypotheses, although logical, are nothing but inferences derived from the inspection of synchronic patterns. In what follows I describe our attempts at verifying the validity of these inferences. I present the results of a second survey carried out in the summers of 1982 and 1984 with the specific intention of gathering data that would constitute a synchronic picture from a second point in time and allow us to verify the strength of our initial inferences of change in progress both on the temporal and geographical planes.

Figure 4 shows data from this second survey of Panama City. Plotted along the time axis represented by speaker age groups and average dates of birth are the mean frequencies of the fricative variant. The status of [ʃ] as an age-related variant is evident from the fact that the frequencies are sharply associated with age differences. The incidence of [ʃ] rises from a low of 7% among the group of informants born in 1909 or earlier, to 62% for the group born between 1949 and 1955 (27 to 33 years of age), which represents an increase of 55% of the incidence of [ʃ] during a time period of 46 years. Further, there would appear to be a tempering of the diffusion process among the younger speakers.

Figure 4. Distribution of CH lenition
by age groups in 1982-84 corpus.

Figure 5 shows comparative data from the 1969 study. The incidence of fricativization ranges from 15% to 62%, which is strikingly similar to the pattern revealed by the later study; and the superposition of both distributional patterns, once speaker ages have been adjusted as shown in Figure 6, enhances their similarities. What emerges is a distribution which conforms with the S-shaped model of linguistic diffusion, where linguistic innovations appear to spread slowly both at the initial and final stages, in contrast to middle stages, which are rapid. Further, the striking similarity between both time periods with respect to the contrastive behavior of adolescents who appear to be lagging behind the young adult speakers demands some explanation. Rather than interpreting the behavior of adolescent speakers as a suggestion of a retrograde movement toward the earlier norm, we believe that these patterns confirm the social importance of CH lenition in the linguistic marketplace (Bourdieu and Boltanski 1975). The behavior of young adult speakers should be more adequately interpreted as an indication of their sensitivity to the social importance of the newer variant, somewhat akin to the hypercorrect behavior of the lower middle-class speakers of New York City (Labov 1972).

Figure 5. Distribution of CH lenition by age groups in 1969 corpus.

Figure 6. Distribution of curves showing the incidence of CH lenition by age groups in 1969 (■) and 1982-84 (□).

Consequently, in the light of these results and those related to the initial comparison of /R/ variants in Montreal French, we believe that in both instances our initial

inferences about extant change in progress in the linguistic norms of the two communities investigated, based on sharp distributional differences in apparent time, were accurate inferences about dynamic tendencies. In both cases a time projection either backwards or forwards in time appears to confirm the consistency of distributional patterns.

4. Verifying hypotheses about spatial diffusion. There remains the question of the validity of inferences drawn about the local origin and the spatial direction of the lenition process described in Panamanian Spanish. Although we believe we have strengthened our arguments about the recent emergence of CH lenition in the speech community, these data do not contribute any evidence as to the origin or direction of the innovative process. Few nonanecdotal studies exist describing the varieties of Spanish spoken in Panama which could establish a comparative baseline to validate any hypotheses about direction and origin. The only exception is Robe's (1960) thorough descriptive study of the Spanish of rural central Panama, which covers an area situated between 150 to 350 kilometers from Panama City. Robe's study is based on data gathered during 1944-46, that is, a generation before our original survey of Panama City. The speakers in his sample cover a time depth going back from the first quarter of the twentieth century to the middle of the nineteenth century. In his description of the phonemic inventory of rural Panamanian Spanish, Robe does not mention the existence of a fricative allophone for CH; he states:

/ç/ is the class of voiceless palatal affricates. It occurs initially and medially but not finally. It has the allophone [ç].

[ç] is a voiceless palatal affricate without aspiration.

And we therefore conclude that at least in the 1940s, among speakers born in the first quarter of the century or earlier, CH had only one variant.

During our return to Panama in 1982 and 1984 we also gathered data in several selected communities outside of the city which would provide a data base on the geographical distribution of the lenition process, if any. We interviewed speakers in the communities of Chepo, Colon, Chorrera, Las

Tablas and Santiago situated at different distances from Panama City. These last two communities, Las Tablas and Santiago, were chosen because they were situated in the same area previously described by Robe. Care was taken to gather data from different age groups for each community.

Figure 7 shows a map of the isthmus of Panama where the localities investigated are indicated with the incidence of [ʃ] per age group and the average year of birth. Inspection of the map reveals that it is only north of Panama City in the coastal city of Colon that we find any evidence of cases of CH lenition among speakers born before the 1920s; however, the incidence of 4% is well below that attested in Panama City for speakers of similar age. It would appear then that the process spread to the northern city, which is the second largest city in the country, before extending either east to the rural town of Chepo, which is only 60 kilometers away, or to the west, across the Canal Zone to the town of Chorrera at a distance of 33 kilometers. The two most distant localities in the west, Las Tablas and Santiago, are situated within the area previously surveyed by Robe in the 1940s. Here we find that speakers who come closest in age to the youngest members of Robe's sample--that is, speakers born in 1928--do not show any incidence of [ʃ] which confirms his observations. The time dimension implicit in the geographical distribution depicted in Figure 7 provides, we believe, corroborative evidence to our assumptions. We therefore conclude that the locus of the CH lenition innovative process is Panama City and that the diffusion process appears to be sensitive to locality size.⁶

5. Conclusion. The quantitative study of linguistic variation can provide the basis for understanding certain aspects of the evolutionary tendencies inherent in language and in speech communities. A careful analysis of the distributional patterns of variable phenomena in the light of apparent time and space should allow us to make stronger inferences about dynamic tendencies operative in speech communities. We believe we have demonstrated the usefulness of apparent time data in resolving questions of evolving community norms.

Figure 7. Distribution of CH lenition by localities.

The striking similarity of the patterns assumed by new changes in progress in two completely different speech communities, Montreal and Panama City, constitutes a challenge which demands explanation. What types of linguistic innovations assume this distributional pattern? Are these types restricted to phonetic changes or can innovations deeply imbedded in the phonological and grammatical subsystems reveal the same diffusion patterns? Are these changes qualitatively different from phenomena which are usually categorized as instances of drift or long-term dynamic tendencies operating in languages?

Any scientific enterprise which seeks to establish a description of the linguistic past is limited by the scarcity and the quality of available data. The results of the two comparative studies described in this paper suggest that the careful use of apparent time may provide strong evidence about dynamic properties responsible for linguistic evolution.

Notes

The work on which this paper is based was supported in part by the Fonds pour la formation de chercheurs et l'aide à la recherche, the Office de la langue française, and the Social and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

1. For an extensive discussion of the methodological and inferential problems inherent in the use of apparent time, see Labov (1981).

2. For a detailed report on these methods, see Cedergren and Lemieux (1985).

3. The time window captured by synchronic studies of linguistic variation is limited by many factors, among which is the average life span of individuals at the particular time of the survey. It is quite common that sociolinguistic surveys succeed in capturing a time window of about 75 years, where the youngest speaker in the corpus may be 15 and the oldest speaker may be 85 years of age. This therefore permits us to witness the dynamic tendencies of four generations of speakers: adolescents, young adults, middle-aged speakers, and older informants.

4. For further details on the methodology and results, see Cedergren (1973).

5. In Hispanic America, we know of the sporadic occurrence of a fricative variant [ʃ] in the Dominican

Republic and Cuba, as noted by Henriquez Ureña in 1940; later, Jiménez Sabater (1975) furnished confirming data on the existence of CH lenition in the Dominican Republic, although quite restricted in nature; Espinosa (1930) identifies the existence of a [ʃ] variant in New Mexico Spanish; for Puerto Rico, Quilis and Vaquero (1973) describe among others a fricative variant for /tʃ/, and recently, López Morales (1983) confirms and clarifies the social dimensions of the phenomenon in San Juan, Puerto Rico, which appears to be a recent innovation in the grammar of the community. Outside of the Caribbean and New Mexico, Canfield (1962) documents the existence of CH lenition in northern Chile.

6. The interaction of linguistic spread with locality size is a well-known phenomenon. See Trudgill (1974).

References

- Bourdieu, Pierre, and L. Boltanski. 1975. Le fétichisme de la langue. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 4:2-32.
- Canfield, Delos Lincoln. 1962. La pronunciación del español en América. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Cedergren, Henrietta J. 1973. The interplay of social and linguistic factors in Panama. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Cornell University.
- Cedergren, Henrietta J., and Monique Lemieux. 1985. Les tendances dynamiques du français parlé à Montréal. Québec: Office de la langue française.
- Charbonneau, René. 1955. Recherches d'une norme phonétique dans la région de Montréal. In: *Etudes sur le parler français au Canada*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Clermont, Jean, and Henrietta J. Cedergren. 1979. Les 'R' de ma mère sont perdus dans l'air. In: *Le français parlé. Etudes sociolinguistiques*. Edited by Pierrette Thibault. Edmonton, Alberta: Linguistic Research, Inc.
- Espinosa, Aurelio M. 1930. Estudios sobre el español de Nuevo Méjico. Buenos Aires: Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana.
- Gauchat, Louis. 1905. L'unité phonétique dans le patois d'une commune. In: *Aus Romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen: Festschrift Heinrich Mort*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Henriquez Ureña, Pedro. 1940. El español en Santo Domingo. Buenos Aires: Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana.

- Hermann, M.E. 1929. Lautveränderungen in der Individualsprache einer Mundart. In: Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. 11:195-214.
- Jiménez Sabater, Maximiliano A. 1975. Más datos sobre el español de la República Dominicana. Santo Domingo: Ediciones INTEC.
- Labov, William. 1972. Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. 1981. What can be learned about change in progress from synchronic descriptions? In: Variation omnibus. Edited by David Sankoff and Henrietta J. Cedergren. Edmonton, Alberta: Linguistic Research, Inc.
- López Morales, Humberto. 1983. Estratificación social del español de San Juan de Puerto Rico. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Quilis, Antonio, and Maria Vaquero. 1973. Realizaciones de la /ɛ/ en el área metropolitana de San Juan de Puerto Rico. Revista de Filología Española 56:1-52.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1974. Linguistic change and diffusion: Description and explanation in sociolinguistic dialect geography. Language in Society 3:215-46.
- Robe, Stanley L. 1960. The Spanish of rural Panama, major dialectal features. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Santerre, Laurent. 1979. Le R apical montréalais en régression rapide. In: Les français régionaux du Québec. Chicoutimi, Québec: Prothée.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul. 1950. Bout de la langue ou fond de la gorge? French Review 23.6:489-98.

CODE SWITCHING AND TYPES OF MULTILINGUAL COMMUNITIES

Carol Myers Scotton
University of South Carolina

My goal is to give a brief but comprehensive explanation of code switching in order to relate the two main types of switching to different types of structural constraints and different types of bilingual and multilingual communities. Much of my data comes from language use in Nairobi, Kenya, but I support my argument with data from other communities as well.

The type of data to be explained here is exemplified in (1) and (2) (Scotton and Ury 1977: 16-17).

(1) Setting: Seven young Kenyan men, most of whom are in form four (equivalent to the senior year of high school) are chatting in a Nairobi home. They come from five different ethnic groups. The conversation is in Swahili, with switches to English. Both are considered rather ethnically neutral languages.

G (Swahili): Hawo chicks hawakuwa STANDARD ya MINE.

'Those girls weren't of my standard.'

A (Sw): Walikuwa A STANDARD HIGHER? Sio?

'They were a standard higher? Isn't that so?'

G (Sw): Ben--si wewe ndio ulikuwa u-na-FLOAT na BEER yako kwa ile CORNER--wewe?

'Ben--weren't you floating with your beer at the corner?'

A (Sw): Haki ya mungu, pale si-ku-FLOAT--mimi nilikuwa na msichana THROUGHOUT.

'I swear, I never floated at that place--I had a girl throughout.'

(2) Setting: A conductor on a Nairobi bus has just asked a

passenger (in Swahili) where he is going in order to determine the fare. Swahili is the expected medium.

Passenger (Swahili): Nataka kwenda posta.

'I want to go to the post office.'

Conductor (Sw): Kutoka hapa mpaka posta nauli ni senti hamsini.

'From here to the post office, the fare is fifty cents.'

(Passenger gives conductor a shilling from which there should be fifty cents in change.)

Conductor (Sw): Ngojea CHANGE yako.

'Wait for your change.'

(Passenger says nothing until a few minutes have passed and the bus nears the post office, where he will get off.)

Passenger (Sw): Nataka CHANGE yangu.

'I want my change.'

Conductor (Sw): CHANGE utapata, Bwana.

'You'll get your change, mister.'

Passenger (English): I AM NEARING MY DESTINATION.

Conductor (English): DO YOU THINK I COULD RUN AWAY WITH YOUR CHANGE?

I believe that examples such as (1) show code switching as an unmarked choice and that such switching encodes dual identities for the speaker--in each of the groups associated with the codes. Note that this type of switching includes switches not only at the sentence or clause level but also intraword switches. I argue that intraword switches occur possibly only with this type of switching and that such switching occurs only in certain types of bilingual communities.

Example (2) shows code switching as a marked choice. This type of switching always is a negotiation to change the social distance holding in the current talk exchange, to change the balance of rights and obligations between participants. Such switching is not restricted to certain types of communities, but may be governed by more stringent structural constraints than switching as an unmarked choice.

Since the type of switching illustrated in (1) has been little discussed before in a principled way, it is given the most attention here.

I begin with an overall model of the interpersonal use of linguistic choices to convey social significance. My premise in explaining code choice is that while conveying referential

information is often the overt purpose of conversation, all talk is also always indexical of the social relationships between speaker and addressee.¹ That is, the model assumes that speakers make the code choices they do because they are using these choices to negotiate relationships.

Speakers have a natural theory of markedness and indexicality. Speaker knowledge that every code choice indexes a set of rights and obligations holding between participants in the conversational exchange is based on this theory. Speakers know that for particular conventionalized exchanges in their community, a certain code choice indexes an expected set of rights and obligations. This code is the unmarked choice for that exchange. That is, the markedness theory can assign to specific code choices readings of markedness for a specific exchange. Speakers have tacit knowledge of the indexical quality of code choices and their markedness as part of their communicative competence (Hymes 1972).

While the theory is universal, actual associations of markedness are necessarily acquired and also are speech community specific. First, let me indicate more explicitly how code choices get readings of markedness in a given community. Not all situational features are equally salient in all exchanges. For example, my gender is typically much more salient in a talk exchange at a party than when I am ordering a fishburger at a fast food restaurant. Those features which are salient in a specific exchange determine the expected rights and obligations balance between specific participants for that exchange. The expected balance is the unmarked balance, and it is indexed by an expected code. Through the weight of frequency of use for a particular interpersonal balance, this code becomes associated with encoding that balance. Speakers abstract this information through exposure to use, and their theory of markedness assigns to this code the status of unmarked choice to index the particular rights and obligations balance in the particular talk exchange. The markedness theory assigns to other codes other readings of markedness for this exchange. That is, other choices are more or less marked in this exchange. And what is marked in one exchange is unmarked in another. Markedness is a gradient, not a categorical, concept. One choice is more unmarked than others and, among marked choices, some are more marked than others. Further, the same choice need not be equally marked for all participants

in the same exchange. Thus, this model assumes speakers have mental representations of the indexicality and relative markedness for a range of exchanges for each code in their linguistic repertoires.

Now, because each speech community has its own norms, situational features are not equally weighted across communities in affecting the expected rights and obligations balance between certain participants. For example, in one community shared ethnicity of participants may be more salient in a given exchange than in another community. Since the saliency of situational factors which affect the unmarked interpersonal balance varies cross-culturally, the unmarked rights and obligations balance between similar participants also varies for each exchange. Further, the unmarked choice to index that balance is speech community specific.²

Speaking of choices as marked or not assumes they take place in a normative framework. Yet, norms do not determine choices but only the relative markedness of choices. Since all members of the same speech community have similar markedness theories, they make similar interpretations of the intended indexicality of a given code choice in a specific exchange and perceive its use as a negotiation of a particular rights and obligations balance. Norms, therefore, can give speakers an indication of the consequences of their choices. In this model, then, speakers are free to make any choices, but how their choices are interpreted is not free. And it is precisely because speakers share knowledge of the markedness of their choices and their consequences ('know' in an abstract, tacit sense), that code choices 'do' something, negotiate social identities. As LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985:181) put it, 'The individual creates for himself the patterns of his linguistic behaviour so as to resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified, or so as to be unlike those from whom he wishes to be distinguished.'

Speakers make unmarked, marked, and exploratory choices in this negotiation.

1. Making the unmarked choice in a conventionalized exchange is a negotiation of normative or predicted behavior. Speakers are following what I have called the 'unmarked choice maxim': 'Make the unmarked code choice when you wish to establish or affirm the unmarked rights and obligations set associated with a conventionalized exchange'

(Scotton 1983:120). For example, in Nairobi speaking English to your boss is generally the unmarked choice if you are in upper level management, and speaking Swahili is the unmarked choice for a wide range of service encounters no matter what your socioeconomic status.

2. But speakers may also make marked choices in conventionalized exchanges. Such a choice is a negotiation for some balance of rights and obligations other than the expected one, a negotiation to change in some way the degree of social distance between participants. Thus, such a choice flouts the unmarked choice maxim, with the resulting conversational implicature that the speaker is negotiating a disidentification with the expected rights and obligations set. For example, in Kenya speaking either English or Swahili at a rural meeting of members of the same ethnic group is a marked choice. See example (3) (Scotton 1982:438).

(3) Setting: Local Development Committee meeting in rural western Kenya, with the location chief presiding. Lwidakho, the Luyia variety which is the mother tongue of all present, has been the sole medium of the meeting up to this point. A teacher complains about mismanagement of funds, and the location chief responds in Swahili, a marked choice encoding both authority and anger.

Teacher (Lwidakho): Tsi shilingi tsya LOCAL RATE tsyamenya Kakamega yi tsi ligavula lyatsyo shilili lihai muno tawe. Mwahana khu tsi PROJECT tsindala tsinyishi nendio shivuli vulahi tawe. Genyekhanenga khuREVISE ligavula yili.

'Money for the 'local rate,' which is in Kakamega, wasn't properly shared out to the projects we have. Some projects have been granted more money than others, and this is not good. The committee should have been the one to portion out this money in the presence of all the members. The whole breakdown should be revised.'

Chief (Swahili): Mimi kama CHIEF. Naweza kuamua na ni lazima mkubaliane nami, mpende, msipende!

'I am the chief. I can decide and you must agree with me, whether you like it or not!'

3. Of course, far from all exchanges are conventionalized. Situations arise for which norms of behavior are not

established, or conflicting norms apply, and for which, therefore, an unmarked code choice is not indexed. In such cases, both speaker and addressee recognize that making any linguistic choice is exploratory, a nomination for the unmarked choice. Accepting a particular code for such exchanges is tantamount to accepting the rights and obligations for participants for which the code in question would be the unmarked index.

Let me now summarize the key points about unmarked choices:

1. An unmarked choice encodes a normative or expected rights and obligations balance, given the specific exchange.
2. Which choice is unmarked depends on the rights and obligations balance; this, in turn, depends on which situational features are salient in the specific exchange.
3. Therefore the unmarked choice varies across exchanges.
4. Speakers know the unmarked choice for any exchange as part of their communicative competence.
5. The unmarked choice can be identified empirically; it is the most frequent choice in a given exchange.
6. Speakers need not choose the unmarked choice. (a) They will do so to establish the expected rights and obligations balance or to maintain the status quo. (b) They will make marked choices to negotiate other rights and obligations sets.

The markedness model summarized here is an abbreviated version of the one more fully explicated in Scotton (1983). Its premise is that in conversation, in addition to relying on a cooperative principle, its associated maxims, and the conversational implicatures generated through their knowledge in understanding the content of what is said (Grice 1975), speakers use a complementary negotiation principle and related maxims to arrive at the social import of a conversation. Gumperz (1982:94) touches upon Grice's discussion of conversational implicatures and the cooperative principle in relation to interpreting code choice. However, I see Grice's framework as limited to implicatures arising from content, and therefore provide a complementary framework to explain implicatures emanating from message form.

The markedness model has been used to explain language use in several multilingual communities: in Kenya (Scotton 1982), in Taiwan (van den Berg 1985), in Strasbourg, France (Gardner-Chloros 1985), for example. It has also been used to explain choices in Beijing, Peoples Republic of China,

among Chinese terms of address (Scotton and Zhu 1983, 1984), and American English style shifting (Scotton 1985).

Within the markedness framework, code switching may take four forms:

1. Sequential unmarked choice. Blom and Gumperz (1972:424) refer to this type as situational switching. Such sequences occur in conventionalized exchanges when external forces (a new participant, a new topic, etc.) alter the expected rights and obligations balance and therefore the relative markedness of one code vs. another. Having originally made an unmarked choice, speakers wishing to maintain the status quo switch to a new unmarked choice when the circumstances change. No switching back and forth now takes place unless situational factors again change, or unless a speaker makes a marked choice. This type of switching is illustrated in example (4).

(4) Setting: Entrance to the IBM Nairobi head office. The visitor, from the Luyia area of western Kenya, approaches. He speaks English and Swahili fluently in addition to his first language, a Luyia variety. The conversation between him and the security guard begins in Swahili, the unmarked choice for interactions between Kenyan strangers in Nairobi. The conversation shifts from an exchange between strangers to one between ethnic brethren.

Security Guard (Swahili): Unataka kumwona nani?

'Whom do you want to see?'

Visitor (Sw): Nappenda kumwona Solomon Inyama.

'I want to see Solomon Inyama.'

Guard (Sw): Unamjua kweli? Tunaye Solomon Amuhaya--
nadhani ndio yule.

'Do you really know him? We have a Solomon Amuhaya--I think that's the one you mean.'

Visitor (Sw): Yule anayetoka Tiriki--yaani Mluyia.

'This one comes from Tiriki--that is, a Luyia person.'

Guard (switches to Luyia): SOLOMON MWENUYU
WAKHUMANYA VULAH!

'Will Solomon know you?'

Visitor (Luyia): YIVI MULOLE UMUVOLERE NDI SHEM
LUSIMBA YENYANGA KHUKHULOLA.

'You see him and tell him that Shem Lusimba wants to see you.'

Guard (Luyia): YIKHALA YALIA ULINDI.

'Sit here and wait.'

2. Switching as an unmarked choice. When participants are bilingual peers, the unmarked choice may be switching, but with no changes at all in situational features. That is, for ingroup communication, the pattern of alternating between two varieties may be unmarked. The motivation is the same as when a single code is the unmarked choice--to index a speaker's expected position in a rights and obligations balance. When the motivation is symbolizing simultaneous identity in two rights and obligations balances, speakers switch between the two codes encoding them.³ I expand on this type of switching below.

3. Switching as a marked choice. Switching away from the expected, away from the unmarked choice in a conventionalized exchange, is a negotiation to replace the current and unmarked rights and obligations set with another one.

Making a marked choice is a common motivation for switching and such choices are often referred to in the code switching literature, but in a variety of rather vague ways, such as 'for stylistic effect'. What Blom and Gumperz (1972) call metaphorical switching and what Gumperz (1982) calls conversational switching seems to confound both switching as a marked and as an unmarked choice.

Because marked choices are disidentifications with the unmarked rights and obligations balance, they are disruptive. Marked choices as switches are more disruptive than initial marked choices since, as switches, they immediately follow the unmarked choice. (Speakers may call attention to them with marked intonation.) They are sometimes uses of what Poplack (1985) calls the mot juste, comments on previous discourse (including repetitions), or emotionally laden comments. Refer back to example (2) for a switch which encodes authority and anger. Marked switches to ingroup varieties typically encode solidarity and are a form of accommodation (see Thakerar, Giles, et al. 1982 on accommodation theory).

Example (5), from Kenya, illustrates switching for solidarity.

(5) A young, well-educated Kenyan woman who speaks Maragoli, a Luyia variety, as her first language, is driving her car into a Nairobi athletic club where she is a member.

There is a good deal of social distance between club members and the club gatekeeper because of the status differential; therefore, even though the gatekeeper turns out to be from her same ethnic group, she would not normally encode solidarity with him by speaking a shared ethnic language. She has stopped her car and wants the gatekeeper to open the gate. The ethnically neutral lingua franca of service encounters in Nairobi, Swahili, is the unmarked choice for this speech event.

Gatekeeper (to young woman stopped in front of gate)
(Swahili): Ingia kwa mlango mmoja tu.

'Enter by using only one gate.'

Woman (looks behind her and sees another car pulled up so that she cannot move easily) (Swahili): Fungua miwili.
Siwezi kwenda REVAS! Kuna magari mengi nyuma.

'Open both. I can't reverse! There are many cars behind.'

(Seeing the situation, the gatekeeper very grudgingly opens both gates.)

Woman (driving by him) (Sw): Mbona wewe mbaya sana leo?

'Why are you so difficult today?'

Woman (to her companions in the car) (English): That man is a Luyia. (She determines this from his pronunciation.)

Woman (to the gatekeeper several hours later when she is leaving) (Maragoli, Luyia variety): UNDINDIYANGE VUTWA.

'You were being unkind to me.'

Gatekeeper (Sw): Pole-- (Maragoli): SIMBERE NI MKHUMANY TU.

'Sorry--I didn't know it was you.'

Marked choices in conventionalized exchanges are universally permissible under two conditions: (1) Choices encoding deference--when the speaker wishes special consideration from the addressee, or when the speaker wishes to perform a face-threatening act, but still maintain good relationships with the addressee (Brown and Levinson 1978). For example, to encode a request, a speaker may switch to an ingroup language, to a more informal style, or to a more mitigating structure (e.g., 'I'm sorry to bother you, but would you mind very much if...'). (2) Choices motivated by a participant's lack of ability to speak the unmarked choice.

Scotton (1983:125) allows for such choices with the virtuosity maxim: 'Make an otherwise marked choice whenever the linguistic ability of either speaker or addressee makes the unmarked choice for the unmarked rights and obligations set in a conventionalized exchange infelicitous.'

4. Switching as an exploratory choice. In nonconventionalized exchanges, multiple identities are sometimes presented via switching as an exploratory choice. Since no unmarked choice is obvious, speakers may switch in order to settle upon a code which will be mutually acceptable as the unmarked choice for the exchange.

Before proceeding, let us distinguish code switching from borrowing. There has been considerable discussion of what constitutes 'true' code switching vs. borrowing (e.g., in recent years, Pfaff 1979 and Poplack 1980, 1981, 1986). Also, code switching has been contrasted with code mixing (e.g., Kachru 1978). Space limitations permit only a few comments which I hope settle the matter of borrowing vs. switching as it is relevant to this paper.

Both borrowing and switching represent normative use in a matrix language of linguistic forms from an embedded language. (The terms 'matrix' and 'embedded' languages come from Joshi 1985:192.) That is, in both cases, the use is within the range of expected behavior, either for special groups or the entire speech community. The difference is this: under borrowing, norms sanction specific forms from the embedded language; but under code switching, what is sanctioned is the pattern of using forms from the embedded language, not specific forms. That is, the forms used in individual instances of code switching are not specified.

It follows that some occurrence of the forms in the matrix language which are borrowings can be predicted, since they constitute a specifiable set at any given time. But what forms from the embedded language will appear in code switching cannot be predicted.

Borrowed forms, therefore, should be distinguishable by their individual frequencies. Because they belong to a specifiable set from the embedded language which speakers know in some abstract sense, borrowings are available to many (or all) speakers, while embedded forms in switching are not.

Criteria relying on phonological, morphological, or syntactic integration are not reliable to distinguish borrowings. It is probably because they are members of a set which has

become part of the matrix language that borrowings are generally phonologically integrated into the matrix language, but code switches never are. Still, not all borrowings are so integrated, so this cannot be a defining criterion. An English borrowing into Nairobi Swahili is town, which maintains its consonant-final shape in spite of strong Bantu constraints calling for open syllables (i.e., CV) only. Many single-word forms from the embedded language which are not borrowings, especially verbs, show morphological integration into the matrix language. Switched verbs are often integrated morphologically into the matrix language because of an apparently universal, obligatory pressure to mark tense and aspect, not because these verbs are borrowings, I argue.⁴ If a verb stem comes from the embedded language, but the tense/aspect markings are more accessible, more transparent in the matrix language, the result may be intraword switching. To use syntactic integration as a criterion marking borrowing is just as wrong-headed. It is a likely universal that there is structural pressure to prefer the syntax of the matrix language when forms from two languages appear in the same sentence, whether the embedded language forms are borrowings or switches.

Using the criterion of frequency indicates, for example, that in example (1) beer has status as a borrowing since it occurs across many speakers in the community. In the approximately ten hours of recording making up the data set this conversation comes from, beer occurs seven times and in different conversations. But not standard, also in (1). It does not occur again in the data set. Standard is part of the overall pattern of code switching as the unmarked choice in this example. Its repetition within the conversation illustrates the frequent lexical accommodation in switching as an unmarked choice; once a speaker has used a word, companions often will use it in their next turn. What kind of frequency can be used to identify borrowings? I do not pretend to have the answer. But in the data set I discuss here, I use a very conservative criterion: If a form occurs three times in the ten hours of recording in separate conversations, it is a borrowing.

Independent motivation for basing the borrowing vs. code switching distinction on frequencies and specified forms vs. specified patterns comes from the overall claim of this paper--that choosing one code rather than another

negotiates social meaning. The presence of either borrowings or switches conveys the macrolevel social meaning that there have been cultural contacts with speakers of the embedded language. But because they have not become specifiable members in a set, only switches can convey microlevel social meaning as interpersonal negotiations. In comparing borrowings and switches, the analogy of naturalized citizen to alien seems apt. In order for switches to be able to negotiate interpersonal meanings, they have to be aliens in the matrix language; they have to stand out. (Style shifting within the same language can negotiate interpersonal relationships because the unmarked style has the same status as the matrix language and the style of a shift corresponds to the embedded language.)

Let us turn now again to code switching as an unmarked choice. I am going to suggest that two different conditions hold when such switching exists, one having to do with types of bilingual or multilingual communities and the other with structural constraints on code switching.

My interest in the consequences of types of code switching was aroused because of the variety of scenarios for switching that were reported in the literature. While many studies reported what I refer to as code switching as a marked choice, few reported switching as an unmarked choice. Did different communities show different types of switching? Then there was the issue of structural constraints on switching which had interested many scholars (e.g. Timm 1975, Pfaff 1979, Southworth 1980, Poplack 1980, 1981, McClure 1981, Gumperz 1982, Woolford 1983, and Joshi 1985). While many constraints on intrasentential switching have been proposed (mainly on the basis of Spanish/English switching), only two general syntactic constraints on intrasentential switching are still actively supported: (1) the free morpheme constraint, which prohibits intraword mixing of morphemes from the matrix and the embedded languages; and (2) the equivalence constraint, which requires that the surface word order of the two languages be equivalent in the immediate environs of the switch point (Poplack 1980, 1981).

My interest in structural constraints was most piqued when Eyamba Bokamba gave a paper on the subject at the 1986 African Linguistics Conference, since some of the data were my own. The paper included compelling, but possibly idiosyncratic, examples which constitute counterexamples to both of these constraints. Why should scholars such as

Poplack be able to present large data bases in which little intrasentential switching appeared at all, and when it did occur, did not violate these two constraints?

Stimulated by the apparent disparity in data bases, I analyzed quantitatively a small, but respectable, data set of my own from natural conversations recorded in Nairobi. Based on much nonquantitative evidence previously collected in African multilingual communities, my prediction was that the data would violate all stated structural constraints. I also searched the code-switching literature for further examples violating the constraints. At about this same time, Berk-Seligson (1986) appeared, showing, via a quantitative analysis of a large data base of Spanish/Hebrew switching in Israel, that the equivalence constraint could not be supported.

The Nairobi data base consists of 18 conversations, drawn as a random sample from a population of 60 conversations audio-recorded in Nairobi in 1983. The matrix language of the conversations is Swahili, with switches to English. The local African research assistants who taped the conversations were instructed to seek out any conversations in Swahili among Kenyans who were nonnative Swahili speakers (in line with other purposes of the data collection). There are about 70 persons in the data corpus. Sometimes speakers knew they were being recorded; but more often they did not. Their permission to use the recordings for linguistic research was always sought, even if after the fact.

Using a conservative criterion to separate borrowings from switchings, I identified a total of 367 switches (types only, not tokens) in about ten hours of recording. (If a form occurred three times and in more than one conversation, and showed phonological integration, it was considered a borrowing, not a switch.) All forms eliminated from the switches were nouns, and no proper nouns at all were counted as switches. Known borrowings also were eliminated. In a larger data corpus these would show up as borrowings because of frequency.

As has been the case in many other studies, a large percentage of the Nairobi switches were nouns--162 or 44%. (Berk-Seligson found that switches were most often individual nouns, 40% of her total of 3,777 switches.) Fourteen English nouns were inflected with the Swahili bound morpheme marking Bantu class six noun plurals, ma-. About half of these consisted of a singular English noun stem and

half a plural stem. One switched noun showed the abstract class 11/14 prefix. See example (6).

- (6a) MaSTORY 'stories'
- (6b) MaGHOSTS 'ghosts', MaWATCHMEN 'watchmen'
- (6c) Kazi ya u-SECRETARY 'work of a secretary'

In sharp contrast to other studies, verbs were the second most frequently switched category (99 or 27%). There were 52 inflected finite verbs and 25 inflected infinitive forms, or 21% of the total, as illustrated under (7).

- (7a) Unaanza ku-BEHAVE kama watu wa huko wa-na-vyo-BEHAVE.
'You begin to behave as people from there behave.'
- (7b) Lakini yeye pia akatoka nyuma a-ka-ni-CONNECT mmoja SOLID sana kwa jicho.
'But he also came from behind and connected to me one solid one on the eye.'
- (7c) Sasa kuingia huko ndio tukaambiwa tu-APPLY tena.
'So when we got there we told we should reapply.'

Whole sentences as code switches (N=24) and parts of sentences (N=5) were the third largest category, but make up only 8% of the data. Thus, the majority of switches were intrasentential, not extrasentential, as was the case in Poplack (1980), for example, or many other data sets.

Adjectives were the fourth most frequently switched class, 26 or 7%. Examples are given in (8).

- (8a) . . .Na utakuwa na mambo mengi NEW. Mapya katika maisha yako.
'And you'll have many new things. New in your life.'
- (8b) --nikapata chakula nyingine iko GREY ni-ka-i-TASTE nikaona ina TASTE LOUSY sana.
'And I got some more food that was grey and I tasted it and thought it tasted very lousy.'

Most important, however, was the fact that the data clearly violated both the equivalence constraint and the free morpheme constraint. All the details of these violations are not directly relevant to this study (see Scotton 1986a for a fuller discussion). Here (8b), for example, can show

concisely how these constraints were typically violated. Ni-ka-i-TASTE (first person singular subject prefix-consecutive aspect prefix-object prefix referring to chakula-TASTE) is a counterexample to the free morpheme constraint since it contains Swahili bound inflectional morphemes and an English verb root. Taste lousy sana violates the equivalence constraint which prohibits switches not conforming to syntactic rules in both languages. (Generally, the Swahili order of modifiers following head nouns is observed in switched material.)

Other examples which violate stated structural constraints on code switching are not hard to find. See the examples in (9).

- (9a) L'HEURE ya kala TROIS QUARTS ya ba-JEUNES basa ko-COMPRENDRE AVENIR te. . .

'In the past three-fourths of the young people didn't understand what their future meant. . .' (Educated Zairean speaking to peer. Bokamba 1986b. Lingala/French.)

- (9b) Ta RANG-is DOORBELL-i.

'He/she rang the doorbell.' (Five-year-old boy conversing with his sister, who is also bilingual. Vihman 1985:12. Estonian/English.)

- (9c) I HAVE WIDELY TRAVELLED IN NORTHERN PARTS BANK-nu venti. Avitokke pookumpool ii muRi hindi aanenkilum, muRi hindi WAS USEFUL TO ME.

'I have traveled widely in the northern parts for the bank. When travelling there this broken Hindi, even though it was broken Hindi, was useful to me.' (Indian university graduate speaking to an interviewer sharing Malayam as a first language. Southworth 1981:133. Malayam/English.)

- (9d) a ɲɛ mĩ HELPe

'They are helping me.' (Educated Ghanaian in informal exchange with fellow native speakers of Adāŋme. Nartey 1982:185. Adāŋme/English.)

Gardner-Chloros (personal communication) also reports such switching in Strasbourg, France, between French and Alsatian between family members. Bernsten (personal communication) reports switches between Indonesian and English violating the free morpheme constraint in a group including speakers of both languages.

All of these, including those from my Nairobi data set and those in Berk-Seligson (1986) between Spanish and Hebrew, show code switching as an unmarked choice, it is argued. While such switching can also be extrasentential, it is hypothesized that intrasentential switching is typically switching as an unmarked choice. Note that all of these examples show ingroup switching between bilingual peers.

Based on these data, it is hypothesized that switching as an unmarked choice operates with looser structural constraints than other types of switching. While all of these data are not counterexamples to the free morpheme constraint, they all violate the equivalence constraint. Whether the possibility of intraword switching depends on the structures of the languages involved is open to question. Certainly, intraword switching is more documented with agglutinating or inflectional languages. But (9d) illustrates intraword switching with a highly analytic language. Why did not the many scholars who studied Spanish/English code switching find more instances of intrasentential switching? Some explanations may have to do with their methodology. It certainly seems that largely code switching as a marked choice was collected, possibly because the exchanges were not perceived by speakers as the type in which it was unmarked for bilingual peers to encode dual identities. Further, many intraword switches may have been counted as borrowings because they were single words showing morphological integration into the matrix language, what have been called 'nonce borrowings' (Poplack 1986). It stands to reason, of course, that single word switches, precisely because they are 'exposed', are more likely to show matrix language inflections than embedded forms which occur in a switch of sentence length where they are more 'protected'. Their morphological integration says little about their status as switches or not.

A second hypothesis also differentiates switching as an unmarked choice. Such switching occurs only between ingroup members (who are normally peers) and only in certain types of bilingual communities, it is suggested. This switching does not occur at all in narrow diglossic communities, it seems (i.e., those communities such as the Arabic-speaking nations of the Middle East and the handful of others discussed by Ferguson 1959 in his original formulation of diglossia). Since the High (H) and Low (L) varieties in narrow diglossic communities never occur in the

same situation, the two simultaneously can never be unmarked, even for different individuals (see Scotton 1986a for an extended discussion of this point).

Unmarkedness for switching between varieties only develops when each variety has been--or still is--unmarked for certain speakers. In many bilingual communities characterized by broad diglossia (Fishman 1967), this state of affairs exists. However, by itself this is not a sufficient condition for unmarked switching.

In order for overall switching as an unmarked choice to occur, two conditions must hold, it is hypothesized. First, each variety must have been--or still be--indexical of unmarked rights and obligations balances for certain speakers in the specific talk exchange under discussion. Each must have a precedence as an unmarked choice for someone; that is, there have to be model speakers to follow. (This is why such switching does not occur in narrow diglossic communities.) Second, both varieties must be indexical of social identities which are positively evaluated for the exchange.

Do these conditions hold in all bilingual or multilingual communities other than the narrow diglossic ones? The answer is 'no'. There may be models in all broad diglossic communities using both the varieties in question as unmarked choices in informal ingroup exchanges. But switching as an unmarked choice only takes place in those communities where the varieties potentially part of the switching pattern are not symbols of present intergroup competition, it is hypothesized. Thus, this hypothesis predicts little switching as an unmarked choice between French and English for informal exchanges between French Canadians in Quebec Province who are bilingual in English. This is not because English is never associated with positive values by these Francophones, but rather because the identity indexed by English for informal exchanges with French Canadian peers is not valued. Of course switching to English as a marked choice is possible with these same peers. Similarly, little switching as an unmarked choice between Flemish and French would be predicted for Belgium for informal ingroup exchanges, or for Catalonia between Catalan and Castilian.⁵ The reason is that varieties are indexical of intergroup rivalries.

In other countries, code switching as an unmarked choice would be predicted between certain languages, but not others, because of their group associations. For example, in India

switching as an unmarked choice between English and any of the Dravidian languages should be possible. Switching between Dravidian languages and Hindi should be less possible. And in Kenya, while such switching is very frequent between English and Swahili for ingroup exchanges in interethnic groups, it is much less possible in intergroup exchanges to switch between either Swahili or English and a language closely identified with an ethnic group, such as Kikuyu. That is, a switch to Kikuyu under such circumstances can only be a marked choice.

Thus, whether switching as an unmarked choice occurs, becomes a predictor of bilingual or multilingual community types. Such switching occurs only if there is not categorical allocation of the linguistic varieties involved to different situations and if the groups associated with the varieties are not in viable competition, with language as a group symbol. The other types of switching can occur in any community.

In conclusion, I have argued here that there are different types of code switching and that the social and structural constraints on their occurrence differ. Switching as an unmarked choice is often intrasentential and it may be intraword, although it is also extrasentential. Neither the free morpheme nor the equivalence constraint holds, although some structural constraints seem to apply. These seem to favor the rules of the matrix language, but that is a subject for another study. Whatever the structural constraints, they are less stringent than those for switching as a marked choice. I can only speculate why this should be so. Possibly the prescriptive power of either variety is less potent under social conditions where both are considered unmarked choices. (If this is the case, unmarked switching would be an example showing social forces as functional pressures on the grammar.) Social constraints are more obvious. Such switching takes place in ingroup situations within communities where the languages involved are not symbols of group conflict, it is hypothesized. Switching as a marked choice is typically extrasentential, although it may be intrasentential, but not intraword. If it is intrasentential, it is typically flagged in some way. The social constraints on such switching are limited; switching as a marked choice occurs across a wide range of communities and for both ingroup and intergroup exchanges.

It is hoped that explaining code switching within the markedness model provides a principled basis for future

discussions. At the least, it provides some hypotheses for testing and suggests directions for more specific ones regarding structural constraints.

Notes

1. The idea of indexicality comes from C.S. Pierce (1956).
2. No doubt there are some universal tendencies regarding which codes are unmarked for certain types of exchanges. Gumperz's formulation of 'we' and 'they' codes may reflect the view that such universals exist (1982:85). But codes can only be referred to as 'we' and 'they' for specific exchanges between specific participants: what is 'we' in one exchange may be 'they' in another. As Singh (1983:71) points out, 'What is identified as the "we" code. . . depends not only on socioeconomic position but also on role expectations of those doing the identification.'
3. Some previous characterizations of code switching as a strategy of neutrality can be better explained as switching as the unmarked choice (Scotton 1976 on code switching by white collar work peers between English and Pidgin English in Lagos, Nigeria, and between English and Swahili in Kampala, Uganda). The entire issue of switching as a neutralizing strategy needs more discussion, however, since switching as a marked choice in order to accommodate may also be a neutralizing strategy.
4. Pfaff (1979:298) points out that degree of morphological adaptation is related to the functional load of morphological marking for different syntactic categories. She specifically remarks on the predominance of morphological adaptation in verbs, mentioning as well Haugen's comment that this tendency can be explained in functional terms (1973:536).
5. See Calsamiglia and Tuson (1984) on code switching in Barcelona.

References

- Berk-Seligson, Susan. 1986. Linguistic constraints on intrasentential code-switching: A study of Spanish/Hebrew bilingualism. *Language in Society* 15:313-48.
- Blom, Jan Petter, and John Gumperz. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In:

- Directions in sociolinguistics. Edited by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 407-34.
- Bokamba, Eyamba. 1986a. Code-mixing, language variation, and linguistic theory: Evidence from Bantu languages. Paper presented at 17th Annual African Linguistics Conference. To appear in *Lingua*.
- Bokamba, Eyamba. 1986b. Are there syntactic constraints on code-switching? Paper presented at 15th Annual N-WAV Conference.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson. 1978. Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In: *Questions and politeness*. Edited by Esther Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 56-310.
- Calsamiglia, Helena, and Amparo Tuson. 1984. Use of languages and code switching in groups of youths in a barrio of Barcelona. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 47.105-21.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15.325-40.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1967. Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *The Journal of Social Issues* 23.29-38.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope Helen. 1985. *Choix et alternance des langues à Strasbourg*. Ph.D. dissertation. Université de Strasbourg.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In: *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech acts*. Edited by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan. New York: Academic Press. 41-55.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. Conversational code switching. In: *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 59-99.
- Haugen, Einar. 1973. Bilingualism, language contact, and immigrant languages in the United States: A research report, 1956-1970. In: *Current trends in linguistics*, vol. 10. Edited by Thomas Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton. 505-91.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972. On communicative competence. In: *Sociolinguistics*. Edited by John Pride and Janet Holmes. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 269-93.
- Joshi, Aravind K. 1985. Processing of sentences with intrasentential code switching. In: *Natural language parsing: Psychological, computational, and theoretical perspectives*. Edited by David Dowty, L. Karttunen, and A. Swicky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 190-204.
- Kachru, Braj. 1978. Code-mixing as a communicative strategy in India. In: *Georgetown University Round Table on*

- Languages and Linguistics 1978. Edited by James E. Alatis. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 107-24.
- LePage, R.B., and Andree Tabouret-Keller. 1985. Acts of identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McClure, Erica. 1981. Formal and functional aspects of the codeswitched discourse of bilingual children. In: Latino language and communicative behavior. Edited by Richard P. Duran. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. 69-92.
- Nartey, Jonas. 1982. Code-switching, interference or faddism? Language use among educated Ghanaians. *Anthropological Linguistics* 24.182-92.
- Pierce, C.S. 1956. Logic as semiotic: The theory of signs. In: The philosophy of Pierce: Selected writings. Edited by Justus Buchler. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 98-119.
- Pfaff, Carol W. Constraints on language mixing. *Language* 55.291-318.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español': Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18.581-618.
- Poplack, Shana. 1981. Syntactic structure and social function of code-switching. In: Latino language and communicative behavior. Edited by Richard P. Duran. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. 169-84.
- Poplack, Shana. 1985. Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. MS.
- Poplack, Shana. 1986. A sociolinguistic paradigm for grammars in contact. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics.
- Scotton, Carol Myers. 1976. Strategies of neutrality: Language choice in uncertain situations. *Language* 52.919-41.
- Scotton, Carol Myers. 1982. The possibility of switching: Motivation for maintaining multilingualism. *Anthropological Linguistics* 24.432-44.
- Scotton, Carol Myers. 1983. The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44.115-36.
- Scotton, Carol Myers. 1985. What the heck, sir: Style shifting and lexical colouring as powerful language features. In: Sequence and pattern in communicative behaviour. Edited by Richard L. Street and Joseph N. Cappella. London: Edward Arnold. 103-19.
- Scotton, Carol Myers. 1986a. Code-switching as an unmarked

- choice and morpheme constraints. Paper presented at 15th Annual N-WAV Conference.
- Scotton, Carol Myers. 1986b. Diglossia and code switching. In: *The Fergusonian impact*, vol. 2. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman et al. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 403-15.
- Scotton, Carol Myers, and William Ury. 1977. Bilingual strategies: The social function of code switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 13.5-20.
- Scotton, Carol Myers, and Zhu Wanjin. 1983. Tongzhi in China: Language change and its conversational consequences. *Language in Society* 12.477-94.
- Scotton, Carol Myers, and Zhu Wanjin. 1984. The multiple meanings of shi.fu, a language change in progress. *Anthropological Linguistics* 26.326-44.
- Singh, Rajendra. 1983. We, they, and us: A note on code-switching and stratification in North India. *Language in Society* 12.71-73.
- Southworth, Franklin. 1980. Indian bilingualism: Some educational and linguistic implications. In: *Studies in child language and multilingualism*. Edited by New York Academy of Sciences. Vol. 345. 121-35.
- Thakerar, Jitendra N., Howard Giles, and Jenny Cheshire. 1982. Psychological and linguistic parameters of speech accommodation theory. In: *Advances in the social psychology of language*. Edited by Colin Fraser and Klaus Scherer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 205-55.
- Timm, L.A. Spanish-English code-switching: El porque y how-not-to. *Romance Philology* 28.473-82.
- Van den Berg, Marinus. 1985. Language planning and language in Taiwan: A study of language choice behavior in public settings. Ph.D. dissertation. Rijksuniversiteit de Leiden.
- Vihman, Marilyn May. 1985. A developmental perspective on code-switching: Conversations between a pair of bilingual siblings. MS.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1983. Bilingual code-switching and syntactic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14.520-36.

VARIATION AS LANGUAGE POLICY: A UNIQUE NATIONAL CASE

Einar Haugen
Harvard University

In recent years the study of variation has become a central concept in sociolinguistic research. I need only refer to the work of William Labov in our country and to that of Peter Trudgill in Great Britain to see how important they consider the concept of variation. To some extent this view stands in opposition to the traditional concept of language as a unified entity, a static view. We probably owe this view to the standardizations of Western languages that took place at the time of the Renaissance and the Reformation, and as one result of the invention of printing. For English this process was not completed until the eighteenth century, when Samuel Johnson published his famous dictionary in 1755. It would seem that language planning which has as its goal the creation of a static and unified language should have no place for variation. Yet the fact is that in Norway the policy of what I shall call 'planned variation' is an essential part of the process of language planning (cf. also Vinje, Språkplanlegging: Mål og metoder, n.d.).

I take it that everyone here is aware of the fact that for the past 100 years Norway has had two competing standard languages. Anyone who does not know it needs to do some homework, for example, by reading my book of two decades ago, Language Conflict and Language Planning (1966). If you wish to explore the attitude of New Norwegian adherents, I can refer you to writings by Skard (1963, 1985) or Vikør (1975). My intention today is to bring you up to date on the last two decades, leading up to the latest orthographic reform, which was adopted by the Storting, the Norwegian parliament, in 1981. Along the way I hope to show just how some Norwegians pinned their hopes on variation as an instrument of language planning.

In 1885, when the decision was taken to make Norway bilingual, or at least diglossic, the country was overwhelmingly rural and agricultural. It was also profoundly class-divided, with a ruling elite of city-based academics and bureaucrats, who ran the government and the school system. The language taught in the schools was spelled identically like Danish, but the urban elite spoke a language that was markedly different from Danish, a Dano-Norwegian that could almost be described as a kind of creolized or at least provincial Danish. The rural population, that comprised at least 90 percent of the people, spoke a wide variety of dialects, lineally descended from the Old Norwegian of the Middle Ages. Out of the rural dialects the linguist Ivar Aasen had fashioned a synthetic language that he called 'Norwegian' and proposed as a substitute for the written Danish. His work was fired by a dual motivation: (1) nationalism dictated that Norway should have a language of her own, recognizably similar to Old Norwegian; (2) democracy called for a norm that would be closer to the spoken language and hence easier for the common people to master.

The decision to sponsor Aasen's language, which came to be called Landsmål 'language of the land', meant no more than that its use was permitted in those schools that chose to adopt it. Its adherents expected it to sweep Danish writing out of the schools and gradually become the only Norwegian language. Here they reckoned without the resistance of the established elite, who struck back by offering to modify Danish to agree with their own elite, urbanized Dano-Norwegian. This was done in the reform of 1907, two years after Norway achieved full independence. One of its main features was elimination of the voiced Danish stops after vowels in favor of the Norwegian voiceless stops, as in tak for tag 'roof', sope for sobe 'sweep', and ut for ud 'out'. But some variation was permitted, e.g., both bok and bog 'book', sak and sag 'case' were permitted, since the voiced pronunciation of these 'learned' words was well established in elite speech. The reform proved to be successful beyond expectations, and before long the exceptional forms were eliminated and the 'hard' consonants, as they were called, became virtually universal. In this new guise Dano-Norwegian got the name Riksmål 'language of the kingdom' and was rapidly adopted by all but the most reactionary publications.

This compromise did not stop the Landsmål from winning over a goodly part of the rural districts, particularly the west coast and midland districts, where the dialects were most conservative. In their eagerness to achieve victory, the reformers were so encouraged by their success that they pushed through new and more radical reforms in 1917 and 1938, with a wide spectrum of variations that they hoped would be adopted. Even so, Dano-Norwegian remained the majority language, and in 1940 an event occurred that changed the whole complexion of the problem. By this time the capital, Christiania, had become Kristiania and in 1928 Oslo, its old, historic name; in 1929 the two languages were tendentiously renamed: Bokmål 'book language' for Dano-Norwegian and Nynorsk 'New Norwegian' for the Landsmål of Ivar Aasen. But in 1940 Norway was invaded by the German Nazis and occupied by the Reich until its ultimate defeat in 1945. The Norwegians had other things to think about, and they experienced a national unity of resistance that made them a greatly sobered people. The Labor Party, which was now the dominant party, had no fixed policy on the language problem. The old slogans of nationalism and democracy were no longer effective means of separating the population into antagonistic camps.

Attempts to enforce the reforms of 1938 after the war met with a vigorous counterattack from urban conservatives who wished to restore their old Riksmål. This opposition grew especially strident in the 1950s, when two radical authors led a very vocal campaign on behalf of Riksmål. The most active was the poet Arnulf Øverland, closely followed by novelist Sigurd Hoel. Øverland published pamphlet after pamphlet, bearing such incendiary titles as 'Is our language abolished?', 'How often must we change languages?', and 'Bokmålet--a misshapen Landsmål'. These were collected in a volume entitled Language and nonlanguage (1960: Sprog og usprog). An elite organization was founded to promote Riksmål, entitled The Norwegian Academy for Language and Literature. It published its own desk-size dictionary, Riksmålsordboken 'the Riksmål Dictionary', declaring the purpose of furnishing 'a guide to those who wish to write a correct Norwegian.' This 814-page book has adopted the orthography of 1917, with only minor concessions to the variations of 1938. Needless to say, this volume is not authorized for use in the schools.

The advance of New Norwegian had brought about a requirement that all Norwegian children had to learn to read and write both norms, but each community chose which norm should be dominant in its instruction. New Norwegian was left with only about one-sixth of the pupils, all in the coastal and central area, and in none of the cities. The sobering fact faced by the reformers was that Norway had entered the industrial age. Not only has the urban population multiplied, but even the farmers all have autos and tractors, shopping centers within easy reach, and electric power that lights their homes and barns as well as their radios and television sets. A population that was once isolated and provincial has within the memory of man become a functioning part of the Western world.

There were certain shibboleths that especially angered the Riksmål people. These were the extensive replacement of folk forms for the traditional Dano-Norwegian ones. The committee that proposed the reform of 1938 had gone very far in fusing the forms of Riksmål with those of Nynorsk. Whole word forms were introduced, e.g. bru for bro 'bridge', or fram for frem 'forward'. Historical and dialectal diphthongs were substituted for monophthongs: ei for e, au and øy for ø. Most drastic of all was the adoption of the suffix -a for the definite article -en, which involved nouns that were considered feminine, a category that did not exist in Danish. The feminine forms had won some currency in words for rural objects like ku 'cow' and gjet 'goat'. An -a also replaced the article of the neuter plural, which had been -ene; only one word had won some support here, viz. barna 'the children' (for Danish børnene). Finally, the suffix -a took the place of Riksmål -et as the preterite of weak verbs.

By taking the exceptional forms as the norm and carrying them systematically through the language, the reformers had in fact created a new norm that had no base in anybody's actual speech. It was part of a dream that had been widely nourished among foresighted planners around the turn of the century. It was articulated by the folklorist Moltke Moe, who wrote in 1909 that the great goal was 'a common Norwegian language, growing out of the living dialects in the cities as well as in the country' (Haugen 1966:62). Over the years the two norms had in fact become much more alike by concessions on both sides and an orthographic regulation that ensured an identical image for words that were pronounced

alike. But there were still these marked shibboleths that separated them.

It was hoped in 1938 that these could be eliminated by the system of optional variation. Whenever it was deemed possible, identical forms were made obligatory. Other forms were made optional (*obligatorisk/valgfri*). But among the optional forms, there were two degrees: equal forms (*jamstilt*) or unequal forms, where one was enclosed in brackets in the lists and called a 'side form' (*sideform*). From the use of brackets, the unequal forms are sometimes called 'bracket forms' (*klammeformer*). School books could choose either one of the equal forms, which are listed twice. Pupils may use bracket forms in their writing. Spelling lists are published giving all such alternatives; Norwegian pupils were made the victims of the spelling lists, and the tendency has been to disregard all rules of spelling.

A Language Commission established by Parliament in 1952 failed to allay the controversy. Only when the Labor government in 1964 appointed a broad-based committee headed by linguist professor Hans Vogt did a new phase begin to dawn. This committee had a mandate for moderation, and its report led to the creation of a new Language Council (*Språkrådet*). This council, which included representatives of all shades of linguistic opinion, advised the government to retreat. This led to the official resolution of 1981, which reversed many of the recommendations from 1938. To a great extent this was done by restoring to equal status a number of Dano-Norwegian forms that had been marked as unequal or wholly excluded in 1938.

Following are some examples of the changes made in 1981:

- (1) Rejected or demoted forms are restored to equal status: bro for bru 'bridge'; syd for sør 'south'; frem for fram 'forth, forward' (but still ku for ko 'cow').
- (2) Monophthongs for diphthongs: ben for bein 'straight' (but not ben 'bone', still bracketed); sen for sein 'late, slow'; ren for rein 'clean' (but not ren 'reindeer', a 'rural' word).
- (3) Sg. def. f. suffix -en for -a: boken for boka 'the book'; listen for lista 'the list'; but not words for rural life like bygden for bygda 'the rural community'; or bikkjen for bikkja 'the dog' or 'cur'--rural words).
- (4) Pl. def. n. suffix -ene for -a: husene for husa 'the houses' (but not barnene for barna 'the children').

- (5) Pret. suffix wk. verbs -et for -a: kastet for kasta 'threw', elsket for elska 'loved'.

The net effect of this reform has been to bury for some time to come any dream of a 'united' or 'common' Norwegian language by a fusion between the two norms. For the foreseeable future the country will have to struggle with two slightly different norms, essentially dialects with a base respectively in the urban and rural areas. There is no victory here for either norm, but conflict has spread knowledge and understanding of the problem. One thing has resulted: a tendency to look with tolerance on dialect variation and to accept the speech form of others. The Language Council has published new, handy dictionaries for each norm: a Bokmål dictionary (containing 65,000 words), and a Nynorsk dictionary (with 90,000 words, many of them purely dialectal). The conflict has been defused, once neither norm is trying to destroy the other. Both are used in the national media, with Bokmål the obvious favorite. The Language Council has also urged people to moderate the tendency toward anglicisms and to cultivate their own language.

To my knowledge, the Norwegian resort to planned variation is unique in the annals of language planning. In Greece the problem of their so-called 'diglossia' is being solved by the firm adoption of the Demotike, with a discreet sprinkling, where necessary, from the learned vocabulary of the Katharevousa. In Yugoslavia the various Slavic languages continue to live side by side, with little or no interpenetration. In Norway there has as yet been no real amalgamation, but there has been a considerable rapprochement. The existence of two norms and a multitude of dialects is a godsend to literary artists, who seek expressive alternatives for tired phrases. A new generation of actors has entered the stage, for whom the squabbles of the past are of less interest. It remains to be seen just how they will approach this problem and solve its many intricate byways.

References

- Guttu, Tor. 1977. Riksmålsordboken. Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget (sponsored by Det norske Akademi for Sprog og Litteratur).
- Haugen, Einar. 1966. Language conflict and language planning: The case of Modern Norwegian. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Hovdenak, Marit, et al. 1986. Nynorskordboka: Definisjons- og rettskrivingsordbok. Oslo: Det norske Samlaget (sponsored by Norsk Leksikografisk Institutt and Norsk Språkråd).
- Landre, Marit Ingebjørg, and Boye Wangensteen. 1986. Bokmålsordboka: Definisjons- og rettskrivingsordbok. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget (sponsored by Norsk Leksikografisk Institutt and Norsk Språkråd).
- Øverland, Arnulf. 1940. Er vårt sprog avskaffet?; 1948. Hvor ofte skal vi skifte sprog?; 1949. Bokmålet--et avstumpet landsmål. Oslo: H. Aschehoug.
- Øverland, Arnulf. 1967. Sprog og usprog. Oslo: Riksmålsforlaget.
- Skard, Sigmund. 1985. Målstrid og massekultur. Oslo: Det norske Samlaget.
- Vikør, Lars S. 1975. The new Norse language movement. Oslo: Forlaget Novus.
- Vinje, Finn-Erik. n.d. Språkplanlegging: Mål og metoder. Oslo: Tapir (stenciled).

LANGUAGE STATUS AND LANGUAGE ACCOMMODATION ALONG A LINGUISTIC BORDER

Shana Poplack

University of Ottawa

It is by now commonplace that the differential power of particular social groups in a society is reflected in linguistic variability and attitudes towards such variability. Typically, the dominant group promotes its patterns of language use as a model, and use of a lower prestige variety by minority group members reduces their chances for advancement and success. A minority speaker is thus often faced with the dilemma of striving for social mobility by adopting the variety of the dominant group, or maintaining his own identity by conserving his native variety. Whichever his choice, this is then evaluated by other members of the speech community in accordance with the social and symbolic value associated with each. These evaluations, or attitudes, towards competing varieties have generally been shown by researchers to have some influence on actual behaviour, which in multilingual situations may be manifested by language maintenance, loss or shift on the macrolevel, and direction, extent, and type of accommodation to, or borrowing between, varieties on the microlevel.

The study of attitudes towards and consequences of language contact is thus a key aspect of our ongoing research into the French spoken along the Quebec-Ontario border, the national capital region of Canada. Since at least 1839, French Canadians have usually been a minority everywhere in Canada except in Quebec, and their language has undergone a slow but inexorable shift toward English, traditionally the language of business, administration, the media, and leisure. It comes as no surprise, then, that a large body of research (e.g. Lambert et al. 1960, Lambert 1967, Giles and Powesland 1975, Clarke and King 1982, Clément in press) has suggested that French Canadian

attitudes toward their own language are less positive than their evaluations of English. It is widely acknowledged (though rarely demonstrated) among historical linguists and students of language contact and change that feelings of linguistic insecurity on the part of a dominated group will increase the susceptibility of their language to contact-induced change, shift, and eventually death.

The Ottawa-Hull region is an ideal laboratory for the synchronic study of these issues. Though the two cities form a single urban complex, they are separated by the Ottawa River, which is simultaneously a provincial, geographic, and linguistic border: on the Quebec side, French is the majority language while on the Ontario side it represents a minority, with less than 19% mother-tongue claimants, according to the 1981 census.

The makeup of the region permits us to assess the roles of majority vs. minority status as sociostructural determinants of linguistic attitudes and behaviour. If, as has been suggested (D'Anglejan and Tucker 1973, Bourhis and Genesee 1980, Genesee and Bourhis 1982, Daoust 1985), the québécois nationalist movement of the 1970s had a positive impact on French Canadian identity in Quebec, we might expect eventual differentiation between populations to manifest itself in terms of greater linguistic security among the majority French speakers in Hull, and presumably greater resistance to the incursions of English. On the other hand, if what dialect geographers refer to as a 'neighbourhood effect' (e.g. Chambers and Trudgill 1980) obtains, whereby linguistic features spread to adjacent areas from a prestige centre (here, anglophone Ottawa), then both minority and majority French speakers should show similar linguistic behaviours.

Five neighbourhoods were selected on both sides of the border, each with a different ratio of anglophones to francophones, in order to test the hypothesis that influence from another language should be most apparent when the recipient language has minority status. These were sampled according to strict random procedures, resulting in a fully representative sample of francophones native to Ottawa or Hull respectively, stratified according to a number of extralinguistic factors. Informal 'sociolinguistic' interviews were carried out with informants by local in-group members, totalling about 340 hours of naturally occurring bilingual discourse, on which the results reported below are based.¹

Figure 1. Neighbourhoods sampled in the Ottawa-Hull region. Percentages refer to number of English mother-tongue claimants according to the 1976 census.

I will first review our findings on the language attitudes prevalent in the Ottawa-Hull area (Poplack and Miller 1985) and then attempt to validate them through independent study of actual language use, focusing here on patterns for incorporating English into French discourse. In particular, I will seek to establish the status of individual factors (such as bilingual proficiency, and language attitudes) and environmental factors (such as social class membership, neighbourhood of residence and status of French therein) as predictors of rate and type of English usage in French discourse.

Language attitudes in the Ottawa-Hull region. To place the results which follow in linguistic context, note that both

Ottawa and Hull francophones report considerable bilingual proficiency, with no present indication, on either side of the border, of French being displaced by English. We nonetheless observe a certain tendency associating several categories of English skills and habits with Ottawa residents. Thus, individuals who report speaking English or both languages with parents and/or spouse, whose languages of instruction in school include both English and French, who read the English paper and watch English television, who consider English an easy language to learn, all tend to be concentrated in Ottawa neighbourhoods.²

A first set of issues to emerge from systematic content analysis of the bilingual corpus involves recognition of the distinctiveness of French varieties, professed affect toward them, and evidence of linguistic insecurity with regard to the dialect the informants themselves speak. All members agree in ascribing negative affect to their own local and personal variety of French. Nonetheless, the minority (i.e. Ottawa) speakers show more preoccupation³ with Hull French, more awareness of its differentiating features, and more positive affect toward the features of Hull French than the majority speakers have toward these same features. Yet specific characterizations of Ottawa and Hull French given by their respective speakers are identical: both are described first as being fraught with anglicisms, and second as joual.⁴ I will return to this area of agreement when I discuss the differences in their actual linguistic behaviour.

Another set of items pertinent to the present discussion concerns global evaluation of the French and English languages, as well as of bilingualism and its effects--all issues which, not surprisingly, again preoccupy Ottawa residents more than their Hull counterparts. Speakers agree in imputing mainly instrumental value to English and affective value to French; but Ottawa speakers ascribe affective value to being bilingual as well, in contrast to Hull speakers, who regard this too as an instrumental necessity. All informants agree that some things are easier to say in English. For Hull speakers, this would be a result of momentary lapses, whereas Ottawa speakers describe constructions which are too 'weird' or long to say in French, i.e. referents for which the French equivalent is no longer in widespread use, as illustrated in (1).

- (1) Là, à un moment donné, 'hey, passe-moi le torque-wrench' ou 'passe-moi la clef-dynamométrique'. Hey, dynamométrique, ça vient long! (101/2120)⁵
 'It gets to the point where it's "hey, pass me the torque-wrench" or "hey, pass me the clef-dynamométrique ['torque-wrench']'. Hey, dynamométrique, that's getting long!

Informants from both sides of the border cite the existence of code-switching, and admit to engaging in it themselves, reportedly to show politeness to unilingual anglophones (i.e. situational code-switching). In defining it, Hull speakers tend to give characterizations of borrowing, as in (2), which we see to be in fact the method of incorporating English forms into French discourse most closely associated with them. Ottawa speakers, on the other hand, invoke true code-switching (as in (3)), which they note often fulfills the function of providing the most precise way of saying something (4).

- (2a) Je vas dire un mot en français puis c'est--le mot est anglais réellement, tu sais? (044/2146)
 'I'll say a word in French and it's--the word is really English, you know?'
- (2b) Dans notre français, il y a bien des mots qu'on dit en anglais. (067/1427)
 'In our French, there are a lot of words we say in English.'
- (3a) On va envoyer une couple de phrases, mettons, en anglais. (012/1566)
 'Like, we'll throw in a couple of sentences in English.'
- (3b) Nous autres on va parler le français puis après ça on va sauter dans l'anglais, puis... ça va faire pas mal mélangé. (017/934)
 'We'll speak French and then we'll jump into English and... it'll turn out pretty mixed up.'
- (4) Ben, comme tantôt, j'ai changé à l'anglais parce que je voulais m'exprimer avec les termes exacts plutôt

que d'essayer de traduire et puis... arriver avec un mot qui était pas le mot juste. (006/980)

'Well, like earlier, I changed into English because I wanted to express myself with the exact terms instead of trying to translate and... ending up with a word that's not the right word.'

The majority francophones blame this behaviour on the presence of English in the milieu, and show negative affect toward it, while the minority speakers view it as a natural result of being bilingual.

Indeed, the Quebec informants distinguish themselves throughout as more militant, insular, and assertive of their rights. More notice a decline in the French character of their neighbourhoods,⁶ react negatively to an eventual lack of French services, insist on initiating conversations with strangers in French, believe that anglophones should be required to learn French, and are against both interracial and interethnic marriage. Ottawa francophones are more tolerant in all these regards.

In sum, linguistic insecurity is overtly expressed by both minority and majority speakers, in denigrating their local and personal varieties of French, considering other varieties superior, evaluating English as having instrumental value while limiting French to affective uses, etc. These attitudes reflect pan-Canadian views on the role of French, as has already been found in numerous other studies. However, from the indirect evidence examined, Hull speakers emerge consistently as less accommodating to the dominant English language (and culture), i.e. show covert indices of linguistic 'security', which may well be a consequence of their majority group membership. This is in sharp contrast to the minority (Ottawa) speakers, who by their preoccupations and their attitudes show more concern, awareness, and readiness to accommodate to the contact situation, both socially and linguistically. They also make more realistic observations with regard to the impact of English on their French: they recognize that English words have displaced French ones in their lexicon, they correctly characterize their code-switching behaviour, ascribe it to their own copious use of English, and show neutral rather than negative affect towards it.

Independent analysis of the way English is actually used in the French of these speakers allows us to validate some of the conative attitudes in Ottawa, and suggests that the

cognitive and affective judgments of Hull speakers regarding the negative impact of English on French are founded more in ideology than in actual practice. As we focus in ensuing sections on the two major manifestations of English in French discourse (code-switching and borrowing), we will see that Hull speakers in fact not only use far less English while speaking French, but use it quite differently from Ottawans, despite their greater preoccupation with anglicisms.

We have been engaged for the last several years in a program of research showing that code-switching and borrowing obey different linguistic constraints (e.g. Poplack and Sankoff 1984, Sankoff et al. 1986, Poplack et al. 1987, Naït M'Barek and Sankoff 1987, Poplack et al. in press, Poplack and Sankoff in press). Here I want to show that they are subject to different social influences as well. In particular, though Ottawa and Hull francophones share the same global patterns for incorporating English into French (as opposed, say, to Puerto Ricans, who have also been quantitatively studied (Poplack 1980, 1981; Poplack and Sankoff 1984), there are subtle differences between the groups which appear to be attributable to their majority or minority status.

Code-switching in the Ottawa-Hull region. For detailed discussion of the problems inherent in distinguishing borrowing from code-switching, I refer the reader to the aforementioned references. Suffice it to say here that recipient language discourse may contain liberal amounts of English incorporations whose status as loanword or code-switch is initially unclear, as their surface form may be consistent with the morphology and/or syntax of both languages, as in the underscored portions in (5).

- (5a) Il y avait une band là qui jouait de la musique steady, pis il y avait des games de ball, pis... ils vendaient de l'ice cream, pis il y avait une grosse beach, le monde se baignait. (057/890)
'There was a band there that played music all the time and there were ball games, and... they sold ice cream, and there was a big beach where people would go swimming.'

- (5b) Il y avait toutes sortes de chambres là, tu sais là, un dining room, living room, un den, un family room, un

rec room, mais... mil neuf cent quatre-vingt dix-neuf par mois. (037/181)

'There were all kinds of rooms there, you know, a dining room, living room, a den, a family room, a rec room, but... \$1999 a month.'

Conversely, other sequences can be identified as to their language membership on the same morphological and syntactic grounds. Thus the English-origin material in (6) is being handled like French and not like English, receiving French affixation in (6a) and French word order in (6b).

- (6a) Sont spoilés rotten. (041/1140)
'They're spoiled rotten.'

- (6b) A côté il y en a un autre gros building high rise. (029/175)
'Next door there's another big high-rise building.'

Forms like these were excluded from our study of code-switching. The discussion which follows is based on analysis of some 2000 unambiguous code-switches, defined as multiword sequences, which remain lexically, syntactically, and morphologically unadapted to recipient language patterns, as in the underscored portions in (7).

- (7a) Je viens déprimée and I take it out on the kids. (015/1120)
'I get depressed...'

- (7b) Tu sais, I helped them à comprendre le français pis à parler. (014/569)
'You know, I helped them to understand French and to speak.'

Examination of the distribution of code-switching across the five neighbourhoods sampled in Ontario and Quebec (Poplack 1985) bears out the predictions of our initial hypothesis regarding the status of French in the environment, at least quantitatively: residents of the Ottawa communities tend to switch from French to English three to four times as frequently as their Hull counterparts. It is nonetheless striking that on both sides of the border, the overwhelming majority of these switches appear to fulfill the

same four discourse functions: the switch provides the apt expression or what I have called the mot juste, as exemplified in (8a); the switch occurs while discussing language or engaging in metalinguistic commentary, as in (8b); the switch calls attention to or brackets the English intervention by the use of expressions such as that in (8c); and finally, in the context of explaining, specifying, or translating as in (8d).

- (8a) Oh, you're darn right qu'ils en mangeaient des maudites rinces. (005/3254)
'Oh, you're darn right they got a good beating.'
- (8b) Pis "chat sauvage". Je dirais pas "un chat sauvage". M'as dire, "'garde le beau raccoon". (109/3254)
'And chat sauvage [raccoon]. I wouldn't say "un chat sauvage". I'll say "look at the pretty raccoon!"'
- (8c) Qu'est-ce qu'ils appellent le frog en anglais là, c'était le français dans ce temps là. (079/412)
'What they call "frog" in English, that was French in those days.'
- (8d) Ils ont cué [sic] cinq détenus là, des screws, des gardiens, ouais. (085/1405)
'They killed five prisoners, the screws, the guards, yeah.'

The use of code-switching to fulfill particular discourse functions has been widely studied (cf. among others, Gumperz 1976/1982, Valdés 1981, Auer 1981, Scotton this volume). Rather than enter into interpretation of the 'meaning' of individual switches, I focus on the global function they all fulfill in the discourse: that of flagging, or breaking up the speech flow, and attendant consequences for the effective separation of the French and English linguistic systems. Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of the code-switching patterns attested in the Ottawa-Hull region is the dramatically reduced frequency in all neighbourhoods of spontaneous code-switches at a turn boundary within the same interaction, as in (9a); switches of full sentences or

independent clauses, as in (9b) and (7); and especially, intrasentential switches, as in (9c).

- (9a) Interviewer: C'est juste un petit micro, il y a une clip tu peux mettre sur ton gilet là.
'It's just a small mike, there's a clip you can put on your sweater.'
Informant: I'm a star! (002/27)
- (9b) Nous autres on étaient mariés, et pis we fight for our marriage. (044/1770)
'We were married and...'
- (9c) A moins qu'ils diraient que le brain est completely finished, pis que toute, toute, toute, toute est fini. (066/2025)
'Unless they say the brain is completely finished, and absolutely everything is finished.'

Thus the kind of behaviour I had earlier (Poplack 1980) designated as 'true' code-switching (i.e. in which individual switches cannot be attributed to particular stylistic or discourse functions, nor be accorded a specific local interpretation) is only a minor phenomenon in the Ottawa-Hull French speech community. Here, in contrast, francophones from both sides of the border, despite reported lack of close interaction between them (Poplack and Miller 1985), are highly 'focussed' (in the sense of Lepage and Tabouret-Keller 1980) around a shared strategy for incorporating English stretches into French discourse. It may be characterized as one which highlights or calls attention to the other-language material, thereby revealing an awareness on the part of the speaker of such usage, and differing from the more spontaneous, unreflecting use of English attested in Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking communities in the United States. It is most likely that this parallel behaviour is attributable to at least two of the agencies promoting focussing cited by Lepage and Tabouret-Keller: the feelings of group solidarity and linguistic insecurity vis-à-vis the anglophone role model experienced by francophones in their minority role within the global Canadian context.

Nonetheless, despite the overall similarities, further comparison of code-switching patterns in the Quebec and

Ontario neighbourhoods allows us to detect subtle distinctions in the uses to which these incorporations are put, beyond the gross frequency differences already noted, as can be appreciated graphically in Figure 2.

In the three Ottawa (minority) neighbourhoods code-switching to English tends to be done to provide (what is perceived to be) the most felicitous rendition (mot juste), consistent with the attitudes of their residents reported earlier. In Quebec, on the other hand, where English usage is denigrated, switches to English are largely restricted to metalinguistic commentary, a device having the effect of showing full awareness on the part of the speaker of using English.

Relative effect of social factors on code-switching. We have seen that intrasentential code-switching, which has been found to be associated with skilled bilinguals in appropriate, ingroup interactions (Poplack 1980), is eschewed in the Ottawa-Hull region in favour of special-purpose or 'flagged' code-switching. This is despite the fact that the speakers in the sample show varying degrees of bilingual ability, so if this were the determining factor, at least the highly bilingual speakers could be expected to manifest code-switching patterns requiring more developed bilingual skills. In fact, as can be observed from the overall rates of code-switching in (10), bilingual ability, as measured by an index of proficiency in English,⁷ does play an important role, at least insofar as overall code-switching 'rate' is concerned: the most bilingual speakers tend to switch into English about five times as often as their least bilingual counterparts.

Minority or majority status of French, as measured by neighbourhood of residence, also has an effect, though apparently inferior to that of bilingual ability, to judge by the 'range': the difference between the largest and smallest average values for the groups included in that factor. Most of the code-switching occurs in the Ontario neighbourhoods, where English is the official language. Finally, there appears to be a minor social class effect, with middle-class speakers switching somewhat less than the others. Now it is, of course, possible that some of these factors are correlated among themselves, either because the highly bilingual speakers happen to be concentrated in the Ottawa neighbourhoods, or among middle-class speakers.

Figure 2. Distribution of favoured code-switch types by neighbourhood.

To determine the independence of these effects, as well as their relative importance, we cross-tabulated these and other factors (e.g. age and sex), as illustrated in Table 1.

(10) Code-switching rates⁸

(a) By English proficiency (range = 22.7)					
	Low	Mid-low	Mid-high	High	
N per speaker:	6.5	11.0	20.8	29.2	
(b) By neighbourhood (range = 17.4)					
	Ottawa:			Hull:	
	West End	Basse Ville	Vanier	Vieux Hull	Mont Bleu
N per speaker:	21.4	17.6	23.0	6.1	5.6
(c) By socioeconomic class (range = 6.6)					
Class:	LWC	UWC	LMC	MMC	
N per speaker:	15.5	17.3	13.3	10.7	

Table 1 shows that two factors exercise a significant independent effect on code-switching rate: an individual's bilingual ability and her linguistic environment are both predictors, of roughly equal magnitude, of overall code-switching rate.

Moreover, their effects are independent of each other: among speakers at each level of bilingual ability, the Ontario residents show clearly higher rates of code-switching, while on each side of the border, the more English-proficient speakers consistently switch most.

The social class effect apparent in (10) may be ascribed to statistical fluctuation. Examining each level of bilingual ability and neighbourhood of residence separately, we can see that class does not operate in a systematic manner, as it would if it had a genuine independent effect on code-switching rates.

Table 1. Relative effects of linguistic environment, English proficiency, and socioeconomic class on code-switching rate.

(a) Environment by English proficiency.

	Neighbourhood:		Average	Range
	Ottawa	Hull		
English proficiency:				
Low	13.6	5.2	9.0	14.2
High	26.4	8.9	23.2	
Average	20.7	5.9		
Range	14.8			

(b) Environment by socioeconomic class.

	Neighbourhood:		Average	Range
	Ottawa	Hull		
Socioeconomic class:				
Working	26.0	4.2	15.9	
Lower-middle	18.6	21.1	19.3	8.5
Middle-middle	22.8	4.8	10.8	
Average	21.3	10.3		
Range	11.0			

(c) English proficiency by socioeconomic class.

	Socioeconomic class:			Average	Range
	WC	LMC	MMC		
English proficiency:					
Low	7.4	11.0	6.3	9.0	14.2
High	27.5	21.2	19.7	23.2	
Average	15.5	15.4	10.8		
Range	4.7				

The other extralinguistic factors were determined to have no significant independent effect on code-switching rates. Only two factors, then, are predictive of propensity towards code-switching: an individual's bilingual ability, and the linguistic environment in which s/he resides. One cannot, of course, be expected to switch into English without sufficient knowledge of that language to do so. But independent of this ability, an individual's membership in a speech commun-

ity and his ascription to the linguistic attitudes prevalent therein, determine not only overall rate, but also, to some extent, type. In effect, cross-tabulation of the same factors found to be predictive of code-switching rate confirms that only the factor of neighbourhood exercises a consistent independent effect on choice of code-switch 'type' (Tables 2 and 3), confirming earlier suggestions (Poplack 1980, 1985) that neither code-switching per se, nor specific type of code-switching occurs without reference to the communicative patterns operative in the bilingual speech community.⁹

This explains, on the one hand, the dearth of intrasentential code-switching and the corresponding preference for special-purpose or 'flagged' code-switching across the Ottawa-Hull region; and on the other, why minority and majority speakers show preferences for different code-switching strategies.

Table 2. Relative effects of linguistic environment, English proficiency and social class on code-switching type: mot juste.

(a) Environment by English proficiency.

	Neighbourhood:		Average	Range
	Ottawa	Hull		
English proficiency:				
Low	3.1	1.0	1.9	2.4
High	5.1	1.0	4.3	
Average	4.2	1.0		
Range	3.2			

(b) Environment by socioeconomic class.

	Neighbourhood:		Average	Range
	Ottawa	Hull		
Socioeconomic class:				
Working	6.1	0.6	3.6	2.2
Lower-middle	3.5	1.6	3.0	
Middle-middle	1.8	1.2	1.4	
Average	4.2	1.1		
Range	3.1			

(c) English proficiency by socioeconomic class.

English proficiency:	Socioeconomic class:			Average	Range
	WC	LMC	MMC		
Low	2.9	4.0	1.1	2.8	0.2
High	4.2	2.5	2.0		
Average	3.6	2.9	1.4		
Range	2.2				

We have seen why the Ottawa speakers should use proportionally¹⁰ more switches to express the mot juste, while their more linguistically (and politically) secure Hull counterparts prefer a strategy entailing maximal distancing from the English intervention.

Table 3. Relative effects of linguistic environment, English proficiency, and socioeconomic class on code-switching type: metalinguistic commentary.

(a) Environment by English proficiency.

English proficiency:	Neighbourhood:		Average	Range
	Ottawa	Hull		
Low	2.3	1.6	1.9	0.4
High	2.5	1.6		
Average	2.4	1.6		
Range	0.8			

(b) Environment by socioeconomic class.

Socioeconomic class:	Neighbourhood:		Average	Range
	Ottawa	Hull		
Working	2.8	1.1	2.0	0.5
Lower-middle	2.2	2.3	2.3	
Middle-middle	2.2	1.7	1.8	
Average	2.4	1.6		
Range	0.8			

(c) English proficiency by socioeconomic class.

	Socioeconomic class:			Average	Range
	WC	LMC	MMC		
English proficiency:					
Low	1.0	3.1	1.8	2.0	0.5
High	3.6	1.9	2.0	2.5	
Average	2.0	2.5	1.9		
Range	0.6				

Borrowing. We turn next to the other major manifestation of contact with English: borrowing. Lexical borrowing involves the incorporation of individual L2 words (or compounds functioning as single words) into discourse of a recipient language, usually phonologically and morphologically adapted to conform with patterns of that language, and occupying a sentence slot dictated by its syntax. The status of 'loanword', however, is traditionally conferred only on words which, in addition, recur relatively frequently, are widely used in the speech community, and have achieved a certain level of recognition or acceptance, if not normative approval (e.g. Haugen 1950, Hasselmo 1969, Mackey 1970, Poplack and Sankoff 1984, Mougeon et al. 1985).

An initial examination of the Ottawa-Hull corpus reveals a particularly complex situation. Coexisting with words which satisfy the aforementioned criteria for loanword status are others which are equally integrated from the linguistic point of view, but for which the frequency and acceptability criteria are unclear or nonexistent. Groceries and check in (11a) and (11b) are presently widely used in the region, and have been attested in French language dictionaries since before 1900; yet the first is both phonologically and morphologically integrated into French, while the second is neither. Conversely, patroller in (12a), although an unattested nonce borrowing, is fully integrated linguistically, while entertainer (12b), with the same characteristics, is only partially so.

- (11a) Elle achetait peut-être bien pour six piastres de groceries, pis elle avait peut-être bien rien que cinq piastres et demi. (057/1526)
 'She'd buy maybe six bucks worth of groceries, and she'd maybe only have five and a half bucks.'

- (11b) Une personne qui est sur la ville, comme on dit, puis qui boit, puis qui fume, elle prend tout son argent dans son check à dépenser à ça. (021/520)
 'A person who lives off the city, as they say, and who drinks and smokes, spends their whole check on that.'
- (12a) Fait je peux pas voir pourquoi payer des gros salaires à ces policiers-là qui ont juste un mille carré à patroller, tu sais? (019/1647)
 'So I can't see why they pay big salaries to those cops who only have one square mile to patrol, you know?'
- (12b) Il va dire, ben 'vous voulez avoir une bière, un café?' Tu sais, les entertainer, tu sais. (040/1766)
 'He'll say, well, "would you like a beer, a coffee?" You know, entertain them.'

Thus, spontaneous borrowings may satisfy the linguistic criteria and widespread loanwords may on occasion remain unintegrated. In order to explain the apparent pervasive variability in the treatment of borrowed forms, we examined the borrowing process itself, and how it patterns according to different subgroups in the community (Poplack et al. in press). All lone lexical items of English origin (i.e. those operationally excluded from the code-switching data) were extracted from each individual's interview, totalling over 20,000 borrowings, all occurring 'naturally' in French discourse. These could clearly be divided into four degrees of diffusion across the community. I retain here what we have referred to as 'widespread' (uttered spontaneously by more than ten speakers), and 'nonce' (said no more than once by a single speaker).

I first present a composite picture of this borrowed lexicon; then show how it is drawn on differentially by different sectors of the population. First, the majority (57%) of the borrowings of the individual speaker is made up of widespread and recurrent words, most of which are attested in both Canadian and European French dictionaries. Moreover, the borrowed lexicon is distributed across numerous semantic fields, so borrowing here, unlike code-switching, is not 'special-purpose' and cannot be said to be

motivated by lexical 'need'. In contrast to their code-switched counterparts, which are attested among all parts of speech, loanwords are concentrated in three grammatical categories: nouns, followed by verbs, and adjectives--the open classes--at a frequency far in excess of the frequency of occurrence of these categories in monolingual speech. The single English-origin words were found to be integrated into French linguistic patterns immediately upon, or shortly after, their introduction into the language: nouns tend to be assigned consistently to the same French gender, and inflected with the French [Ø] plural affix where appropriate; verbs are categorically placed in the first conjugation; and all forms are inserted into French, and never English, syntactic structures (as in example (6b)), regardless of their current level of diffusion across the community. It is only at the phonological level that integration is a gradually increasing function of date of attestation of the word and its current frequency of usage.

Figure 3 shows that nonce borrowings are about as likely to be rendered in English as in French, with only a slight bias in favour of the former. Compare this with unambiguous code-switches into English, which receive English phonology three-quarters of the time. As we move to the most widespread words, the index of integration rises steadily, so that the greater its diffusion across the community, the less likely a word is to receive English phonology. The effect of date of attestation on phonological integration is almost identical in magnitude. Previously unattested words are about as likely to be integrated into French as not, while the oldest words show a strong tendency to assimilate into French phonological patterns.

Thus, despite apparent variability, the core loanword stock in Ottawa-Hull French consists largely of 'established' loanwords--i.e. words of long standing and in widespread use in the region. They tend to be nouns, show strong evidence of assimilation into the French grammatical system, and undergo parallel phonological integration into French at rates far exceeding those of English lexical items (i.e. code-switches), a tendency which is particularly striking in the oldest and most widespread words. The basic stock of English loanwords in French contains forms which are for all intents and purposes indistinguishable from their French counterparts, i.e. which constitute an integral part of the French lexical system, and in this contrast strikingly with

code-switches, which categorically retain English morphology and syntax.

Figure 3. Average integration into French and English of loanwords used by varying numbers of speakers, compared with code-switches and native usage.

I noted earlier that many loanwords used in the region do not form part of the basic loanword stock, in particular, nonce borrowings. We now look at the conditions of usage of these (as well as the widespread) loanwords, as we examine the characteristics of the loanword users, to determine social influences on (1) overall propensity to borrow (i.e. 'rate'), and (2) preference for a particular type of borrowing (i.e. nonce vs. widespread).

Relative effect of social factors on borrowing. As in the case of code-switching, degree of proficiency in English is a strong and statistically significant determinant of both rate and type of loanword usage. Overall borrowing rates depicted in Table 4 indicate that the most bilingual speakers in the sample use proportionally more English-origin forms. It also turns out that their role is one of lexical innovation: their inflated borrowing rates are in fact due to a predilection for nonce borrowing. Their greater knowledge and use of English explain why they resort to this strategy, which, by definition, involves active ability to access the L2 lexicon, much more frequently than those less familiar with the language.

Table 4. Borrowing rates and patterns.¹¹

(a) By English proficiency.						Range
English proficiency:		Low	Mid-low	Mid-high	High	
% Loantypes/ All types	2.5	3.0	4.1	4.2		1.7
% Nonce loans/ Loan types	7.1	9.3	12.5	13.9		6.8

(b) By neighbourhood.						
	Ottawa			Hull		Range
	West End	Basse Ville	Vanier	Vieux Hull	Mont Bleu	
% Loantypes/ All types	3.4	3.8	4.7	2.8	1.9	2.8
% Nonce loans/ Loan types	12.1	12.1	14.5	6.9	5.6	8.9

(c) By socioeconomic class.						Range
Class:		LWC	UWC	LMC	MMC	
% Loantypes/ All types	4.0	3.1	3.5	1.9		2.1
% Nonce loans/ Loan types	10.1	12.1	9.8	8.2		1.9

The status of French in the speech community in which the individual resides is another important indicator of borrowing behaviour. In both overall rate and type of loanword usage, there are consistent differences between the Ottawa and Hull neighbourhoods. The direction of these differences suggests that borrowing is a function of the amount of exposure to English in the environment: the highest rates for both loanwords in general and nonce borrowings in particular are found in the Ottawa communities.

Yet another effect is contributed by social class pressures, which militate against the use of recognized loanwords. This would explain the reduced rate of borrowing in the middle class. Other factors, like age, sex, and educational attainment do not exercise an independent effect on borrowing.

Once these individual effects were determined, we could again establish a hierarchy among some of the cross-cutting extralinguistic influences on borrowing (Tables 5 and 6).

With respect to overall use of loanwords as a proportion of total vocabulary (i.e. borrowing 'rate'), social class membership is a better predictor than either environmental effects (i.e. neighbourhood of residence) or individual attributes (i.e. bilingual proficiency). The social class effect may be equated with normative pressures on speaking 'well'. Loanwords apparently form part of the stigmatized lexicon (whether because speakers are aware of their English origin or for some other reason), and thus are avoided by members of the upper classes.

It is striking that bilingual proficiency is actually the least important influence on borrowing rate. Thus, regardless of a speaker's actual linguistic capacity to access other-language lexical items, he conforms to the tendencies prevalent in his speech community. If he resides in an area in which borrowing is common (e.g. Ottawa), we may predict that loanwords will constitute a larger proportion of his total vocabulary than if he lives elsewhere, providing, of course, his social circumstances do not militate against such usage.

Yet when we examine the preferred borrowing type with respect to proportion of nonce loans (Table 5), we find that the factor of social class has no explanatory power, in contrast to its preeminent influence on overall rate. Given that only nonce borrowing involves drawing lexical items directly from English (since established loanwords may be

transmitted via other francophones), it would be reasonable to assume that individual bilingual ability was the key predictor of borrowing type.

Table 5. Relative effects of linguistic environment, English proficiency and social class on borrowing rates: loan types as a percentage of total lexicon.

(a) Environment by English proficiency.					
		Neighbourhood:		Average	Range
		Ottawa	Hull		
English proficiency:					
Low	3.3	2.3	2.8	0.8	
High	4.5	2.7	3.6		
Average	3.9	2.5			
Range	1.4				
(b) Environment by socioeconomic class.					
		Neighbourhood:		Average	Range
		Ottawa	Hull		
Socioeconomic class:					
Working	4.9	2.9	3.9	2.0	
Lower-middle	3.7	2.2	3.0		
Middle-middle	2.2	1.7	1.7		
Average	3.6	2.3			
Range	1.3				
(c) English proficiency by socioeconomic class.					
		Socioeconomic class:			Range
		WC	LMC	MMC	
English proficiency:					
Low	3.2	2.8	1.7	2.6	1.2
High	5.1	3.9	2.3	3.8	
Average	4.2	3.4	2.5		
Range	1.7				

Table 6. Relative effects of linguistic environment, English proficiency and social class on borrowing patterns: nonce loans as a percentage of total loan types.

(a) Environment by English proficiency.					
	Neighbourhood:				
	Ottawa	Hull	Average	Range	
English proficiency:					
Low	11	6	8.5	2.5	
High	14	8	11		
Average	12.5	7			
Range	5.5				
(b) Environment by socioeconomic class.					
	Neighbourhood:				
	Ottawa	Hull	Average	Range	
Socioeconomic class:					
Working	14	5	9.5	0.0	
Lower-middle	12	7	9.5		
Middle-middle	13	6	9.5		
Average	13	6			
Range	7.0				
(c) English proficiency by socioeconomic class.					
	Socioeconomic class:				
	WC	LMC	MMC	Average	Range
English proficiency:					
Low	8	9	6	7.7	5.3
High	13	13	12	13	
Average	10.5	11	9		
Range	2.0				

But although this does have an effect, as evidenced by the preference of the most proficient English speakers for nonce borrowings, the influence of the speaker's linguistic environment is paramount. The norms of the community override individual abilities by a factor of more than two. This finding must be interpreted as showing that borrowing behaviour is acquired, and not merely a function of lexical

need. If it were otherwise, individual competence would outweigh the other factors. Instead, both borrowing rate and type are seen to correspond to wider environmental norms, evidenced as sanctions against (elevated rates of) loanword usage. Our results indicate that borrowing, especially nonce borrowing, resembles code-switching in that it must be a community 'mode' (Poplack 1980) in order to gain any real currency. It differs from code-switching not only in its linguistic characteristics, but also in the differential effect of extralinguistic factors on the two processes. Propensity to code-switch is affected primarily by bilingual ability, with linguistic environment predictive of favoured type. That social class plays no role here may be explained by the fact that these are special-purpose switches, a function which is shared by all francophones in the Ottawa-Hull complex. Indeed, the entire repertoire of bilingual phenomena is shared by speakers on both sides of the border, but with differing frequencies ascribable to the local status of their language, the concomitant attitudes of its speakers and the resulting norms of their respective speech communities.

We have seen that both the minority and majority francophones in our study show overt indices of linguistic insecurity, reflecting pan-Canadian views on the role of French. However, Hull speakers evidence covert indices of linguistic security, in contrast to the minority speakers, who accommodate more readily to the contact situation. These attitudinal differences are reflected in the linguistic behaviour of the region: Ottawa speakers make the most innovative use of English in their French, through both code-switching and nonce borrowing. Among the more conservative majority speakers, on the other hand, incorporations from English tend to appear either in metalinguistic commentary, or more frequently, in the form of established loanwords, which we have seen to be indistinguishable from native-language lexical items.¹²

Notes

The research reported here forms part of a larger project on sociolinguistic consequences of language contact in the Ottawa-Hull region, which has been generously supported by a series of grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. This paper is a synthesis of the

results of several of the reports to have emerged from the project. I am grateful to Chris Miller and Marguerite Trudel for their assistance in the preparation of the manuscript.

1. Full details of sample constitution and corpus construction are provided in Poplack (in press).

2. Though our study revealed that each of sex, age, and socioeconomic class distinguished language attitudes to some extent, I focus here on the single most consistent and recurrent differentiating factor, that of province of residence.

3. One advantage of the indirect method of interpreting language attitudes adopted here is that of providing access not only to opinions, but the degree to which these opinions represent a real preoccupation to the informants.

4. Joual is a nebulous but widespread cover term used to refer to nonstandard Canadian French.

5. Codes identify speaker and line number of her/his utterance in the corpus transcript.

6. Despite the objective fact that these remained at least 90% francophone in 1976 (Figure 1).

7. The index is calculated from a combined score based on individual reports of (1) the language generally spoken to a series of interlocutors, (2) the language spoken most frequently overall, (3) ability to read, write, speak, and understand English, and (4) the number of years of instruction received in English. This gave four distinct levels of proficiency in English, or bilingual ability, since all informants, as a precondition for inclusion in the sample, were required to demonstrate fluency in French.

8. The number of code-switches per individual interview was used as a (rough) measure of 'rate'. For clarity of exposition, in what follows I present amalgamated results for Ottawa and Hull, two levels of bilingual ability, and three socioeconomic classes. The amalgamated subgroups showed consistent rate parallels.

9. Extralinguistic factors do not contribute a significant independent effect to the choice of either of the remaining favoured switch types: English bracketing or repetition/translation.

10. The higher rates of switches in both the categories of metalinguistic commentary and the mot juste among the Ottawa speakers in Tables 2 and 3 are due to the fact that these figures are 'averages' calculated on the basis of a greater number of speakers and switches in the three Ontario

neighbourhoods. When we calculate the 'proportions' represented by each type out of all code-switches, the results are as in Figure 2.

11. Borrowing 'rate' is calculated as the proportion of distinct borrowed types (i.e. words) out of all types; borrowing 'pattern', as the proportion of nonce loans out of all borrowed types.

12. Research in progress (Poplack and Clément in preparation) will enable us to determine which, if any, of the differential characteristics of nonce and widespread borrowings are reflected in speaker awareness and affect.

References

- Auer, J.P. 1981. Bilingualism as a member's concept: Language choice and language alternation in their relation to lay assessments of competence. Sonderforschungsbereich 99. Konstanz: University of Konstanz.
- Bourhis, R., and F. Genesee. 1980. Evaluative reactions to code-switching strategies in Montreal. In: *Language: Social psychological perspectives*. Edited by H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, and P. Smith. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 335-43.
- Chambers, J., and P. Trudgill. 1980. *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, S., and R. King. 1982. Speech stereotypes in French Newfoundland: An investigation of language attitudes on the Port-au-Port peninsula. Papers from the Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association. Edited by S. Clarke and R. King. St.-John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland. 105-23.
- Clément, R. (in press) Second language proficiency and acculturation: An investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*.
- D'Anglejan, A., and G. Tucker. 1973. Sociolinguistic correlates of speech in Quebec. In: *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects*. Edited by R. Shuy and R. Fasold. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 1-27.
- Daoust, D. 1985. Planned change and lexical variation. Paper presented at NWAVE 14, Georgetown University.
- Genesee, F., and R. Bourhis. 1982. The social psychological significance of code-switching in cross-cultural

- communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 1.1:3-27.
- Giles, H., and P.F. Powesland. 1975. *Speech style and social evaluation*. London: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J. 1976/1982. *Conversational code-switching*. In: *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 59-99.
- Hasselmo, N. 1969. On diversity in American Swedish. In: *Svenska Landsmål och Svenskt Folkliv*. 53-72.
- Haugen, E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26.210-31.
- Lambert, W. 1967. A social psychology of bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 23.91-109.
- Lambert, W., R. Hodgson, R. Gardner, and S. Fillenbaum. 1960. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60.44-51.
- LePage, R., and A. Tabouret-Keller. 1980. *Acts of identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackey, W. 1970. Interference, integration and the synchronic fallacy. In: *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1970*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 195-227.
- Mougeon, R., E. Béniak, and D. Valois. 1985. *Variation in the phonological integration of loanwords in a bilingual speech community*. Toronto: Centre for Franco-Ontarian Studies.
- Naït M'Barek, M., and D. Sankoff. 1987. *Le discours mixte arabe/français: des emprunts ou des alternances de langues?* Paper presented at the 7th Annual Conference of the Association québécoise de linguistique.
- Poplack, S. 1980. 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español': Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18.581-618.
- Poplack, S. 1981. Syntactic structure and social function of code-switching. In: *Latino language and communicative behavior*. Edited by R. Duran. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Poplack, S. 1985. Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. In: *Methods V: Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Methods in Dialectology*. Edited by H.J. Warkentyne. Victoria: University of Victoria Press.
- Poplack, S. (in press) The care and handling of a megacorpus. To appear in: *Language variation and change*. Edited by R. Fasold and D. Schiffrin. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Poplack, S., and C. Miller. 1985. *Political and interactional*

- determinants of linguistic insecurity. Paper presented at NWAVE 14, Georgetown University.
- Poplack, S., and D. Sankoff. 1984. Borrowing: The synchrony of integration. *Linguistics* 22.99-135.
- Poplack, S., D. Sankoff, and C. Miller. (in press) The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26.1.
- Poplack, S., and D. Sankoff. (in press) Code-switching. To appear in: *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society*. Edited by U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, and K.J. Mattheier. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Poplack, S., S. Wheeler, and A. Westwood. 1987. Distinguishing language contact phenomena: Evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. In: *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics* 6. Edited by P. Lilius and M. Saari. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press.
- Sankoff, D., S. Poplack, and S. Vanniarajan. 1986. The case of the nonce loan in Tamil. Centre de recherches mathématiques Technical Report 1348. Université de Montréal.
- Scotton, C.M. (this volume) Code-switching and types of multilingual communities.
- Valdés, G. 1981. Code-switching as a deliberate verbal strategy: A micro-analysis of direct and indirect requests among bilingual Chicano speakers. In: *Latino language and communicative behavior*. Edited by R. Duran. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

STANDARDIZATION AS A FORM OF LANGUAGE SPREAD

Charles A. Ferguson
Stanford University

1. 'Language spread' is a useful and stimulating concept that seems to orient and unify many lines of sociolinguistic research, and in this paper it will be used to organize some thoughts about the process of language standardization and the kinds of research most likely to lead to better understanding of that process. Probably like other papers at this Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, this paper will start from Cooper's definition. By 'language spread' is meant 'an increase over time in the proportion of a communicative network that adopts a given language or language variety for a given communicative function' (Cooper 1982:6). By 'language standardization' is meant 'the process of one variety of a language becoming widely accepted throughout the speech community as a supradialectal norm--the "best" form of the language--rated above regional and social dialects, although these may be felt to be appropriate in some domains' (Ferguson 1966:31).

It seems clear from these two definitions that standardization must be a type of language spread, characterizable in terms of the variables included in the respective definitions. Presumably, one could analyze particular historical instances of standardization in terms of the speech communities and communication networks involved, the languages and language varieties at issue, and the communication functions fulfilled by the spreading variety and by the varieties being supplemented or replaced. Presumably, one could then proceed to generalize across large numbers of instances, in the spirit of typologically based language universals research, and thus progress to a general model or set of alternative models valid in general for

language standardization. Indeed, this is the approach suggested in Ferguson 1966, proposed more explicitly and with greater elaboration in Malkiel 1984, and essentially adopted in such comparative collections as Guxman 1960 and Scaglione 1984.

Certainly, I am not going to reject this approach, since it offers a promising direction of research that can bring deeper understanding of the social factors at work in standardization as well as in the converse process of disintegration or dialect differentiation. We can be reasonably sure that if we choose the most diverse instances (to get an idea of the limits) and try for representative instances of hypothesized typological categories, we will find some useful generalizations, even if the accidents of history often fail to provide the kind of documentation needed to reconstruct the path of spread at the requisite level of detail.

The approach proposed in this paper, however, is that of empirical research, of the variationist sort, in language situations of standardization in progress. Just as the variationist perspective has been fruitful in the study of language change in general, it is likely to provide new insights for students of standardization and language planning.

1.1 First, let us note that the spread of a favored variety in standardization is always a more complex process than the definitions suggest, and at least three tendencies are apparent. One tendency is 'koineization' or the reduction of dialect differences, both by dialect leveling, i.e. the avoidance of salient markers of particular dialects, and by simplification, i.e. the reduction in inventory and regularization in alternations that in other contexts is an aspect of pidginization. One well-documented component of koineization is the avoidance of 'stigmatized' forms, i.e. forms that for one reason or another have come to be regarded as 'bad' or 'wrong', marking disfavored social groups or occasions of use.

A second tendency is 'variety shifting', in which specific linguistic features came to be viewed as marking identity with particular social groups ('dialect shifting') and particular communicative functions or occasions of use ('register shifting'), and individuals adopt such features as part of their 'acts of identity' in producing utterances (LePage and

Tabouret-Keller 1985). When this variety shifting is tending toward the spread of a supradialectal norm it is, of course, standardization par excellence; if it is tending toward fragmented norms it is dialect diversification.

A third tendency is 'classicization', or the adoption of features considered to belong to an earlier prestige norm. This spreading may be from spoken forms identified by the hearer as belonging to the targeted norm, or directly from written texts representing that norm, or from the speaker's own innovations attempting construction of the presumed norm. In the context of the so-called 'creole cycle,' this form of spread is the decreolization phase.

All these tendencies may appear simultaneously--sometimes even in the use of the same form by the same person--but they deserve analytic autonomy because of their different social dynamics and different sociolinguistic outcomes. The intensity of their operation and the degree of group consciousness of these tendencies can be interpreted in terms of the overall processes of 'focus', by which institutionalization of prestige norms takes place, and 'diffusion', by which such norms are dissolved (for this terminology, cf. LePage and Tabouret-Keller 1985:187).

1.2 In a speech community or set of linguistically related speech communities that remain(s) in place over long periods of time, it is possible to have a succession of periods of focus with standardization and periods of diffusion with dialect differentiation. It is also possible, of course, to have a period of focus which results in dialect differentiation and separate standardizations, if the focus is in terms of smaller communities rather than the overall community.

The paradigm case of the former type of successive periods of standardization and differentiation is the Egyptian example of the 'standardization cycle', as recently reviewed and interpreted in Greenberg (1986). His characterization of this four-thousand-year cycle is worth citing in full:

An originally basically unified language develops regional dialects which if unimpeded will diverge in the course of time into mutually unintelligible languages. However because of social and political factors one of the dialects, in modified form, becomes the basis of a new common language, a koine which tends to supersede the original dialects. In a community with writing the common

language acquired the additional prestige which accrues to literary use. In the course of time the spoken koine develops local dialects so that ultimately, if linguistic unity is to be preserved, a new common language must develop on the basis of a dominant dialect of the old koine (Greenberg 1986:273).

The paradigm case of the second type, that of successive periods of standardization resulting in separate local standardizations, is the example of Latin and the Romance languages, as generally recognized in the standard handbooks and introductions to Romance linguistics. For example, Elcock 1960 notes the stylistic differences between 'urban' and 'rustic' Latin passing into the 'learned' and 'popular vernacular' Latin of the Middle Ages and then 'From the pattern of unrecorded Romance as it must have been in the ninth century, certain local speeches, widely separated in the limited geographical concepts of the time, were to assume the role of standard languages' (Elcock 1960:334).

The accounts of such historical instances are helpful as summations of countless individual events over considerable periods of time, and in this respect are like the neogrammarian 'sound laws' which summate complex verbal behaviors over time but do not elucidate the interactional mechanism that lead to the regularities.

We are fortunate in having a growing number of detailed studies of standardization in progress in one of the world's largest speech communities--the Arabic-speaking 'nation' al-'ummah al-'arabiyyah, which includes a score of sovereign nations from Morocco to the Persian Gulf. This 'super' speech community has long been regarded as a typical example of the language situation of diglossia in which there are two functionally distinct norms, a superposed H variety, the Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), and a mother-tongue L variety, Colloquial Arabic, which exists in a series of local vernaculars (Ferguson 1959a, Altoma 1969, Diem 1974). Almost everywhere in the Arab world, however, communicative tensions that arise in the diglossia situation are resolved by the use of 'relatively uncoded, unstable, intermediate forms of the language' (Ferguson 1959a). Some observers identify a number of intermediate levels ranging from the MSA or a more traditional Classical Arabic to a 'plain colloquial', 'vernacular', or 'colloquial of the illiterate' (e.g. Blanc 1960, Badawi 1973, Meiseles 1980). Other

observers (e.g. El-Hassan 1978, Mitchell 1980, Mahmoud 1984) posit a single intermediate variety, Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA) which is, in Mitchell's words, 'created' and maintained by the constant interplay of written and vernacular Arabic' (Mitchell 1986:13), and has within it a range of variation [$\pm$ formal], and if [-formal] then either careful or casual (Mitchell 1986:17).

The rapid changes now taking place in Arabic are the focus of study by an impressive number of sociolinguistically oriented researchers (cf. Daher 1986 for a review of some of this literature; note especially Jernudd and Ibrahim 1986a, 1986b), and we are in the favorable position of being able to follow aspects of the three standardizing tendencies in operation. In Ferguson (1959a) the tentative prognosis for Arabic was slow development over two centuries toward several standard languages, more or less like the model of Latin and the Romance languages. In Ibrahim and Jernudd (1986) the confident prognosis is for 'the emergence of a new, international koine... compatible with emerging national or subregional dialects of what will remain one Arabic,' more or less like the standardization cycle of the Ancient Egyptian language. In view of the inexact terms of the two prognoses and the present state of our knowledge, it is not clear in what ways the two prognoses differ, let alone which one of the two might be valid.

Much more important at this stage than defending alternative prognoses is careful analysis of the language behavior of Arabic users, not only with the more general sociolinguistic goals of understanding the functioning of language in its social context and understanding the sources, paths, and outcomes of language change, but also with the more specific sociolinguistic goal of understanding the particular process of language spread called standardization.

2.0 The remainder of this paper will be devoted to examining examples of the three standardizing tendencies I have identified here. Before proceeding, however, it is worth noting that linguists who are focusing on one part of the range of variation typically pay so little attention to other parts of the range that a full picture of the variation and directions of change never appears. Thus analysts of change in MSA (e.g. Blau 1981) generally leave out of consideration not only the dialects but even the 'various mixtures of Modern Standard Arabic with the local dialect' (Blau

1981:247). Analysts of the vernacular (e.g. Holes 1983) consider the 'crosscutting influences of the locally prestigious dialect... and of the supradialectal variety of Arabic (MSA)' (Holes 1983:437-38), but do not attempt to describe unmistakably 'educated' spoken Arabic or oral or written MSA itself. Analysts of Educated Spoken Arabic (e.g. Mitchell 1986) leave out of consideration both the 'spoken prose' end of the range of variation and the 'speech of the uneducated and of the illiterate' (Mitchell 1986:14) at the other end. Sociolinguists studying language change must be grateful for the detailed studies of Arabic now at last appearing, but models of change of the attempted generality, for example, of Milroy and Milroy (1985) cannot be adequately formulated or tested in the Arabic-speaking world until both a fuller range of variation is investigated in at least some region and the verbal interaction of social networks of language users is recorded and analyzed in much more detail.

2.1 Koineization. Leveling in the sense of avoidance of disfavored alternatives is harder to document than the adoption of preferred alternatives, which is treated here under variety shifting. Nevertheless, observers have noted that speakers of Arabic tend to avoid particular lexical, phonological, and grammatical characteristics that they feel would identify them as speaking a too local or too uneducated Arabic or that they fear will be misunderstood or regarded as comic by their listeners. Thus Blanc (1960) notes that Iraqi speakers conversing with Arabs from other areas avoid using timman for 'rice' or 'aku 'there is, there are'; that Aleppo speakers avoid their strong local 'imālah (in many words they have i for a). Similarly, Moroccans conversing with Eastern Arabs may avoid būt 'fish', khəl 'black', shāl 'how much', and other salient localisms. Those Syrian and Lebanese speakers who have long vowels in the masculine singular imperative may avoid this form in talking with other Arabs. Such examples are easy to multiply in this anecdotal way, but careful investigation of the avoidance phenomenon is badly needed.

Equally interesting are the cases where a severely local form is avoided, as in Blanc's observation that the Syrians persisted in using fī(h) 'there is, there are' in inter-Arab conversation even though it is non-MSA whereas--as pointed out--Iraqis seem to avoid 'aku (and Moroccans kāin). Perhaps the Syrians are secure in knowing that Egyptians

also use fī(h). Such hierarchies of preference are not at all well understood, and we can hope that some of them will be explained in detail as research continues.

The other aspect of koineization, simplification, is somewhat easier to specify, even if actual processes of spread are not clear. Many authors have listed simplifying changes in varieties of Arabic. For example, Ferguson (1959:619-20) identified a set of specific simplifying trends as a 'drift' or general direction of change in Arabic, and excluded them from the argumentation for the formation of the koine that was hypothesized in that article as the source of most modern dialects. A recent study of the Arabic of northeast Arabia and the river valleys of Iraq and Khuzestan (Ingham 1982) devotes a whole chapter to 'reductional changes'. Versteegh (1984), which takes a more extreme view than Ferguson (1959b) by positing a pidgin as the source of most modern dialects, lists numerous examples of simplifying processes.

The following are typical examples of simplification in Arabic that appear in various lists.

Phonology:

Mergers: j merges with y; ð merges with d; i, u merge to ə.

Shortenings: unstressed long vowels shortened; long vowels in closed, nonfinal syllables shortened.

Cluster elimination: 'helping vowels' inserted in word-final two-consonant clusters.

Morphology and syntax:

Inflectional reduction: dual lost in verbs, adjectives, pronouns; fem. pl. forms lost in verbs and pronouns.

Pattern reduction: trend to 'strict' agreement between subject and verb, eliminating difference between pre- and postverbal patterns.

Pattern regularization: stem and affix alternation (indicative, subjunctive, jussive, imperative; m. f. sg. pl.) of 'hollow' verbs unified.

Insofar as such simplifications appear in various localities or social strata and spread throughout the Arabic-speaking world, they are part of the koineizing tendency of a pan-Arab language standardization process. Insofar as they are

more locally accepted and differentiated from one another, they represent the development of regional standardization processes (e.g. j/y merger in the Gulf region, partial mergers of masculine and feminine second person singular pronoun forms and verb forms in Lebanon and Morocco).

2.2 Variety shifting. The adoption of preferred variants is the essence of standardization, as indeed it is the essence of all language change. The problem is to discover in each language situation why certain variants are preferred by certain users under certain conditions and how such lines of preference move through the speech community and result in shared irreversible systemic change. Sociolinguists also want to discover the linguistic and social constraints that operate in general in these processes of change, i.e. to discover the principles that explain possible outcomes of different language situations. The process of standardization, as a special case of language spread, which is in turn a type of language change, is a process of convergence whereby differently favored variants in different sectors of the community or on different occasions of use come to coincide. In the Arab world a number of recent studies of such convergence agree in showing that the dominant lines of convergence are toward regional standards, namely, prestigious urban educated speech patterns of various communicative centers, rather than toward a single unified prestige norm for the Arab world as a whole.

The simplest illustration is the frequently discussed phonological variable (q). The almost universally accepted norm of MSA pronunciation is a voiceless uvular stop [q], but in many parts of the Arab world a regional prestige norm has a voiced velar stop [g] or a glottal stop [ʔ]. Local reflexes of Old Arabic /q/ include not only these three sound types but also velar and postvelar (nonuvular) stops and several affricates. Wherever careful, detailed variation studies have been undertaken, the local pronunciation is being displaced by the relevant regional standard [g] or [ʔ], and this holds true even where the original local reflex is [q]. Thus in Bahrain the low prestige rural Shiites who have traditionally said [q] are clearly shifting to [g], which is the pronunciation of the urban educated Sunnis (Holes 1986). In Amman, which is in the process of becoming the center of a new regional standard, a variety of local reflexes, including [q], are yielding to [ʔ], the reflex of urban Palestinian and

Syrian Arabic, a major component of the newly evolving Amman urban dialect (Abd-el-Jawad 1986).

This example of the reflexes of Old Arabic /q/ moving toward regional standard prestige norms rather than the pan-Arab MSA norm (cf. Ibrahim 1986), is not a new phenomenon, having been noted for decades. It was reported in passing, for example, in Cantineau's descriptive grammar of the Palmyra dialect (Cantineau 1934). The Colloquial reflex of /q/ in that isolated local dialect was [q] and this was clearly the dominant pronunciation among the 6,000 inhabitants of the town. Cantineau noticed, however, that two other pronunciations were in use: the [g] of the surrounding beduin and those young Palmyrene men who admired the skills and bravery of the beduin and the motorized camel corps in the area; and the [ʔ] of Damascus, the national capital, used by a handful of urban outsiders in Palmyra and by some Palmyrenes who identified with school, government, and 'middle class' values on the national scene. Cantineau did not provide much information on actual language use of individuals and social groups, so that it is now not clear whether these aberrant pronunciations were transitory phenomena limited to particular words or particular occasions of use, or whether they represented the beginning stages of a set of changes spreading thorough the community. The important point here is that the MSA/Classical /q/ was yielding to local prestige norms at that time and place as it is now doing in large areas of the Arab world.

Other phonological, morphological, and syntactic examples of variety shifting toward regional standards can be cited. Although careful studies of these phenomena are not yet plentiful, a large proportion of the language change in progress in the Arab world seems to fall in this category. It must be noted, however, that the /q/ example is somewhat misleading in its apparent simplicity. The factors of age, sex, agreement with MSA, and several kinds of evaluative judgments (e.g. 'old-fashioned', 'tough, daring') all interact in complex ways, along with lexical variables such as the marking of particular words as foreign, local, formal, and the like (Holes 1983 presents a revealing account of a set of Bahraini phonological variables undergoing shifts of this sort).

2.3 Classicization. The adoption of variants from a superposed, formal, traditional norm at the expense of local

dialectal variants is often an important ingredient in the process of standardization, and, in the case of Arabic, dialectal convergence with MSA or Classical is a well-attested phenomenon. This classicizing tendency is most obvious in lexicon, either in borrowing words into Colloquial or in classicizing dialectal words by restructuring them phonologically and/or morphologically. Thus /ʔāmi'a/ 'university' in Syrian Arabic is recognizable as a classicism by syllable structure and vowel quality (a corresponding original Colloquial form would be /ʔām'a/; /jāmi'a/ 'university' in Bahrain Arabic is recognized as a classicism by having invariant /j/ instead of the $j \sim y$, which is the local Colloquial counterpart of Classical/MSA /j/).

The range of stylistic variation utilized in the pronunciation of individual words is very great, and the factors affecting the choice of variants are complex. A simple example is the word for Egypt or Cairo in many dialect areas, where the pronunciation /maʕ(i)r/ is understood as MSA. The usual pattern seems to be to vary the pronunciation depending on the educational level of one's interlocutor, the formality of the occasion, etc. Some speakers may have only /maʕ(i)r/ in their verbal repertoire, but no one seems to select only the MSA variant exclusively. The frequency of use of the two pronunciations also varies by degree of education and social status of the speakers, reminiscent of the phonological variables explored by Labov. The situation differs, however, in that this is not a general $a \sim i$ alternation but is limited to the particular word, and the MSA variant is part of a codified norm found in various sources of authority, including dictionaries, whereas the other variant is not given such overt recognition. Mitchell (1986) offers a number of more complex examples of this kind of stylistic variation in phonology, morphology, and lexical suppletion.

Classicization is convergent in principle when there is a single codified classical norm. This is largely the case in Arabic, since the superposed MSA is much more homogeneous throughout the Arab world than the local dialects and there are no overall classical norms competing with it; fluctuation within MSA is to all intents and purposes part of the variation discussed in this paper. In the Arabic situation, however, and in many other situations of standardization, the classicizing tendency is much more lexical and formulaic in implementation and much more stylistically variable on a

formal-informal or literary-colloquial dimension than the interdialectal koineizing and variety shifting.

3. The frame of reference suggested in this paper and the examples cited may in the long run turn out to be inaccurate, inappropriate, or wrongheaded (although the author sincerely hopes otherwise), but they will have served the intent of the paper if they point up the value of the study of standardization in progress as opposed to historical cases of standardization. The framework seems more or less applicable to earlier instances, and in some cases crucial features of convergence seem to have been adequately identified and significant trends of koineizing, variety shifting, and classicization have been described. Also, in some cases alternative possible outcomes have been the subject of informed and insightful speculation. But in no case do we have data of the richness of present-day variationist studies of language change, and thus in no case can we really see the process of standardization from the perspectives of universal constraints and the transition, embedding, evaluation, and actuation problems (Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog 1968).

This year, 1987, is being celebrated in many countries as the bicentennial of the birth of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, the great Serbian 'language reformer', and the case of Serbian standardization is one that has been discussed in countless books and articles over the years. In comparing it with Arabic, one notices immediately the diglossic situation with which it began--the H variety of so-called 'Slavo-Serbian' and the L variety consisting essentially of local South Slavic dialects ancestral to modern Serbo-Croatian. Some people at the time favored the development of the H variety as the standard, some favored a so-called 'middle style', and some, including Vuk, favored the spoken language of the people. Eventually, the last is what won out. Nowadays one rarely considers what might have happened if the process of standardization had resulted in a common South Slavic standard which included all the varieties ancestral to modern Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovenian, and Macedonian. On the other hand, discussion continues about the viability of the bimodal standard of Serbian and Croatian. The parallel with Arabic is far from complete, but at least we may note that South Slavic as a whole, like the Arabic 'nation' as a

whole, had no obvious economic, cultural, and political center that could serve as the source of a new, unifying standard.

The one element in the Serbian picture that has not been mentioned in the case of Arabic standardization is the existence of conscious language planners or 'reformers', such as Vuk, whose persistent advocacy and successive publication of folk poetry, grammar, dictionary, and New Testament translation had an important influence on the whole standardization process. Any full-scale study of Arabic standardization would have to include investigation of such deliberate attempts to influence the outcome, and we are fortunate to have already a few scattered studies of this kind (e.g. Benabdi 1986), but these studies do not include data on the effects of the planning. Unfortunately, variationist sociolinguists interested in language change generally ignore this issue, although it seems reasonable to assume that any 'theory of language change [including language standardization] is incomplete if it does not allow for the possible influence of language planning' (Ferguson 1983).

The discussion of the present paper is intended to lead to a single programmatic conclusion. If we want to understand the standardization process, as an important type of language spread and hence of language change in general, the most obvious research strategy is to study the process in operation, and the most obvious way to do so is to collect detailed data in the variationist tradition as a kind of baseline and add subsequent comparable data at regular intervals in the future. Standardization in Arabic is one such situation to study.

References

- Altoma, S.J. 1969. The problems of diglossia in Arabic: A comparative study of Classical and Iraqi Arabic. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Badawi, E.M. 1973. *Mustawayāt al-'arabiyyah al-mu'āṣirah fī miṣr*. Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif.
- Blanc, H. 1960. Style variation in spoken Arabic: A sample of interdialectal educated conversation. In: *Contributions to Arabic linguistics*. Edited by C.A. Ferguson. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Blau, J. 1965. The emergence and linguistic background of

- Judaeo-Arabic: A study in the origins of Middle Arabic. London: Oxford University Press.
- Blau, J. 1977. The beginnings of the Arabic diglossia. A story of the origins of Neoarabic. *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 4:175-202.
- Blau, J. 1981. The renaissance of Modern Hebrew and Modern Standard Arabic. Parallels and differences in the revival of two Semitic languages. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cantineau, J. 1934. *Le dialecte arabe de Palmyre*. Vol. 1, Grammaire. Beirut: Mémoires de l'Institut Français de Damas.
- Cohen, D. 1962. Koiné, langue commune et dialectes arabes. *Arabica* 9:119-44.
- Cooper, R.L., ed. 1982. *Language spread. Studies in diffusion and social change*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Daher, N. 1986. Arabic sociolinguistics: State of the art. Paper presented at the meeting of the Middle Eastern Studies Association. To appear in: *Al-'Arabiyyah*.
- Diem, W. 1974. *Hochsprache und Dialekt im Arabischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Elcock, W.D. 1960. *The Romance languages*. London: Faber and Faber.
- El-Hassan, S.A. 1978. Educated spoken Arabic in Egypt and the Levant: A critical review of diglossia and related concepts. *Archivum Linguisticum* 8:151-87.
- Ferguson, C.A. 1959a. Diglossia. *Word* 15:325-40.
- Ferguson, C.A. 1959b. The Arabic koine. *Language* 35:616-30.
- Ferguson, C.A. 1968. Language development. In: *Language problems of developing nations*. Edited by J.A. Fishman, C.A. Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Ferguson, C.A. 1983. Language planning and language change. In: *Progress in language planning*. Edited by J. Cobarrubias and J.A. Fishman. Berlin: Mouton.
- Fishman, J.A., et al. 1985. *The rise and fall of the ethnic revival*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Greenberg, J.H. 1986. Were there Egyptian koinés? In: *The Fergusonian impact*. Vol. 1. Edited by J.A. Fishman et al. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Guxman, M.M., ed. 1960. *Voprosy formirovaniia i razvitiia nacional'nyx jazykov*. Moscow.

- Holes, C.D. 1983. Patterns of communal language variation in Bahrain. *Language in Society* 12:433-57.
- Ingham, B. 1982. North east Arabian dialects. London and Boston: Kegan Paul International.
- Jernudd, B.H., and M.H. Ibrahim, eds. 1986a. Aspects of Arabic sociolinguistics. (= *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 61). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jernudd, B.H., and M.H. Ibrahim, eds. 1986b. Issues in Arabic sociolinguistics. (= *Anthropological Linguistics* 28.1). Bloomington: Department of Anthropology, Indiana University.
- LePage, R.L., and A. Tabouret-Keller. 1985. Acts of identity. Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahmoud, Y. 1984. Middle Arabic: A variable functional medium. In: *Ecology in language*. Edited by W. Enninger and L. Haynes. Essen.
- Malkiel, Y. 1984. A linguist's view of the standardization of a dialect. In: Scaglione, ed. (1984).
- Meiseles, G. 1980. Educated spoken Arabic and the Arabic language continuum. *Archivum Linguisticum* 11:89-106.
- Miller, A.M. 1986. The origin of the modern Arabic sedentary dialects: An evaluation of several theories. *Al-'Arabiyyah* 19:47-74.
- Milroy, J., and L. Milroy. 1985. Linguistic change, social network and speaker innovation. *Journal of Linguistics* 21:339-84.
- Mitchell, T.F. 1980. Dimensions of style in a grammar of educated spoken Arabic. *Archivum Linguisticum* 11:98-105.
- Mitchell, T.F. 1986. What is educated spoken Arabic? In: Jernudd and Ibrahim, eds. (1986a).
- Scaglione, A., ed. 1984. The emergence of national languages. Ravenna: Largo Editore.
- Siegel, J. 1985. Koinés and koineization. *Language and Society* 14:357-78.
- Weinreich, U., W. Labov, and M. Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In: *Directions for historical linguistics*. Edited by W. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel. Austin: University of Texas Press.

LANGUAGE SPREAD AND THE WRITING OF GRAMMARS

Sidney Greenbaum
University College, London

The spread of the English language has been a blessing for those of us who are authors of scholarly reference grammars of English: the potential market for our wares is so much greater than if English were still confined to the countries where it is predominantly a mother tongue. In recent times the potential market has been expanding at a great pace. The expansion is in part thanks to a rising population in what the British weekly The Economist recently called 'the new English empire',¹ the 40 or so countries where English is a mother tongue or official language--those countries where it is a medium for internal communication. Perhaps more significant is the demand for English by those living outside the new English empire. Since the Second World War the advance of English as the medium for international communication has been spectacular. And only in the last few years a vast new market has opened up in China, where a substantial proportion of its one billion people are enthusiastically learning English as the gateway to the modernization of their country.

I must not exaggerate, of course. Only a tiny number of people actually buy--or consult--scholarly reference grammars of English. But the influence of the grammars extends beyond those who use them. What they say and how they say it ultimately percolate in attenuated form into textbooks and study materials throughout the English-teaching world.

The spread of English is not, however, an unmixed blessing for the authors of scholarly reference grammars. The recent consolidation of the new English empire poses a problem: What should be the scope of reference grammars?

Theoretical grammarians seek to exemplify a particular model of language description. They may confine their

analyses to one variety of English--often (sad to say) their own idiolect. Their treatment of the language will be praised more for depth than for breadth. If sociolinguists and dialectologists deal with syntax at all, they tend to focus on a narrow range of syntactic features and to trace their distribution in a set of sociolects or dialects operating within one city, or one region, or (at best) one country. Most traditional grammarians write their monographs and learned papers on circumscribed topics in restricted varieties. Pedagogical grammarians have a specific studentship in mind and limit the coverage in their course books accordingly. But spare a few moments to commiserate with the plight of those of us who write reference grammars.

The reference grammarians of today address alike native speakers of English, second-language speakers, and foreign speakers. They expect their works to be used by readers with a variety of backgrounds: both fellow specialists, (say) linguists and grammarians of English, and nonspecialists--perhaps literary critics, researchers in the field of information technology, and even some intrepid members of the educated general public. Most burdensome of all, reference grammarians have in theory the whole world of English for their subject matter.

How have they been coping with these responsibilities? And should they act differently in the future to meet the challenges of the changing conditions of English?

In practice, reference grammarians have restricted their treatment of English largely to the standard language. They do so for at least two reasons: (1) most of their potential readers are likely to be interested primarily in the standard language; and (2) the syntax of nonstandard varieties of English has not been investigated in comparable detail, and indeed many nonstandard varieties have not been investigated at all.

The deficiencies in what we know of the syntax of nonstandard varieties could be remedied in the long run if enormous resources were devoted to the collection and analysis of syntactic data from these varieties. Sufficient resources are unlikely to be made available, although certain varieties may attract generous funding under political pressure. In any event, rapid progress will be impeded by the very nature of the data. In the first place, researchers need to accumulate many more samples from many more speakers than would be necessary for studies of standard

varieties, since there are grounds for suspecting that nonstandard varieties exhibit far more variability than their standard counterparts (Milroy and Milroy 1985:22-36). Second, except for some literary imitations that cannot constitute the primary data, nonstandard varieties are confined to the spoken language. The recording of spoken utterances is more difficult to arrange than the collection of written material and transcription of spoken material is very time-consuming.² Studies of the standard language have always relied heavily on written texts, supplemented where relevant by the intuitions of the researchers and their informants, although in the last few decades grammarians have begun to take account of spoken material as well.

In the absence of full descriptions, reference grammars can merely make sporadic comparisons between standard and nonstandard features and are likely to mention chiefly those well-known usages that apply to all or most nonstandard varieties, such as double or multiple negatives (I don't want nothing) or the use of objective pronouns where the standard language requires subjective pronouns (Me and Bill are going abroad next week).

Most users of reference grammars, I have said, turn to them for information on the standard language. This is particularly true for foreign learners of English, who look to the standard language of native speakers for their norms. One dimension of the standard language is national. At one time the grammars were devoted to either the British or the American standard, with occasional acknowledgments of differences. This limitation seemed reasonable as long as the world of English speakers (native and nonnative) could be conceived as divided into British and American spheres of influence. But since the end of the Second World War there have been great changes in this respect. Britain has declined as a world power and the British Empire has been dissolved. At the same time there has been a surge in the military and economic power of the United States and its influence on world affairs, and these developments have greatly increased the prestige of American English. The result is that the two spheres of language influence have become blurred. American and British English compete for the hearts and tongues of nonnative speakers, and in some countries both national standards are taught, sometimes even in the same institution. Reference grammars must now give equal place to both national standards.

Other national standards have also begun to enter the competition. Among the countries where English is a mother tongue, Canada and Australia in particular are asserting their linguistic independence as equal partners in the new English empire. The loosening of political ties with Britain since the Second World War is being followed by a quest for a separate linguistic identity, heralded by the publication of national dictionaries and by the establishment of national surveys of usage. The Canadian quest is reflected in a recent conference organized by the Strathy Language Unit, a research unit at Queen's University, Ontario, that was founded in 1981 to investigate Canadian English usage and to publish guides to communication. The conference topic was titled 'In search of the Standard in Canadian English'. Several contributors called for a one-volume collegiate-type dictionary that would be as aggressively Canadian as The Macquarie Dictionary (first published in 1981) was aggressively Australian. In the concluding remarks the question was posed: 'Can we be satisfied to accept either British or American standards?' The question was answered with a resounding 'NO!'--in capital letters and followed by an exclamation mark (Lougheed 1986:164).

There are similar stirrings in several of the countries where English is an official second language, notably India. We are seeing in India the first signs of a local recognition and acceptance of the indigenous varieties of educated English and a preference for them over native-speaker models (cf. Kachru 1986:19-32). And Indian teachers and Indian textbooks carry Indian English abroad in Asia and Africa.

I have said earlier that reference grammars have drawn largely on written texts. It is appropriate that they should do so, since it is the grammar of the written language--especially in its neutral and formal styles--that shows the greatest uniformity both within one country and across countries (Quirk et al. 1985:1.23). The differences between the national standards of the United States and Britain are relatively minor for the written language. The national written standards of other mother-tongue countries have yet to be fully investigated and codified, but we should expect them to agree closely with those for the American and British standards. Reference grammars can then describe an international written standard English and note national variations. The international grammars will always have less to say about the educated spoken language, because the

spoken language is more resistant to institutionalization and therefore displays greater variability.

In countries that are still groping for national standards of English, grammatical research can highlight the emerging norms and provide guidance. The need for research and guidance is particularly pressing in countries like India that are turning away from the norms of native-speaking countries to find national norms in their own educated varieties. So far, little has been accomplished. It is instructive that a bibliography of English in South Asia published only five years ago (Aggarwal 1982) contains a total of 1,181 items but can list only three items under the heading 'grammatical'. However, in the last couple of years there are some promising signs of future research in this area. It is a reflection of the growing respectability of Indian English among its educated speakers and the self-confidence of Indian scholars that a million-word corpus of Indian English has been assembled on the same principles as the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen corpus of British English and the Brown corpus of American English (Shastri 1985).

I have suggested that grammatical research can provide guidance on norms. In countries like India and Nigeria the learner's competence in English may be heavily affected by the inadequacies of school teaching as well as by influences from the first language. A recent warning points to the advantages of standardization: 'unless local standards were clearly established, there would be the obvious danger ... of drifting into mutually unintelligible creolized forms' (Quirk and Widdowson 1985:35).

Local grammarians are best placed to describe the developing standard varieties in their own country. But their responsibility goes beyond description (cf. Greenbaum 1986). Standardization requires prescription as well as description. The standardization of English in England took centuries, and in that process normative grammarians assisted as well as lexicographers and printers. Standardization should not be left to chance. In shaping national norms from the educated variants current in their country, present-day grammarians should bear in mind that many of their countrymen who adopt their norms will need English for international communication as well as for intranational communication. They should promote variants that conform closely with the international norms of English. As in mother-tongue countries, only a minority are likely to become fully

competent in the standard language, but it is that minority who have most need for English as a written language and as an international language.

Fifteenth-century England needed a standard dialect that was generally intelligible and could therefore facilitate efficient communication between people in different parts of the country. The twentieth-century new English empire (in which the United States is the dominant partner) needs an international written standard English that will be generally intelligible to people in different regions of the empire and that will therefore encourage the use of English as a world language. Reference grammars can contribute to the perception and acknowledgment of, and to the maintenance of, that standard. To do so, the grammars must become truly international.

Notes

1. December 20, 1986, p. 129.

2. To supplement a corpus of speech samples, we can turn to elicitation procedures to collect information on specific items (cf. Greenbaum 1984). However, unless we know where the gaps are in our knowledge, we cannot know what to ask for in elicitation experiments.

References

- Aggarwal, Narindar K. 1982. English in South Asia: A bibliographical survey of resources. Gurgaon, Haryana: Indian Documentation Service.
- Greenbaum, Sidney. 1984. Corpus analysis and elicitation tests. In: *Corpus linguistics: Recent developments in the use of computer corpora*. Edited by J. Aarts and W. Meij. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 195-201.
- Greenbaum, Sidney. 1986. English and a grammarian's responsibility: The present and the future. *World Englishes* 5.189-95.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1986. *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.
- Lougheed, W.C., ed. 1986. *In search of the standard in*

- Canadian English. Kingston, Ontario: Strathy Language Unit, Queen's University.
- Milroy, James, and Leslie Milroy. 1985. Authority in language; Investigating language prescription and standardisation. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman.
- Quirk, Randolph, and H.G. Widdowson. 1985. English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shastri, S.V. 1985. Word frequencies in Indian English: A preliminary report. International Computer Archive of Modern English Newsletter 9.38-44.

PLANNING LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Robert L. Cooper

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

When my wife and I and our two small children arrived in Jerusalem on July 15, 1972, to take up a two-year assignment, we knew no Hebrew except for the word shalom. A brief history of our acquisition of Hebrew provides examples of the kind of language planning which this paper discusses.

A case study. My wife and I were not overly concerned about our own ignorance of Hebrew. After all, we thought, we could manage perfectly well with English for most purposes. It seemed scarcely worthwhile to make a serious effort to learn a new language when our stay was to be so short. but we were concerned about our children's lack of Hebrew. For them, two years would be a long time. Moreover, in only six weeks they were to enter the first and second grades of an ordinary public school where there would be few if any other native speakers of English. While their teachers would understand English, their classmates would not. Our kids were about to be thrown into a Hebrew sea. What could we do to help them to swim?

The municipality offered an intensive summer course in Hebrew as a second language for elementary school pupils who were about to enter the school system. Although we were not immigrants, we were permitted to enroll our children in this program. This we promptly did. Thus when our children entered their ordinary classes in September, they were not as utterly unprepared to cope with Hebrew as they would otherwise have been. During their first year in school, they received additional assistance. For a few hours a week they were pulled out of their classes for special instruction in Hebrew as a second language, when and if the

teacher hired for this purpose was not pressed into service elsewhere.

What organized efforts were available to help my wife and me to learn Hebrew? Indeed, many were available and we took advantage of most of them. After about a month in Jerusalem, when we found that in fact there were numerous occasions in which even a rudimentary knowledge of Hebrew would be useful to us, we decided to enroll in an 'ulpan', an intensive Hebrew course. Ours, which met 20 hours per week, and was heavily subsidized by the municipality, charged only a nominal fee. Although the course was scheduled to run for three months, we stayed with it for only six weeks. Our early departure was due to no fault of the ulpan--indeed, our instructor, Dalia Ben Asher, was a brilliant and inspiring teacher--but rather to anxiety about starting our new jobs, which were soon to begin and for which we wanted to prepare, and to a feeling that a six-week investment of effort was enough for a two-year stay.

Only after we had overstayed the two-year period to which we had initially committed ourselves and it had begun to dawn upon us that we might be staying rather longer, did we decide to invest additional effort in formal instruction. Over the years, each of us has enrolled in various classes: we took a course at the university, designed for instructors and their spouses, which met twice a week during the academic year; I twice enrolled in the university's three-month summer ulpan, designed principally for foreign university students, each time studying for six weeks; and three years ago, my wife returned to our original Hebrew ulpan for a two-month summer course, this time studying in an advanced class for 'veteran' Israelis who wanted to improve their vocabulary and reading comprehension. For a time, we both read simplified versions of Hebrew novels and short stories. In addition, one year my wife faithfully read for an hour a day a weekly newspaper written in simplified Hebrew, and both of us occasionally listened to the radio news which is broadcast twice daily in simplified, slowly spoken Hebrew.

Corpus planning and status planning for Hebrew. In this account of my family's struggle to learn Hebrew, I mentioned several organized efforts to help us: ulpanim for children and for adults, and mass media and literature in simplified Hebrew. I argue that all of these programs and devices exemplify language planning (LP), whether one views LP as

organized efforts to solve language problems or as organized efforts to influence language behavior. But what sort of LP do these examples represent?

Most students of LP accept Kloss's (1969) distinction between corpus planning and status planning as the twin foci of the field. 'Corpus planning' refers to activities such as coining new terms, reforming spelling, and adopting a new script. It refers in short to the creation of new forms, the modification of old ones, or the selection from alternative forms in a spoken or written code. In contrast, Kloss viewed the focus of 'status planning' to be the importance or position of one language in relation to others as recognized by the national government. However, the term has since been extended to refer to the allocation of languages or language varieties to given functions, e.g., medium of instruction, official language, vehicle of mass communication. The extension of Kloss's status planning to include the allocation of language functions seems quite well established by now. Ferguson (1983:35), for example, writes, in connection with types of LP: 'You can plan changes in the functions or the use of different varieties within the speech community, and you can plan changes in the structure of the language or language variety itself. These are, of course, the familiar categories of language planners that have been mentioned in this volume [Cobarrubias and Fishman 1983], essentially what we call "status planning" and "corpus planning", or other similar names.'

The distinction between these two foci of LP can be seen in the planning of Hebrew in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Palestine. There were three types of organized activity. First, there was an effort to modernize the language and to standardize new terms. This is an effort which continues to this day but which was especially important when the lack of vocabulary for everyday items and activities was keenly felt.

Second, there were the efforts of teachers to promote Hebrew as a language of instruction, which culminated in the 'Language War', which Rabin (1973:75) has called the 'first national struggle' of modern Palestine. A German-Jewish foundation for the advancement of Jews in technologically less developed countries, the Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden, planned to set up a technical high school in Haifa. The foundation operated a number of schools in Palestine, all of which used Hebrew as the medium of instruction.

Nonetheless, the Hilfsverein felt obliged to promote German as a language of culture. Its promotion of German in the curriculum of its schools aroused resentment. When the Hilfsverein announced in 1913 that its new 'Technikum' was to use not Hebrew but German as the language of instruction, on the grounds that Hebrew was not sufficiently developed for work in the sciences, resentment exploded. The teachers left the organization's schools and took their pupils with them. The boycott prevented the implementation of the Hilfsverein's decision. When the institution finally opened after the First World War, it opened not as the 'Technikum' but as the 'Technion'; its language of instruction was not German but Hebrew.

The third type of organized effort was designed to encourage people to use Hebrew as an all-purpose vernacular. For example, a youth organization, the Gedud Meginnei Hasafah (Language Protection Legion), was founded in 1923 to combat the use of languages other than Hebrew and remained in existence until the late 1930s (Wigoder 1972:1000). Among its activities was the distribution of posters bearing the legend Ivri, daber Ivrit! 'Hebrew (person), speak Hebrew!'

Whereas the first of these activities exemplifies corpus planning, the second and third illustrate status planning. Of course, as Fishman (1983:382) has pointed out, the distinction between corpus planning and status planning is clearer in theory than in practice. In the present instance, the corpus planning, which was designed to equip Hebrew to serve as an all-purpose medium, probably encouraged people to use it for more and more purposes as the language became more adequate for such purposes. Similarly, the promotion of Hebrew as the chief language of instruction and as the primary language of everyday life for the Jewish population of Palestine revealed gaps in vocabulary, which organized efforts then attempted to fill.

A third category. Today, organized efforts to promote Hebrew in Israel are largely concentrated upon helping immigrants and the non-Jewish minorities to learn the language. With respect to new immigrants, a substantial proportion avail themselves of these opportunities. Among the Rumanian immigrants studied by Hofman and Fisherman (1971), for example, as well as among the immigrants in Rosenbaum's (1983) sample, about 40 percent had studied

Hebrew formally in Israel. Many of the non-Jewish population also enroll in those Hebrew courses which are open to the general public. Such organized activities on behalf of Hebrew cannot be comfortably fitted into the rubric of status planning, since they are not designed to increase or change the language's uses or to alter the existing functional allocation of codes. Nor can these activities be fitted into the rubric of corpus planning, since their purpose is not to modify the code itself. It seems to me that when language planning is directed toward promoting the learning of a language, then a separate analytic category is justifiable. I call this category 'acquisition planning'.

When Haile Selassie's government not only insisted that Christian missionaries restrict their activities to non-Amhara areas but also that they teach via Amharic, language planning was directed toward promoting the learning of Amharic. Similarly, when in the 1960s middle-class anglophone parents in Montreal began to pressure elementary schools to provide French-medium instruction for their children, in order to improve their children's competence in French, and when, at about the same time, the United States Congress began to support bilingual education programs for poor, ethnolinguistic minority children, in order to improve these children's English, these again were examples of planning directed toward the promotion of learning. In these three cases, as in the case of helping new immigrants and minorities in Israel to learn Hebrew, planning was not directed toward increasing the functions of a language, at least not within the wider society. Rather, there were efforts to increase the opportunity of selected subgroups to participate in those domains or to engage in those functions which require competency in the target language. We see, in short, acquisition planning.

Types of acquisition planning. The several examples of acquisition planning which I have mentioned here can be distinguished from one another on at least two bases: (1) the overt, language-related planning goal and (2) the method employed to attain the goal.

I refer to 'language-related' planning goals in order to distinguish them from the ultimate goals toward which LP is typically directed. For example, the Israeli government helps newcomers and minorities to learn Hebrew in order to foster national integration and political control. The Ethiopian

government's language policy regarding missionary activity was directed toward similar ends. The incentives which stimulated Montreal anglophone parents to demand French-medium instruction for their children may have been economic in large part, a consequence of their concern that when their children left school, French, not English, might well be the working language of the province. With respect to federally sponsored bilingual education programs in the United States, one can argue that the pacification or cooption of poor, ethnolinguistic minority groups was a goal at least as important as the improvement of their children's English proficiency. That LP is typically carried out in the service of nonlinguistic ends does not deny the existence of communicative problems. But if the solution of overt communicative problems did not promote the attainment of nonlinguistic goals, it is doubtful that much LP would take place.

With respect to the overt, language-related goals to which acquisition planning is directed, we may distinguish language spread from language maintenance. In the latter, activities are directed not toward increasing the number of users but toward maintaining them. For example, the inclusion of English as a compulsory subject in the Israeli school curriculum requires each new generation of pupils to study English. Since school attendance is now universal, the English-language requirement contributes now not to the spread of English but to its maintenance in the population.

With respect to the methods employed to attain acquisition goals, we may distinguish between direct and indirect procedures. The former refer to the provision of explicit teaching devices--courses, simplified mass media, etc. The latter refer to the deliberate creation of conditions which enhance motivation to learn the target language. The inclusion of English as a compulsory subject on the Israeli matriculation examination, for example, encourages those pupils who want a matriculation certificate to take their English courses seriously. The setting of language prerequisites for employment, as with Irish for certain civil service jobs in Ireland, provides another example of creating incentives for language acquisition. Similarly, Quebec's promotion of French as the language of work, with sanctions for firms which do not comply with francophonization guidelines, provides incentives for anglophones to learn French.

Thus a preliminary framework into which acquisition planning can be classified yields four cells formed by the intersection of two variables: overt goal (spread, maintenance) and method (direct, indirect).

Acquisition planning and evaluation. The existence of indirect methods for promoting language acquisition reminds us of the influence of social constraints on the outcome of evaluating the success of acquisition planning. In the case study of my family's acquisition of Hebrew, for example, what was the impact on our acquisition that is traceable to planned, direct procedures, in the light of the tremendous incentives and opportunities to learn that we encountered daily? How important have these planned acquisition efforts been for the population as a whole? Once Hebrew became established as the principal language of public life, was it not likely that newcomers would have learned it whether or not there were organized efforts to help them to do so? Indeed, Schmelz and Bachi (1974:769) suggest that the number of adult immigrants who have become Hebrew speakers exceeds any reasonable estimate of the direct output, quantitatively or qualitatively, of public instruction. But if one wanted to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs, how would one go about it? One could not compare the proficiency of those who had studied in such courses with those who had not because the two groups are self-selected and thus not likely to have been equivalent in the first place. If the former were more highly motivated to learn, as is likely, they probably would have attained higher proficiency than the latter, even without formal instruction.

Of course, these evaluational difficulties are not confined to acquisition planning. With respect to status planning for Hebrew in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century, there seems to be general agreement that the promotion of Hebrew as the language of instruction in the schools was crucial for the victory of Hebrew as the vernacular of Jewish Palestine. However, the linguistic diversity created by the 'ingathering of the exiles' might ultimately have led to the same result. Linguistic diversity has long been a feature of the Jewish community in Palestine and Israel. With respect to the principal language claimed by respondents during the censuses of 1916-18, Bachi (1956:197) estimates that if any two Jews met at random during that period, the chance that they would share the same principal

language was only about one in three. But even then, the most common principal language was Hebrew (40%), followed by Yiddish (36%), Arabic (18%), and Ladino (4%). It is likely that Hebrew was also the chief lingua franca among the Jews of Ottoman Palestine. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that the language most likely to be shared by interlocutors who did not speak the same mother tongue was Hebrew, if only in a literary form. If this hypothesis is correct, then its spread created pressure on others to learn it and prevented the spread of its chief rival, Yiddish. The potential of Yiddish as lingua franca was probably undermined, in addition, by the fact that where opposition existed to the use of Hebrew for secular purposes, it was found among 'old-fashioned' ultraorthodox persons of Eastern European background. Almost all of these spoke Yiddish and thus had no need of a lingua franca with one another. If the opponents to Hebrew for secular purposes had been linguistically heterogeneous, Yiddish would have been their probable choice of lingua franca because Yiddish was spoken by the greatest number of persons who did not claim Hebrew as principal language. As it was, the opponents to Hebrew were linguistically homogeneous whereas those not opposed to Hebrew were linguistically heterogeneous. So the field was left clear for Hebrew. Since LP--whether with respect to form, function, or acquisition--never occurs in a social vacuum, the difficulties for evaluating its effectiveness are considerable.

Acquisition planning, language planning, and applied linguistics. In suggesting a trichotomy in place of the familiar dichotomy, I differ from most scholars of LP, who do not view language acquisition as a focus of that field of inquiry. In response to this position, I can make at least three arguments.

First, an unwillingness to view acquisition as a focus of LP may stem from a desire to separate LP from applied linguistics (AL), for which language teaching is a major focus. But one cannot entirely separate LP from AL. In fact, students of AL commonly embrace LP as a subfield. For example, the editors of Applied Linguistics write that 'the journal welcomes contributions in such areas of current inquiry as first and second language analysis, translation, language testing, language teaching methodology, language

planning, the study of interlanguages, stylistics, and lexicography' (Applied Linguistics 1980).

As spheres of inquiry, both AL and LP are concerned with the relationship between means and ends, i.e., the relationship between the means adopted to solve problems or influence behavior and the extent to which the problem is solved or the behavior influenced. But LP as a sphere of inquiry is broader, in my view, in that it is also concerned with processes of planning. It seeks to determine who defines the problem to be solved or the behavior to be changed, how decisions are reached with respect to goals and means, and what relationships exist among the formulation of goals, the specification of means, and the outcomes of implementation, on the one hand, and between each of these and the social context in which planning is embedded, on the other. One can view LP as superordinate or subordinate to AL; one cannot separate them entirely from one another.

A second argument in support of language acquisition as a focus for LP is that the changes in form and function sought by corpus and status planning affect and are affected by an increase in the number of a language's users. New users may be attracted by the new uses to which a language is put. For example, when Hebrew began to spread as a lingua franca in Palestine, its enhanced usefulness probably attracted new speakers, withing both the Jewish and the non-Jewish population. New users may influence the language through language contact, as the structure of modern Hebrew has been influenced by its large number of speakers of Eastern European origin. And new users may introduce new uses, as when Hebrew was introduced as a language of scientific discourse by the first generation of native speakers.

A third argument for regarding language acquisition as a legitimate focus of LP is that acquisition planning, because of the visibility of classroom teachers, supervisors, and principals reminds us that LP involves decision-making at numerous levels of authority and that therefore LP is not the exclusive domain of decision-makers at the top. Prator, one of the few scholars who regard language teaching as an object of language policy making (he prefers the term 'language policy' to 'language planning'), states this point forcibly:

Language policy is the body of decisions made by interested authorities concerning the desirable form and use of languages by a speech group. It also involves consequent decisions made by educators, media directors, etc., regarding the possible implementation of prior basic decisions. According to this definition, the decision to emphasize in a language class specific skills or linguistic forms--even the choice of a textbook--could become a part of language policy. The latter should thus be one of the primary concerns of language teachers. The entire process of formulating and implementing language policy is best regarded as a spiral process, beginning at the highest level of authority and, ideally, descending in widening circles through the ranks of practitioners who can support or resist putting the policy into effect. (Personal communication)

The role of teachers in carrying out LP decisions may be more visible than the role of, say, Israeli disk jockeys, who are constrained to broadcast a minimum number of Hebrew-language songs; or, say, Hebrew-language supervisors, who edit the grammar of radio scripts according to normative principles. Nonetheless, the role of intermediate and lower level personnel can no more be ignored in status and corpus planning than in acquisition planning. But acquisition planning, at least that involving direct instruction, heightens our awareness of the role of such personnel.

Prator's view of LP as a sequence of decisions of smaller and smaller scope is an attractive one not only because some of the same principles and factors which constrain planning at the highest levels may be presumed to operate at lower levels as well, but also because it provides a bridge from macrolevel decisions to microlevel implementation. It should not be concluded, however, that there is a one-way sequence from macrolevel decisions to microlevel implementation. Policy set initially at lower levels can move upward as well, as we saw in the case of the teachers who insisted on Hebrew as the sole language of instruction in the first technical and scientific institute to be established in Palestine.

Summary. In this paper, I argue that to the traditional corpus planning-status planning dichotomy we add a third focus of LP, acquisition. I justify this suggestion on the

following grounds: (1) LP and AL are closely related fields of inquiry; the latter's interest in language teaching should encourage students of LP to focus on acquisition as well. (2) Just as the planning of a language's form and function influence the number of its speakers, so do new users influence a language's form and function. Since form, function, and acquisition are related to one another, planning of one should consider planning of the others. (3) Instructional personnel are particularly visible actors in the implementation and formulation of decisions regarding acquisition. Inclusion of acquisition as a focus for LP research may serve to remind us of the importance of intermediate and lower level personnel in the attainment of status and corpus planning goals as well.

If my suggestion is accepted, the considerable efforts now expended to maintain or to increase the number of a language's users will be viewed as LP no less than efforts to modify that language's form or function.

References

- Applied Linguistics. 1980. Aims. Applied Linguistics 1.1. Inside back cover.
- Bachi, Roberto. 1956. A statistical analysis of the revival of Hebrew in Israel. *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 3:179-247.
- Cobarrubias, Juan, and Joshua A. Fishman, eds. 1983. *Progress in language planning: international perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Cooper, Robert L. 1982. A framework for the study of language spread. In: *Language spread: Studies in diffusion and social change*. Edited by R.L. Cooper. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 5-36.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1983. Language planning and social change. In: Cobarrubias and Fishman, eds. (1983:29-40).
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1983. Progress in language planning: A few concluding remarks. In: Cobarrubias and Fishman, eds. (1983:381-83).
- Hofman, John E., and Haya Fisherman. 1971. Language shift and language maintenance in Israel. *International Migration Review* 5:204-26.
- Kloss, Heinz. 1969. *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

- Rabin, Chaim. 1973. A short history of the Hebrew language. Jerusalem: The Jewish Agency.
- Rosenbaum, Yehudit. 1983. Hebrew adoption among new immigrants to Israel: The first three years. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 41:115-30.
- Schmelz, Uziel O., and Roberto Bachi. 1974. Hebrew as everyday language of the Jews in Israel--statistical appraisal. In: American Academy for Jewish Research, Salo Wittmayer Baron jubilee volume: On the occasion of his eightieth birthday, vol. 2. New York: Columbia University Press. English section. 745-85.
- Wigoder, Geoffrey. 1972. Israel, State of (Cultural life), *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 9. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House. 996-1020.

CHANGING LANGUAGE POLICY IN A BUREAUCRACY

Roger W. Shuy
Georgetown University

In American bureaucracies, language policies seldom are visible. Only recently, for example, has there been discussion about language choice for election ballots or public services. When language policy finally does rise to the surface of discussion, it is usually a matter of which of several languages to use rather than the most effective use of a specific language, a notable exception being the government's effort to promote clear English during the Carter administration.

Within a particular branch of our government, however, little outward attention is given to some of the most crucial aspects of language use. Bureaucrats learn to use the jargon and acronyms of their own agencies but they tend to exert little effort to communicate effectively with the world outside the agency. It often takes a lawsuit to bring such communication to the attention of insiders.

This study focuses on the success of one government agency, the Social Security Administration (SSA), in bringing about significant improvements in language policy, improvements which brought significant change to its extant procedures but which are now being implemented, despite the pessimism of many that it could not be done. There are many ingredients for the success of SSA in changing its language policy: strong leadership, effective staff, willingness to admit past errors and weakness, recognition of the problem without being defensive, protection of the innovators by high-level administrators, and an openness to outside help. This paper focuses, not on these, however, but on the nature of the outside help sought by the agency from the field of linguistics. However, linguists can be of little or no assistance without these primary ingredients.

The historical origins of the SSA training program. Whenever language is the focal point in legal disputes, analysis of such language can be extremely important. In recent years linguistic analysis has proven helpful in cases involving housing discrimination, slander, libel, equal opportunity employment, and criminal charges. Many of these, especially civil cases, may take years to resolve. A case brought by the National Senior Citizens Law Center (NSCLC) against the United States government's Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is a prime illustration. The complaint was essentially that the Medicare report forms, issued by the Health Care Financing Administration to recipients, were unclear, if not unreadable. The National Senior Citizens Law Center brought suit against HHS and won. HHS appealed the decision, and again NSCLC won in the appellate court. Finally, the case was put on appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, which also ruled for the plaintiff. Even then, the matter was not settled since months of interpretation of various aspects of the decision had to be resolved. Meanwhile, the senior citizen Medicare recipients were limited in the receipt of the services resulting from the court decision until the final agreements on interpretations were resolved. The entire process covered over eight years.

For all the above reasons, the National Senior Citizens Law Center is not predisposed to litigation. The process simply causes even court victories to be drawn out for unconscionable lengths of time. A more efficient and amicable resolution of disputes is always to seek agreement out of court. Thus, when Congress required the Social Security Administration to send a letter to all social security recipients to advise them that they might be eligible for additional benefits, called Supplementary Security Income (SSI), the NSCLC looked very closely at the proposed letter and found it lacking in many ways. Instead of initiating litigation, however, the Center called on me to draft an alternate version of that letter which would be clearer and more effective than the version proposed by Social Security. The resultant draft was, somewhat surprisingly, essentially acceptable to SSA and a lengthy court battle was averted.

Even more surprising, however, was the telephone call I received a few months later from the Project Director for an initiative to improve SSA's notices. It seems that SSA was quite aware of the inadequacies of the letters (which they

refer to as notices) sent out by that Agency. The Acting Commissioner for Social Security, Martha A. McSteen, decided to do something about this serious problem, so she made clear notices one of her eight priorities for the Agency.

With considerable wisdom, McSteen decided upon a project management approach for solving the notice-writing problems which plagued the Agency. Essentially, this approach featured certain elements critical to solving these problems. The Acting Commissioner:

Designated one of SSA's four Deputy Commissioners to oversee the activities required to reach a solution. She named Herbert R. Doggett, Jr., SSA's Deputy Commissioner for Operations, as the Executive Manager for the project on notices.

Required periodic progress reports. Initially, the Acting Commissioner and her deputies received, on a monthly basis, both a written and an oral report. This stringent requirement allowed problems to be detected and solved quickly at the Agency's highest decision-making level.

Established a project management team. Each of the four Deputy Commissioners and the Assistant General Counsel, Social Security, named high-level managers to serve on the team. By this device, all of the Agency's concerns about notices were represented on the team. Doggett named Barbara Schnackenberg as his project director. She devoted her attention to managing both the project team and the newly created notice-writing staff.

This last point on the project management approach was especially crucial. At the beginning of the project, the concerns of the four basic parts of the Agency and the General Counsel were clearly delineated.

The **Policy** people wanted to be certain that regulations and SSA policy were well represented.

The **Systems** people wanted to be certain that notices could be generated by SSA's computers or through other word-processing capabilities.

The **Management and Assessment** people wanted to be certain that project activities were funded, that any needed procurements were properly obtained, that any needed training was delivered correctly, and that the project solved problems identified through notice quality reviews.

The **Operations** people wanted to be sure that notices clearly conveyed the proper message. Poorly written notices cause frustration for the public and result in a high volume of inquiries which must be answered in SSA's field facilities. The notice-writing staff was organizationally placed in Operations, with Ms. Schnackenberg as the senior manager.

The **Legal** people, while not technically a part of SSA's organization but charged with defending notices in possible court cases, wanted to be sure that the intent of the law was carried out.

Although it could be argued to the contrary, the writers of notices had traditionally found themselves at the bottom of an authority pecking order. The lawyers had the law as their powerful authority for preferred wording of notices. The systems specialists could modify the legal requirements as the computer's capabilities dictated. The policy representatives had the authority of the Agency's regulations to look out for. The management people had the budget and procurement rules to govern expenditures and procurement processes.

But the writers had little or no authority. They were subservient to all others. By bringing the five SSA areas together on one team, McSteen created a common communication capability within the agency which had not before existed for notices.

Considerations for the training program. One of the first steps the project team took was to try to build in-house expertise both in the notice-writing staff and in the other parts of the Agency which would produce notices equivalent to the one I wrote for them. Once informed of the organizational structure, I was better able to consider what type of training program to develop. Time and resource constraints were an agency consideration, and the following plan was developed. No more than 12 participants would be involved in any given training program. We would meet for three hours once a week for six weeks. The focus of our work would be on notices currently being worked on by the participants. The participants would be expected to do outside-of-class 'homework', including observation and interviewing. I would be joined by a psychologist as a

cotrainer, Jana Staton, since the problem faced by SSA was considerably larger than a linguistics problem alone.

In all, six sections of 15 SSA participants were trained. The approach selected, as noted above, was to begin with current work issues and to apply linguistic and psychological principles to their problems rather than first to introduce linguistic and psychological principles and expect the participants to make the synapse of application. Such a procedure was far from the traditional training programs frequently experienced at SSA. In essence, Staton and I had to do various analyses on the participants' work problems both inside and outside of class before we could select the appropriate analytical routines or preparatory work. But this procedure proved to be better individualized to the work of SSA and it is our belief that a traditional program would not have been as useful.

It is perhaps unfair to exhibit the sort of writing that exemplified the problem we faced in this program. And in all fairness to SSA, it should be pointed out that when millions of letters are sent each year by this Agency, a computerized approach was deemed necessary. Thus, the computer held in storage thousands of ready-made paragraphs on various letter categories such as award notices, denial notices, etc. When a letter was constructed, the computer was asked to assemble a series of paragraphs appropriate for that letter. The results were often disorganized and, occasionally, almost comical.

Consider, for example, the award letter which had been in frequent use at least until 1984. (This photocopy is about the same quality as that which the recipients receive.)

We asked the workshop participants to find some actual SSA recipients and to interrogate them, sentence by sentence, about what they understood or misunderstood, liked or disliked, about this letter. The results were that the recipients were confused about its meaning, and unclear about what they should do about it. The sequence of the letter was odd and, not surprisingly, few interviewees even recognized that the letter was actually an award notification.

From the perspective of the general counsel, the letter was an adequate representation of what the law required. From the systems perspective, it was thought to be as good as the computer could do. But from the clear-writing project staff's perspective, it was a hodgepodge of unclarity--a perspective on which the lawyers and computer specialists readily agreed.

Social Security Award Certificate

From: Department of Health and Human Services
Social Security Administration

RETIREMENT	7/84	\$632.70
HOSPITAL	7/84	
MEDICAL	7/84	

BECAUSE OF A CHANGE IN THE LAW, YOUR REGULAR PAYMENT WILL BE ROUNDED DOWN TO THE DOLLAR EVEN THOUGH YOUR MONTHLY BENEFIT OF RECORD MAY BE IN DOLLARS AND CENTS.

A MONTHLY PREMIUM OF \$14.60 IS REQUIRED TO KEEP YOUR MEDICAL INSURANCE PROTECTION. YOU WILL BE BILLED FOR THESE PREMIUMS. YOU WILL RECEIVE YOUR FIRST PREMIUM NOTICE BEFORE 8/84. AFTER THAT NOTICES WILL BE SENT EVERY 3 MONTHS. THESE NOTICES WILL SHOW THE MONTHS COVERED, TOTAL PREMIUM AMOUNT, AND THE DATE PAYMENT IS DUE.

YOU CANNOT QUALIFY FOR MONTHLY BENEFITS BASED ON ANOTHER PERSON'S SOCIAL SECURITY RECORD WHEN YOU ARE ENTITLED TO AN EQUAL OR LARGER INSURANCE BENEFIT BASED ON YOUR OWN EARNINGS RECORD.

BASED ON THE INFORMATION GIVEN TO US, YOU WERE BORN ON 07/25/19.

IF YOU NEED MEDICARE SERVICES BEFORE YOU RECEIVE YOUR HEALTH INSURANCE CARD, YOU MAY USE THIS NOTICE AS PROOF OF COVERAGE. YOU SHOULD RECEIVE YOUR CARD WITHIN 4 WEEKS.

IF YOU RETIRE FROM YOUR BUSINESS OR CORPORATION BEFORE THE MONTH YOU ATTAIN AGE 70, YOU WILL BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF YOUR RETIREMENT BEFORE YOUR BENEFITS CAN BE PAID.

YOU ARE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR ANY TYPE OF BENEFIT OTHER THAN STATED ON THIS CERTIFICATE. ENTITLEMENT TO ANOTHER BENEFIT ON THIS OR ANY OTHER RECORD IN THE FUTURE REQUIRES A SEPARATE APPLICATION.

IF YOU BELIEVE THIS DETERMINATION IS NOT CORRECT, YOU MAY REQUEST THAT YOUR CASE BE REEXAMINED. IF YOU WANT THIS RECONSIDERATION, YOU MUST REQUEST IT NOT LATER THAN 60 DAYS FROM THE DATE YOU RECEIVE THIS NOTICE. YOU MAY MAKE YOUR REQUEST THROUGH ANY SOCIAL SECURITY OFFICE. IF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE IS AVAILABLE, YOU SHOULD SUBMIT IT WITH YOUR REQUEST.

This certifies that you (or the person(s) on whose behalf you applied), became entitled under the Social Security Act to the Social Security benefits shown.

Acting Commissioner
of Social Security

Important: See other side for additional information►

Form SSA-1007 (10-83)
Printing price of 100

The question, then, was how to recast this letter in a way which made it understandable, which took advantage of the positive note that SSA was actually awarding money to the reader and which gave the recipient a clear road map of what to do next.

Topic analysis. At this point we considered which linguistic principles might be operative. In discourse analysis, for example, the idea of topic is useful (Shuy 1980). As a revision exercise, one might first determine the topics of this notice. This reveals the following topic sequence:

- (1) Your payment will be rounded down
- (2) You'll be billed for monthly insurance premiums
- (3) You can't qualify on another person's SS record
- (4) You were born
- (5) Use this notice until you get your health insurance card
- (6) If you retire, provide evidence
- (7) You're not eligible for other benefits
- (8) What to do if you disagree with this

Having derived these topics, the participants were then asked to read them sequentially. After a good chuckle, it was pointed out that nowhere in the body of this letter does it say that an award has been made, and yet this is the ostensible reason for the letter in the first place.

Some controversy ensued about the need to tell the readers what their birthdates were. A legal reason could be made for it, but a writing reason could not be. It was finally determined that the legal reason for the birthdate could be satisfied by putting this information in the top, right-hand corner boxed data. Likewise, it was decided that one number already in that box, the amount of the monthly check, was too important to be relegated to that area and should be incorporated in the text itself.

But why, the participants argued, should the rounding down of the amount of the check be placed first in the text? No adequate answer was provided (or perhaps even possible).

What became clear from the discussion of this notice was that a topic analysis strategy was a useful first step in determining how to revise this letter. All participants agreed that the purpose of the letter should be first and that what was first in this version was certainly not the purpose. This

led us to develop a set of topic analysis strategies, as follows:

- (1) Determine the purpose of the letter and front this topic.
- (2) Determine the main idea of each paragraph.
- (3) Write down these main ideas, as in the topic analysis above.
- (4) Read the resulting list of topics, or main ideas.
- (5) Determine whether the sequence of these topics is appropriate. If not, resequence them.
- (6) Determine whether this sequence captures the reader's perspective. If not, revise until it does.

The reader's perspective was determined from the results of the participant's fieldwork. When they found their SSA recipients to interview, they asked them, among other things, what they wanted to hear from SSA. They found, to a person, the following three things: (1) Am I going to get any money? (2) How much? (3) When? There were no other questions from the recipient perspective. SSA may want or need to tell them other things, but these are the things the recipients wanted to hear; this was their perspective.

Topic analysis, then, became an important first step in all notices analyzed by the participants in the training program. By analyzing the topics in existing notices that were being revised, it became clear that there are several types of topic marking. The approach I used in my revision of the congressionally mandated SSI notice was the question-answer framework. In this approach, the question is asked in the voice of the participant, as in 'How can I get more Social Security funds?' and answered in the voice of the SSA. The question-answer (Q-A) approach can be very useful because it obviously captures the participant's perspective, but it would tend to become tedious if all correspondence from SSA were in that format. For this reason, Staton and I proposed a set of topic-marking alternatives, as follows:

- (1) Performatives.

Example: 'This notice is to inform you that--
 you will be receiving \$435 a month...'
 your benefits will stop on October 3...'
 your benefits will increase from \$345 to \$450...'

(2) Headings.

Examples: Your Social Security Benefits
Amount of Payment
Your Eligibility for Other Benefits

The headings format calls attention to the topic as the heading and writes with the voice of SSA instead of the recipient (as in the Q-A format).

(3) Question-Answer. As noted earlier, this approach speaks with the voice of the recipient, not SSA.

Examples: How much money will I get?
How did you figure my payment?
How can I find out more?

(4) Embedded in text (but not performatively). Whereas the performative format explicitly states what the topic is, the embedded format is more indirect. This format is common in most writing.

Examples: 'Your attorney must send us a copy of the bill and we must approve it.'

'In April 1985 we will look at your case again to see if your disability has gotten better.'

(5) Implied in text. These topics are neither performative nor embedded in the text. They are even more indirect than embedded topics, often appearing in the letterhead or in a boxed area of the letter.

Examples: (On letterhead): Social Security Award Certificate

(In box at top): Monthly Benefit Amount (often simply stated as an amount, such as \$432.27).

By our calling attention to these five ways of indicating the topic, the participants became aware of alternative strategies of topic marking in order to select the one most appropriate for the type of notice under consideration for revision.

As a revision strategy, then, topic analysis has a great deal to offer. By providing a holistic macropicture of the entire letter (rather than a word or individual sentence picture), topic analysis causes the revisor to front the main idea, sequence the topics from the reader's perspective, and mark the topics in the most appropriate way.

The decision tree. As part of their field interviewing experiences, the participants asked the SSA recipients what they thought they were to do as a result of receiving the letters. Not surprisingly, there was large-scale confusion. There was complete agreement among the clear-writing project participants, however, that SSA's notices should give clear guidance to recipients about their alternative courses of action. The problem then was articulated as 'How do we provide a clear road map of the appropriate action a recipient can take?' This led to the development of the concept of a decision tree, a kind of outline map of the alternatives available and the choices available to the recipient. The following is an example. When revising an award notice, for example, the following steps are taken:

- (1) Chart all topics.
- (2) Arrange topics as a flow chart, with three column categories: SSA propositions, decision points, and reader actions.
- (3) Arrange the chart as the example (Figure 1) indicates.

Figure 1. A decision tree.

SSA propositions.	Decision points.	Reader actions.
<hr/>		
(1) Your first payment will be 3-8-84.		
(2) We will round down the amount.		
(3) We counted your time in the armed services.		
	(4) Should we count anything else?	
	(No) (Yes)	
		Contact the SSA office.
	(5) Are you still disabled?	
	(No) (Yes)	
	Your Benefits	
	benefits continue.	
	stop.	
		Report facts to SSA.

If a notice can be outlined with clarity as in Figure 1, there is a good chance that the road map will be clear to

the reader. If not, the writer should revise until the map is clear.

Speech act analysis. Speech acts can be very useful in considering how to revise a piece of writing since, of all the available linguistic units of analysis (phonology, morphology, syntax, discourse, etc.), speech acts are closest to intentionality. People use language to get things done: to promise, deny, give directives, offer, report facts, apologize, warn, threaten, advise, and request, among others (Searle 1969). A letter may contain the speech act of warning, for example, when the writer's intention is merely to advise. It may give a directive when the writer intended to offer an alternative. Especially in the public sector, it is crucial that appropriate tone be achieved. Most writers and revisors can spot a problematic tone, but they often do not know how to analyze what is wrong. Speech act analysis provides one such tool.

Speech acts bring about certain effects on the audience because their utterance serves as a means of 'getting things done in the world.' Speech acts occur in written notices, and communicate to the reader the intentions of the writer, particularly what the writer wants the reader to do. By analyzing a notice for speech acts, one can test whether or not the message communicates clearly and 'felicitously' the writer's intentions and the actions which the reader can or must take (Searle 1969). A given speech act may be felicitous or infelicitous, direct or indirect.

Felicity refers to the set of conditions which must be true in order for a speech act to be understood by the audience as an apology, promise, offer, etc. A felicitous speech act will specify or clearly refer to the real-world conditions which justify the speech act. That is, one may apologize by saying 'I guess I goofed...', but a truly felicitous apology would require that one give explicit evidence that one recognizes the offending behavior and is, therefore, sincere in apologizing.

In many social contexts, we may accomplish the goal of getting other persons to do what we want by indirect speech acts, such as the following means of directing or ordering someone else to close the window, by using statements which appear to say something else:

It's very cold in here. (asserting a fact about the room)

Can you reach that window? (requesting information)

Indirection is often good in social interactions, but in administrative writing, being direct in a polite way prevents misreading by the recipient, who should not be required to infer what the SSA wishes to suggest in the way of action.

Consider the following revision of an earlier draft of an SSA notice. The revision has adopted the Q-A format, largely because this is a one-time letter (one that is sent out only once) and, therefore, the impact of the recipient's perspective Q-A format will not be overused and diminished.

1,2 You may be able to get more money because of a recent court decision about Supplemental Security Income (SSI). These questions and answers will help you decide if the court decision applies to you.

3 **What did the Court say?**

4,5 The court said that we have to change the way we figure how much SSI we pay to some people. The change applies only to married couples living together in Massachusetts at some time since January, 1977.

6 **Does the court decision mean that any couple can get more SSI?**

7,8 No. The only couples who may get more money are those where only one person got SSI and the other person had income.

9 **What if both of us are getting SSI?**

10 Then the court decision won't change what you get from SSI.

11 **Will the court decision raise my SSI if I'm not married now?**

12 If you were married at any time since January 1977, the court decision may apply to you.

13 **Could the court decision change?**

14,15 Another court may be looking at this decision. If there is a new court decision, the way we have to figure your payments may change again.

16 **I have been getting SSI for some time. Does the court's decision mean I can get back benefits?**

17,18 Yes. We can refigure your benefits as far back as January 1977. If we owe you money because of this, we will pay you.

20 **If I think I can get more SSI money, what do I do?**

21,22 Call or visit your Social Security office right

23,24 away. Look in the telephone book for the office closest to you. If you visit our office, be sure to bring this paper with you. It will help us answer your questions.

A revision-oriented speech act analysis of this letter first asks the analyst to mark all speech acts in this letter. The resulting sequence, as numbered on the preceding letter, is as follows:

(1) Offer	(9) Question	(17) Report fact
(2) Promise	(10) Report fact	(18) Offer
(3) Question	(11) Question	(19) Promise
(4) Report fact	(12) Report fact	(20) Question
(5) Report fact	(13) Question	(21) Offer
(6) Question	(14) Report fact	(22) Give advice
(7) Report fact	(15) Give advice	(23) Give advice
(8) Report fact	(16) Question	(24) Report fact

Participants were urged to mark the speech acts on the margins of the letter where these acts occur.

Speech act analysis of more problematic SSA letters led to a discussion of politeness, indirectness vs. directness, and eventually to the kinds of speech acts that are most appropriate for a government agency to make. It became clear, for example, that SSA should probably not threaten recipients in their letters (even though rare instances of threatening could be found in some drafts). The issue of positive versus negative tone led to a tentative categorizing of speech acts, as follows:

Potentially negative speech acts	Neutral speech acts	Positive, polite speech acts
Warning	Reporting facts	Offering
Complaining	Requesting	Promising
Giving directives	information	Thanking
Threatening		Congratulating
		Inviting
		Sympathizing
		Advising
		Greeting

Questioning
'from the
reader's
perspective
Closing

This issue of positivity vs. negativity extended, of course, beyond the examination of speech acts. It was called to our attention, in addition, that in notices that denied the readers their claim to eligibility, negativity was absolutely necessary. This is, of course, quite true. This fact led us to understand that what we mean by avoiding negatives is actually to avoid unnecessary negatives. For example, the following negatives appear to be useful and necessary:

- (1) If you are not a class member, the new law does not apply to you.
- (2) Attorney fees will not be held back from any benefit you receive while we are reviewing your case.
- (3) And you will not be asked to pay back any Medicare benefits you get while we review your case.

Number one is in reference to a class action suit and it was necessary to determine whether or not the reader was a member of that class. Several sentences had identified what it meant to be a class member and now, to be completely clear, the notice contrasts such membership in a possibly negative way. Numbers two and three are statements which, though they use negatives, actually have a positive effect since the result to the reader is positive and the negative act works to their advantage.

On the other hand, many statements in the original SSA notices were unnecessarily negative, as the following illustrate.

Negative original:

Your case will not be reviewed unless you ask us to.

But we can't pay you for any month before the court returned the class action suit.

Positive revision:

If you ask us we will review your case.

But we can pay you only for months after the class action suit began.

The participants agreed that their agency should be as positive and, of course, as polite as possible. Much of the task of the SSA notice writer is to provide and request information, a neutral speech act area, neither positive nor negative. But when the reader is to take some sort of action, a choice between powerful speech acts, such as warning or giving directives, and more polite ones, such as offering advice, must be made.

In terms of a useful procedure to be followed in revising an SSA notice, the following was suggested:

- (a) For a given notice, mark all speech acts on the text (in the margins or over the sentences).
- (b) Think about the intention of the notice. Do these speech acts best reflect SSA's intentions? If not, modify the speech acts (make indirect ones direct, if appropriate, and replace negative speech acts with neutral or positive ones where possible).
- (c) Think about the speech acts that the reader needs in order to respond effectively to the notice. If necessary, modify the speech acts accordingly.

More specific to the special problems created by past SSA letters, the following checklist was developed.

- (1) Does the notice warn when it should advise?
- (2) Does the letter offer, invite, or promise appropriately?
- (3) Does the letter threaten or warn unnecessarily?
- (4) Does the letter give directives when the intent of SSA is to offer alternatives?
- (5) Are the speech acts unnecessarily negative?

In developing this checklist we were guided by Grice's maxims of communicative cooperation (Grice 1975). These maxims were presented to the participants and were applied to their written products. Grice observed that communicative exchanges do not normally consist of a succession of disconnected remarks and would not be rational if they did. Our talk is characteristically a cooperative effort and each participant recognizes, to some extent, a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction. This may be fixed from the start or it may evolve during the exchanges. But at each stage some possible conversational moves would be excluded as conversationally unsuitable.

The rough general principle which participants expected each other to observe is: Make your communicative

contribution such as is required by the accepted purpose or direction of the communication in which you are engaged. The maxims of the Cooperative Principle are the rational 'rules' we follow when we speak or write, which allow us to 'make sense' out of what other people communicate to us:

- Quantity:** Make your contribution as informative as required, no more and no less.
- Relation:** Make all your information relate directly to the topic: Be relevant!
- Sincerity:** Do not say what you believe to be false; do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
- Clarity/Manner:** Avoid obscurity of expression. Avoid ambiguity. Be orderly.

These maxims are the minimum expectation all language users have toward incoming communication, spoken or written. Adhering to these maxims will yield results in accord with the Cooperative Principle; openly flouting these maxims will lead to confusion, lack of comprehension, and very often, outrage.

Cohesion. The concept of cohesive ties also proved to be a useful tool for the Clear Writing Project. Taking our cue from Halliday and Hassan (1976), we briefly presented this concept, illustrating five types of cohesive ties: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical. By taking actual notices that the participants were working with together, we marked all cohesive ties in these letters and drew arrows from them to the words to which they were connected semantically. This visual approach proved to be quite effective for soon the participants also began to see where better cohesive ties could have been used in the original documents.

An example of one type of cohesive tie difficulty, lexical cohesion, can be seen in the last paragraph of the entire notice presented earlier.

If you believe this determination is not correct, you may request a **reexamination**. If you want this **reconsideration**, you must request it not later than 60 days from the date you receive this notice. You may make your **request**

through any Social Security Office. If additional evidence is available, you should submit it with your **request**.

As is evident, three different terms are used to refer to a process that the reader may request: reexamination, reconsideration, request. However elegant it may be to use synonyms in English classes or in New Yorker style writing, such synonymy can work against clarity in good administrative writing. This is true largely because the reader can never be certain exactly what constitutes a term of art in the mind of the sender. Are the three terms the same or different? If one were to write to SSA, which term should one use? Even if it is clear that request is synonymous with reexamination and reconsideration, which one of the latter is the official one to use? Such quandaries face us all daily and can be expensive traps. I was recently asked by my health insurance company whether or not I was 'sponsoring' my college-aged son. My first reaction was to affirm this. After all, what father would not 'sponsor' his son? But my awareness of terms of art in general caused me to hesitate and ask what they meant by sponsor. As it turned out, an affirmative answer would have doubled my monthly premium, since sponsoring means only that he would be added to my policy as a nongroup participant, rather than as a group participant.

The point here is that by examining a notice for cohesive ties such as reexamination and reconsideration, the SSA participants were able to see a difficulty from the reader's perspective and they eventually agreed on a single term to be used in all occasions to refer to the object of this request.

The topic of cohesive ties also provided the opportunity to consider linguistic notions of coreference and presupposition: one element in the text presupposes the other (it cannot be decoded without recourse to it). We took Grice's work on presupposition (1975) and developed three checklist questions that the clear-writing project could use against their attempts at revising:

- (1) Is the presupposed assertion actually clear and true for this situation?
- (2) Is what is presupposed likely to be known and understood by most readers?

- (3) Would it help the clarity and comprehensibility of the notice if the presupposed assertions were made explicit?

Finally, the concept of cohesive ties led to a revision strategy procedure which the participants could use as they worked on their notices:

- (1) Mark all cohesive ties in the notice.
- (2) Draw arrows to the defined referent of each cohesive tie, even if it is a previous paragraph.
- (3) Is what is presupposed likely to be known and understood by most readers?
- (4) Would it help the clarity and comprehensibility of the notice if the presupposed assertions were made explicit?

Finally, the concept of cohesive ties led to a revision strategy procedure which the participants could use as they worked on their notices:

- (1) Mark all cohesive ties in the notice.
- (2) Draw arrows to the defined referent of each cohesive tie, even if it is a previous paragraph. If no defined referent exists, insert one.
- (3) Ask yourself what possible misreadings or misunderstandings might result from any existing or missing cohesive ties.
- (4) Add or modify existing cohesive ties that avoid such misreadings and misunderstanding.
- (5) Examine the notice for external (across-paragraph) cohesion as well as for internal (within-paragraph) cohesion.

Word comprehension. To this point it should be clear that a major goal of the training program was to achieve reader comprehension. The strategies outlined first, however, were ones in which discourse and syntactic comprehension were dealt with before word comprehension was addressed at all. It proved somewhat difficult to defer such analysis since some of the participants, especially those with some background in English or education, kept wanting to discuss the issues with which they were most familiar: the more surface level, visible word choice decisions.

It should be pointed out that there is nothing essentially wrong with a concern for word level comprehension. Such matters are, indeed, important. Our task in this training program, however, was to devise a workable task methodology for continuous use in the agency, one in which sequentiality played an important role. In our view, it is better to deal with the larger discourse, speech act, and syntactic issues before one addresses the more micro word level. In fact, one of the basic principles known to all linguists who analyze naturalistic language is that it is necessary to make several passes through the data, each pass focusing on a specific thing. Language is simply too complex and too multilayered to do it all at once. Thus, the pass through the text related to word comprehension, though important in its own right, is seen to be dependent on earlier passes relating to discourse and syntactic meaning. That is, there is no point being worried about word comprehension in either a discourse or sentence unit which itself lacks comprehensibility. Our approach was to work on the big things first, then move to the smaller ones.

Our focus on word comprehension relied heavily on work that had gone on before us, particularly on that of the Document Design Center (Reddish 1979), but not excluding some of the more conventional knowledge in the field of composition. For example, we emphasized the need to try to stick to simple present, past, and future tenses and the need not to switch verb tenses inappropriately, as the following older version of an SSA notice did:

Before the law changed, it had been the right of all recipients to..., or you may have been informed previously that..., or by next year, you will have been paid.

We also stressed the need to include causal relators and not to rely on the reader's ability to infer a connection which is not made explicit, as the following contrast shows:

There is a new law. We are reducing your amount.

vs.

We are reducing your amount because of a new law.

The earlier two-sentence version produced a high score on the readability formula being used at that time (SSA has since seriously reduced its reliance on any readability

formula), but it certainly lacked the explicit causal connector which, though it produced a longer sentence and a lower readability formula score, also created a comprehensible sentence (see Reddish 1979 for a more thorough analysis of the fallacies of readability formulas).

Many other word comprehension issues were addressed, all based on the text of existing SSA notices, including the following.

(1) Which-that relators should be included, e.g. 'We feel the best thing to do is...' vs. 'We feel that the best thing to do is...'

(2) Preposition relator should be included, e.g. 'past year's income' vs. 'income for the past year'.

(3) Use active rather than passive constructions.

(4) Use positive rather than negative constructions, e.g. 'Please remember' vs. 'Don't forget'.

(5) Use single embedded clauses sparingly and avoid multi-embeddings altogether.

(6) Limit the use of must and shall (highly directive speech acts).

(7) Use animate nouns rather than inanimate ones, e.g. 'your husband' vs. 'a relative'.

(8) Use verb rather than compound nouns.

(9) Use concrete nouns rather than abstract ones, e.g. 'money' vs. 'resources'.

(10) Avoid terms of art which may not be understood as terms of art by the reader.

All such choices, of course, are generalizations and are dependent on contextual constraints. It may be necessary, for example, to use the passive voice in some circumstances. The danger of such lists resides in the false assumption that they are fixed rules rather than general guidelines.

Providing authority base for justifying a revision. Earlier, it was noted that the final product, the notice, sent out by SSA was influenced by many things. First of all, notices are a direct result of congressional laws, and so the agency must be careful to carry out the law accurately. Thus, attorneys, whose use of language differs markedly from that of other professions, have deep concern for the actual wording of all correspondence emanating from SSA. Their authority is

based on the law and their effort to keep within its bounds. Likewise, policy specialists have the authority of SSA procedures and practices based on interpretations of that law, often in the form of regulations. Their concern is that SSA correspondence not be inconsistent with such policies. Computer systems specialists, in addition, also have an authority base--the existence and capability of the extant computer system's hardware and software. For example, the computer capability, at the onset of our training program, was limited to all capital letters (see the notice used as an example earlier) despite the fact that document design psychologists have long averred that readers have great difficulty with all capital print.

When SSA decided to make clear writing one of its priorities, these authority bases clearly had precedence over whatever authority base the individual writer could muster. One major goal of the training program, therefore, was to establish an authority, a credibility, a muscle for the writers that would provide them with equal footing in decision making with the attorneys, the systems people, and the policy specialists. If clear writing was to mean anything, it had to be able to justify its procedures not only to its own group, but also to the others. This was, of course, one important reason for insisting that the workshop participants be from all four areas of SSA.

All the activities of the training program noted above led to the formulation of this ability to justify the changes made in any notice. The last training sessions, in fact, required the participants to justify to their superiors why they had made the revisions they made. As an aid to this procedure, we developed a Notice Review Guide to be used as a checklist for such justification. It does not include all the points covered in the training program or all the points possible to imagine. To do so would be unwieldy. The points that were included, however, were the ones which came up repeatedly in the participants' analyses of the specific documents they were working on, and they were ones considered by the participants to be most crucial.

Figure 2 displays the Notice Review Guide.

Conclusions. A number of approaches to the language policy issues at SSA might have been attempted. SSA could have tried to farm out its writing problems to consultants outside the agency.

Figure 2. The 'Notice Review Guide' (Shuy & Staton, SSA 1985).

This content has been removed due to copyright restrictions. To view the content on p.173, please refer to the print edition of this work.

It could have patterned after the insurance industry by simply applying readability formulas to its written communications, achieving only word comprehension, if even that. It could have denied that there was a problem at all. It could have engaged in petty bickering among subcomponents of the agency--general counsel, systems, policy, and the writing staff. In fact, we expected this bickering but we never actually found it.

Instead, SSA admitted its weakness, coopted the linguist who had been working against them in the lawsuit, asked for help, created a well-protected administrative entity that nourished the project, took the advice and procedures outline above, instituted training programs for staff, and, finally, implemented the new language policy. Today, the clear-writing project at SSA is considered to be one of the strong points of the Agency. There is much remaining to be accomplished, but concrete steps have been taken. Language policy in a bureaucracy can, indeed, be changed.

References

- Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In: Syntax and semantics, vol. 3: Speech acts. Edited by P. Cole and J.L. Morgan. New York: Academic.
- Halliday, M., and R. Hassan, 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longmans.
- Reddish, Janice C. 1979. Readability. In: Drafting document in plain language. Edited by D.A. MacDonald. New York: Practicing Law Institute, Handbook A-4-3034.
- Searle, John. 1969. Speech acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shuy, Roger W. 1981a. A holistic view of language. Research in the Teaching of English 15.2:101-11.
- Shuy, Roger W. 1981b. Topic as the unit of analysis in a criminal law case. In: Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1981. Edited by Deborah Tannen. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

LANGUAGE POLICY AND SOCIAL POWER: GENDER AND ETHNIC ISSUES

Patricia C. Nichols
San Jose State University

1. Introduction. Almost 16 years ago, Charles Fillmore gave a series of lectures at a California Summer Linguistics Institute on the ways in which natural languages reflect the deictic anchorage of sentences. Through these lectures, he brought a generation of young scholars to an awareness of how specific linguistic elements can be used to locate a speech act in the space and time frame relevant for the participants. In so doing, he helped shift attention from the isolated linguistics units to the context in which they are used--and to the participants in the discourse and their relationships to each other. In the decade and a half since that lecture series, a generation of feminist scholars has explored interactional and language use patterns of males and females in specific contexts, a topic not previously given much serious attention except for the occasional chapter by Jespersen or Sapir lumping women's language in with other abnormal types of speech. Some of the recent research on language and gender, usefully summarized in the annotated bibliography edited by Thorne, Kramarae, and Henley (1983), has also considered the interaction of gender and ethnicity for some social groups. Another recent volume, edited by Kramarae, Schulz, and O'Barr (1984), includes several articles which make a concerted effort to examine the effects of both gender and ethnicity on language and power. But such considerations are rare.

I propose to extend Fillmore's notion of sentence-level deixis to encompass language choices which are affected by gender and ethnicity-based group identity. With this broader application of deixis, we can examine how groups with disparate social power position themselves relative to each other through specific linguistic choices--choices often

imposed by language policies controlled by the dominant group. This extension of Fillmore's notion of deixis as an operative factor in the language use of larger social groups allows us to get a better perspective on how the language of the nondominant gender or ethnic group is affected by the language policies of the dominant in ways that have much in common.

The discussion here focuses on studies of how gender and ethnicity affect language use within the contemporary United States society. As the recent PBS series The story of English suggested, American English is rapidly becoming an international language variety. As the series did not make clear, this language variety reflects a particular segment of United States language and cultural experience, one which any consideration of language spread and language policy must examine carefully. If American English is indeed becoming an international variety, then its particular cultural biases must be recognized--as a necessary step toward changing them.

2. U.S. language policy. The United States, like other English-speaking countries, has never had an official language academy. English is not even the official language of the country, although it serves that function in most significant public domains of language use. Like other English-speaking countries, the United States has relied on unofficial language authorities to set its national language policy. Primary among them have been the dictionary, the English usage handbook, and public school textbooks. What variety of language and culture have these unofficial language authorities promoted over the two centuries of the nation's existence? And what variety do they now promote as an international language? Whose language, encompassing whose life experiences, will be spread as the international variety to be used as a common language by many of the world's peoples? Answers to these questions are imperative for any rational policy which affects the spread of English.

2.1 Dictionaries. Three recent perspectives on these unofficial authorities demonstrate how they function as representatives of male-dominated Northern European and Mediterranean basin cultures. One perspective, A feminist dictionary by Kramarae, Treichler, and Russo (1985), leads us to consider who assembles the dictionaries we usually consult

and to ask how the words have been chosen, whose usage is reflected, and whose speech is chosen to illustrate the definitions. To choose one word which reminds us of an all too painful contemporary problem, incest, according to a standard collegiate dictionary, originates from a Latin word meaning 'impure' and is defined as 'sexual intercourse between persons so closely related that they are forbidden by law to marry' (Webster's ... 1979). By contrast, A feminist dictionary includes information on the changing definition of the word, figures on who is the perpetrator in 80-90 percent of the cases, and information on the historical tradition of father-daughter incest. The difference in these two definitions is one of deictic anchoring in the social situation: Webster's ... defines the act from the position of a neutral onlooker; A feminist dictionary defines it from the position of a daughter or a mother or a friend who understands the power relationships which accompany and make possible most cases of incest.

The very definition of power is another interesting case in point: the standard dictionary definition includes notions of control or possession, as in 'possession of control authority, or influence over others', in the first meaning given in Webster's ... In contrast, A feminist dictionary defines it initially as 'ability to get things done' (351) and includes several discussions of the term from feminist authors. One of these explicitly contrasts male/female views of power: 'conceptualized by men as assertion and aggression, by women as nurturance' (351). Powerlessness is defined negatively as 'lacking authority or the capacity to act' in the standard dictionary, but the alternative dictionary defines it in terms of a two-way relationship between the weak and the ruled, quoting one feminist author's view that 'women are the oldest, largest, and most central group of human creatures in the wide category of the weak and the ruled' (Janeway 1980:4).

For many of the words it defines and discusses, A feminist dictionary includes ethnic perspectives beyond those of the dominant ones in a given society. Poverty, for example, is defined initially much as a standard dictionary would define it: 'quality or condition of being poor or in need' (350). Webster's ... gives us, 'the state of one who lacks a usual or socially acceptable amount of money or material possessions.' Both these definitions imply notions of ownership. But the alternative dictionary also includes a Native American

definition of poverty: not so much the lack of material goods as the inability to live in traditional ways. As Carol Lee Sanchez puts it: 'Our poverty is that we can't be who we are. We can't hunt or fish or grow our food because our basic resources and the right to use them in traditional ways are denied us. In order to live well, we must be able to provide for ourselves in such a way that we can continue living as we always have. We still don't believe in being slaves to the "domineering" culture systems' (quoted in Kramarae, Treichler, and Russo 1985:351). This deictic anchoring of poverty in a particular cultural experience gives us a very different understanding from that of the usual Euro-American definition.

In addition to such different perspectives on words also defined by standard dictionaries, A feminist dictionary includes terms of significance to an audience not always considered by other commercial dictionary makers: malism--'the opposite of feminism' (245); gynocide--'the murder of women, especially mass murder' (184); genderlect--a term used in earlier studies of sex differences in speech and now discarded because of the greater attention given to how men and women use words in social contexts (175). The entry for broad, which the standard dictionary lists as simply slang for woman, is expanded to denote a 'woman who is liberal, tolerant, unconfined, and not limited or narrow in scope' (81). Such entries force us to recognize that both the standard American English dictionary and its intended audience have a particular deictic anchoring in the cultural world of the Euro-American male.

2.2 Handbooks. Baron (1986) examines historical discussions of the grammatical category of gender. He gives an overview of its treatment in dictionaries and theoretical works, but his primary focus is handbooks--those convenient guides to prestige or standard language use which writers keep ready to hand for easy reference. Fasold (this volume) gives a contemporary view of gender treatment in one specific kind of handbook, the news service style manual. Baron chronicles how such manuals have come to be concerned with the topic.

Although gender in English is his main concern, Baron provides a synopsis of Greek and Latin treatments also. Early English grammars relied heavily on Greek and Latin grammars for their analysis of English categories, and

grammatical gender was affected in ways that would seem astonishing without considering these grammarians' deictic anchorage in a male-centered universe. Although Aristotle himself distinguishes between natural and grammatical gender, he indicates that the earliest Greek grammarian to isolate the category of gender, Protagoras, attempted to change the grammatical gender of certain words because they did not fit prevailing notions of 'maleness' and 'femaleness' (Baron 1986:92). The Greek words for anger (menis) and helmet (peleks), Protagoras felt, should be masculine rather than feminine in gender since they expressed male attributes and associations (cited in Robins [1951] 1971:15-16). Latin grammarians of the Middle Ages followed suit by treating masculine gender as the mode which signifies active agency, and feminine gender as 'that which signifies the patient, or passive acceptance of an act' (Baron 1986:93). Baron cites truly wondrous reasoning by medieval grammarians who argue that petra 'rock' is passive in meaning and therefore feminine, while lapis 'stone' is active and masculine. And he cites early modern English translators of Greek who go on at length about how the grammatical gender of inanimate objects parallels their essence in nature, likening rivers and marshes, intellect and soul, to human men and women in the act of intercourse (93-94). One longs for the equally wondrous reasoning of the grammarian deictically anchored in a female experience of the world.

The early grammarians of the English vernacular carried on the discussion of gender agreement begun in Latin. As Baron observes, some even tried to claim that the adjectives in English agreed in gender with the nouns they modified, even though the language clearly does not mark adjectives for gender. Even eighteenth century English grammarians reflect William Lily's 1597 explanation of grammatical concord in Latin when they discuss similar concord for English gender. Lily had argued that a noun phrase containing two or more nouns whose genders differ would take an adjective which agreed in gender with the worthier gender; for Lily masculine was more worthy than feminine, and feminine more worthy than neuter (cite in Baron 1986:98). Thus, a noun phrase containing references to a king and queen takes a masculine plural adjective because the masculine gender is more worthy than the feminine. It took English grammarians some time to recognize that concord between pronoun and noun, rather than adjective and noun, is the issue in English;

when they did so, however, the same argument was used--with far-reaching results for contemporary handbooks of English usage.

Despite ample evidence that singular they has long been used as a common-gender pronoun, the language authorities of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries rejected it firmly in their grammar and usage manuals. Baron cites an argument first advanced by Julia Stanley and Susan Wolfe that a dual system of gendered and sex-neutral pronouns may have coexisted since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. At that time masculine and feminine forms he and heo had become almost indistinguishable in pronunciation and the new feminine form she was introduced to maintain gender distinctions. Dialect forms for sex-neutral or common-gender pronouns persisted, however, and may have constituted an alternative system. Unstressed common-gender a and u, as well as forms of the old feminine hoo or u, can still be heard in some modern dialects of English. The epicene or common-gender pronominal forms have never been admitted to handbooks of standard usage, however. Baron suggests that, like the dialectal common-gender pronouns, singular they may be a continuation of this dual system for marking sex-specific and sex-neutral referents of singular number--a system used to designate an unknown person without forcing the choice of a worthier gender. While it remains nonstandard usage and is not accepted by most handbooks today, singular they continues to be a vigorous alternative to the standard he, as any composition instructor might attest.

In this century language authorities no longer refer to worthiness, but to custom and convention, when commenting on the use of the masculine pronoun for a person of unknown gender. A few accept the singular they, but none have proposed that singular she be used as a generic pronoun. Exclamations of outrage arise at any suggestion that supernatural deities might be referred to by a feminine pronoun, or even by language which encompasses both feminine and masculine genders. And editorials in the mass media sometimes use the neuter pronoun for human reference, with tongue in cheek, in an attempt to trivialize the issue. A number of publishers' guidelines written since 1970 have offered alternatives to use of the generic he and man--with uneven results, as Fasold's work (this volume) indicates.

Baron's careful and thorough discussion of the historical development of the treatment of pronominal gender in

English language handbooks lays to rest forever the claim that this is a trivial problem of usage. His outline of the historical development of the agreement rule promoted for almost four centuries lays bare the deictic anchoring in a male-centered universe which underlies traditional analyses of grammatical gender and pronominal case in English. And his discussion of common vernacular usage underscores the significance of whose language policy governs reference texts in English.

2.3 Literary anthologies. Literature anthologies represent a third unofficial language authority in the United States, influencing whose voice is heard, whose experience honored in the expressive language read by students, explicated by scholars, and discussed by teachers. Paul Lauter has edited a volume entitled Reconstructing American literature (1983), which he characterizes as 'a tool in a larger effort to change the teaching of American literature and, therefore, the definition of what we call American culture' (xi). In so doing, he calls attention once more to the male-centered, Euro-American bias of a major teaching and reference tool: anthologies of our national literature.

This volume broadens the traditional definition of American literature by presenting a collection of syllabi for college courses which have included both male and female authors from the wide range of American ethnic groups. As the cover subtitle indicates, Lauter has assembled these course outlines 'so that the work of Frederick Douglass, Mary Wilkins Freeman, Agnes Smedley, Zora Neale Hurston and others is read with the work of Nathaniel Hawthorne, Henry James, William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway and others.' This volume represents an attempt to shift the deictic center of the language policy governing an important segment of American education from that of a Euro-American male-centered universe to one encompassing women and men of Asian, African, and indigenous American cultural traditions as well as European.

Muriel Schulz, in a retrospective essay which addresses problems of minority writers, examines the complexity of these problems for writers who share membership in more than one minority group. Black women, she observes, were initially ignored both by feminists and by black male writers (Schulz 1984:206). They were not included by women in collections of female writers, nor were they included by men

in collections of black male writers. Each group of editors, in other words, shifted the deictic center of their collection from a male Euro-American one to one which still managed to exclude the perspective of the female Afro-American writer. This illustration is instructive. Most of us would have been denied the extraordinary perspective of one of the greatest of American novelists, Zora Neale Hurston, were it not for the efforts of Alice Walker to bring her works into our collective consciousness and to introduce a new generation to Hurston's achievements. (And for those who obtain their images of black literature from celluloid rather than print, it is Richard Wright's Native Son rather than Zora Neale Hurston's Their Eyes Were Watching God now playing in local theaters.)

The availability of literary texts by women and minority writers is, of course, a central issue. As Lauter notes in his introductory comments (1983:23) about his own course in literature of the United States, reading choices depend on what texts are available as well as on the needs of the students and the objectives of the instructor. And far too many of the voices of women and minority writers have been unheard within the United States because of decisions by editors and commercial publishers of anthologies and school texts. Most students of literature know the works of the French naturalist, Emile Zola, but few are aware that the American naturalist Rebecca Harding Davis preceded him with her novel of Life in the Iron Mills set in West Virginia. Even nonliterature students know the works of John Steinbeck, but works by California playwright Luis Valdez are not known and not easily found even in the libraries of San Jose State University, his alma mater. The haunting lyric poetry which evokes Mitsuye Yamada's wartime experiences in a concentration camp must be ordered by mail from Shameless Hussy Press. Rudolfo Anaya's critically acclaimed Bless Me Ultima was turned down by major publishing houses before its acceptance by Quinto Sol, a small press in Berkeley. Although it has now sold over 100,000 copies, despite the distribution difficulties associated with such a press, one wonders what its total audience might have been.

If individual texts have been difficult to obtain in libraries and bookstores, anthologies which include representative works by ethnic minorities and women have been virtually nonexistent until very recently. Anthologies of literary works are especially important because of the canonization

they bestow on the authors selected for inclusion and because of the aesthetic sensibilities they influence for generations of students and teachers. Those who would present the broad scope of American literature in their classes may be interested to know of Paul Lauter's new anthology, which has evolved from his earlier collection of course syllabi (Lauter 1988).

The importance of such an anthology can scarcely be underestimated for purposes of language policy and language spread. Those students who now are able to read and reflect upon texts by Zora Neale Hurston, Alice Walker, Leslie Silko, Rudolfo Anaya, N. Scott Momaday, Maxine Hong Kingston, and Mitsuye Yamada will become the next generation of teachers. And these new teachers will have a far broader and deeper appreciation of the scope of American English language and literature than those of us who knew only James Fenimore Cooper, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Henry James.

3. Conclusions. In his recent discussion of political consequences of language choice, Weinstein (1983) labels the group of individuals who write, edit, and publish the books discussed here as 'language strategists'. By the choice of this term he implies that they play an important role in strengthening the language choices made at some higher level, usually governmental.

However, in a pluralistic society like the United States, which historically has not had extensive governmental intervention in language policy, I suggest that this group of individuals plays a much more than strategic role. Through the networks participated in by those who write, edit, and publish these language references and anthologies from a male-centered, Euro-American perspective, much U.S. language policy is set. Individual writers, teachers, and students who read these books in the privacy of their studies and classrooms implement this policy when they accept these references as guides to the standard language variety. Awareness of this process and its implications is particularly important as dictionary editing becomes computerized. With the new capacity for a timely and regular updating of a work like the Oxford English dictionary, editors can include, if they choose, not only the expanding vocabulary of world Englishes. They can also seek out pluralistic perspectives for

given entries, thereby expanding not only our word hoard but also our appreciation of its multifaceted nature.

How can such a policy be implemented, given women's and ethnic minorities' lack of social power? Almost a decade ago, Ervin-Tripp addressed this question at a conference on the languages of American women, held in Las Cruces, New Mexico. In a paper entitled 'What do women want?' she observed that sociolinguistic research on gender issues would enrich our understanding of broader theoretical issues. She urged those feminists interested in such research to broaden their focus from a narrow concern with gender-specific issues to concerns of broader audiences 'across space, time, and differences in social beliefs' (1978:6). As scholars, we can be alert to the possibility that close examination of how gender and ethnicity affect language use may shed significant light on theoretical issues associated with language spread and change. We can insist, in reviews and reader evaluations of publications which embody language policy, that gender and ethnicity issues be treated seriously and fully in them--from perspectives other than male and Euro-American. And in choosing texts to use in our classes, we can consider their use of inclusive language and their selection of representative authors in making our decisions.

Implementation of such a policy change will be far from easy or automatic. Ervin-Tripp herself relates (1978:4) that a memo she wrote to a publisher, suggesting that a change in the title 'Man and his work' might gain more readers and more contributors, evoked a spate of telegrams and letters among the men responsible for the title--and culminated in an accusation of blackmail. When she later told a group of publishers about this incident, they all thought, to a man, that she was wrong in her assumption that the title was misleading. At that time, she knew of no relevant study on the generic male to which she could refer them. Since that time, considerable research has been done and has been reported in such volumes as that edited by Thorne, Kramarae, and Henley (1983) and that written by Baron (1986). Relevant research alone does not effect change, of course. But the informed exercise of buying power in direct and indirect ways has historically had considerable influence on American commercial publishers. Well-designed and relevant research can convince us that the issue is not a trivial one, and individual and group action can follow from that conviction.¹

Where socioeconomic power is lacking, dominated groups can exercise the powers of the weak which Janeway (1980) delineates: women and ethnic minorities can refuse to accept the deictic center presupposed by many dictionary entries, some handbook usage, and most anthology selections. Withholding consensus can itself be an exercise in social power. The new result for language policy can be the empowerment of more of the peoples who make up this society--and an enrichment of a language which has historically been open to diversity.

Note

Group action affecting curricular changes is now occurring at many institutions of higher education. Stanford University will soon include the contributions of women and minorities in its undergraduate requirement for the study of Western Civilization. The California State University system requires that all undergraduate general education courses include such perspectives. To help faculty implement this requirement, CSU has funded small grants which enable faculty to assemble bibliography and teaching materials, and the chancellor's office has encouraged sharing of such materials among the nineteen campuses of the system (Rosenfelt 1981; Heisch, Lamendella, and Nichols 1986).

References

- Baron, Dennis. 1986. Grammar and gender. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1978. What do women sociolinguists want?: Prospects for a research field. In: The sociology of the languages of American women. Edited by Betty Lou Dubois and Isabel Crouch. San Antonio, Texas: Trinity University. (Reprinted in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 17:17-28.)
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1975. Santa Cruz lectures on deixis. Bloomington: Indiana Linguistics Club Papers. (Lectures delivered at UC-Santa Cruz, 1971.)
- Heisch, Allison, John Lamendella, and Patricia Nichols. 1986. Project on cross-cultural perspectives in the curriculum: A

- training module for general education. San Jose State University.
- Janeway, Elizabeth. 1980. Powers of the weak. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Kramarae, Cheri, Paula A. Treichler, with Ann Russo. 1985. A feminist dictionary. Boston: Pandora Press.
- Kramarae, Cheri, Muriel Schulz, and William O'Barr, eds. 1984. Language and power. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Lauter, Paul. 1983. Reconstructing American literature: Courses, syllabi, issues. Old Westbury, N.Y.: The Feminist Press.
- Lauter, Paul. (forthcoming, 1988) The Heath anthology of American literature: Reconstructing American literature. Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath.
- Robins, R. H. [1951] 1971. Ancient and medieval grammatical theory in Europe. Reprint. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat.
- Rosenfelt, Deborah. 1981. Project on cross-cultural perspectives in the curriculum. San Francisco State University.
- Schulz, Muriel. 1984. Minority writers: The struggle for authenticity and authority. In: Kramarae, Schulz, and O'Barr (1984:206-17).
- Thorne, Barrie, Cheri Kramarae, and Nancy Henley, eds. 1983. Language, gender, and society. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Webster's new collegiate dictionary. 1979. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company.
- Weinstein, Brian. 1983. The civic tongue: Political consequences of language choices. New York and London: Longmans.

LANGUAGE POLICY AND CHANGE: SEXIST LANGUAGE IN THE PERIODICAL NEWS MEDIA

Ralph W. Fasold
Georgetown University

Language policy is most often thought of as the official action of governments to determine the status of a language and the form of its corpus. Paulston (1984:58) agrees with Jernudd (1973), who distinguishes language 'policy', always carried out by official government action, from language 'treatment', which can be conducted by a variety of other agencies. Jernudd (1973:18-19) gives a short list of examples of unofficial language treatment agents:

(1) National but nongovernmental agencies. Example: the Singapore Chamber of Commerce which constructed and issued language examinations and a style manual for business correspondence in Malay.

(2) Nonnational and nongovernmental agencies. Example: the Shell Company provides its own Malay oil terminology in Malaysia and influences language development in its personnel and training policies.

(3) A newspaper's proof-reading function.

(4) The individual author, letter writer, or even after-dinner speaker.

In fact, as Ray (1968) long ago pointed out, official actions by governments are much more likely to succeed if they are supported by such lesser authorities as Jernudd lists. Nichols (this volume) argues that handbooks, dictionaries, and school textbooks are instruments of an unofficial language policy that has worked to the detriment of women. Evidence will be presented here that the newspaper editing function, guided by handbooks of the same general type that Nichols discusses, also exerts a considerable influence on the use of language. Language use related to gender seems a good place

to look for evidence of change in response to language treatment since it has been a prominent issue for more than a decade. Cooper (1984), in fact, has already reported on a survey of American periodical publications in an attempt to trace change in the use of androcentric generics over the period from 1971 to 1979. The use of man or masculine pronoun forms for references of undetermined or mixed genders was one category of androcentric generic that Cooper investigated, e.g., '...and the basic question as to whether man has a future' and 'A judge who follows the law and does his duty needs no defense'. Another category is the use of compounds ending in man/men, e.g., '... to meet and photograph its people: the musicians, the craftsmen, the nomads and other tribesmen' (Cooper 1984:9-10). In general, Cooper and his associates found a marked decline in the use of androcentric generics over the period, especially the generic use of man as a free word, but that the use of -man in compounds was the most resistant to change.

A number of news-reporting organizations published style manuals in the late 1970s (Webb 1978, Jordan 1976, Angione 1977) in order to, as the preface to The Washington Post Deskbook on Style (Webb 1978:xii-xiv) puts it: 'provide the reporters and editors...with common rules of practice about good writing and correct usage...'. The same preface shows an awareness of the possibility of guiding language change: 'This stylebook also is a time for renewal. Just as fashions change, so, too, does language usage.' Potential innovations with respect to language and gender are explicitly mentioned: 'And there are new words and new phrases--Ms., chairperson--and the question of what to do about them.' The compilers of these style manuals see them not only as in-house guides, but recommend them to other writers as well. Again quoting from the preface of the Post Deskbook: 'In sum, the rules in this book apply not just to Washington or The Washington Post. They are good rules for good usage in life and letters here and everywhere...' And, indeed, the manuals are readily available in bookstores.¹ It is clear that these language treatment instruments have considerable potential for effectiveness. Not only are they designed to guide the form of what hundreds of thousands of readers encounter every day, but there are apparently many other writers who refer to them in their own work. As I have indicated, the issue of language and gender is one that the print-media stylebooks do not ignore. All of the manuals

that were examined have extensive sections on the subject. These sections invariably decry sexism and the use of language in a discriminatory fashion. Typical is the following quotation from The New York Times Manual of Style and Usage (Jordan 1976:224):

In referring to women, we should avoid words or phrases that seem to imply that The Times speaks with a purely masculine voice, viewing men as the norm and women as the exception. The principle is similar to that involving certain racial and religious designations, and some of the same questions must be asked: Is the term being used essential to the story? Is it denigrating? Would it be appropriate if applied to someone of another race, religion or sex?

Besides avoiding designations that are obviously disparaging--such as doll, weaker sex or the little woman--we should be aware of undesirable subtleties of meaning that can be conveyed in some contexts by otherwise innocuous terms like housewife, comely brunette, girl, grandmother, divorcée, sculptress and numerous others.

General guidelines such as these appear reasonably sensitive to the issue. Discussion of this kind is accompanied by specific directions on how to deal with particular usages. As we shall see, some of these specifics actually seem to have led to a reduction in sexist usage in the printed news media. Other usage suggestions are keenly disappointing to someone concerned with fairness in language and gender usage. For example, the following individual entries appear in the same New York Times manual:

spokesman, spokesmen. Use for both men and women. Do not use spokeswoman or spokesperson.

pronouns for countries. Use the pronoun it in references to all countries, except in contexts where it is appropriate to personify by using she and her, as in this instance: Verdun stands as a symbol of what France owes her sons.

pronouns for ships. Use the pronouns she and her in references to ships and other vessels, even when they have masculine names.

-person. Do not use compounds like these: chairperson, forperson, newsperson, salesperson. Also, do not use Assemblyperson, Congressperson, Councilperson.

Compounds ending in -person are explicitly proscribed by all the manuals examined. The Washington Post (WP) and Associated Press manuals (Webb 1978, Angione 1977), and for the most part The New York Times (NYT) manual (Jordan 1976) encourage the use of compounds ending in -woman instead, or avoiding the compound entirely by using a term like representative instead of spokesman. The NYT allows some compounds ending in -woman, for example newswoman, servicewoman and Congresswoman, but explicitly forbids spokeswoman and chairwoman. As for the title Ms., the WP manual disallows it except in direct quotations, in discussing the term itself, or 'for special effect' (Webb 1978:43). The Associated Press manual allows Ms. as well as Mrs. and Miss, depending on the preference of the individual referred to. The policy in the NYT manual was proscriptive along the lines of the WP policy.² The manuals are explicit in general about how to refer to people by name and it is in this area that some of the most interesting research results emerged.

In order to determine the extent to which the language treatments set out in the manuals were actually carried out in the publication of newspapers and magazines, a research project was carried out in a graduate course in language planning at Georgetown University in the spring of 1986, with a similar design to the one directed by Cooper. Four students in the class selected a newspaper or magazine for data extraction. The Washington Post was chosen by Esther Figueroa, Hye Sun Kim investigated Time magazine, Ana Lado selected Ms magazine, and Shirley Fisher-Arends took data from The Wall Street Journal. I worked on The New York Times.³ We decided to trace sexist language usage over a 20-year period from 1966 to 1986. Dates were selected at random within each year and the publications on those dates were used as the source data representative of that year.⁴ For each issue, we selected at least one 'hard news' article and one 'soft news' article (such as one that might appear in an entertainment section). If possible, one article featuring a man and one featuring a woman was examined for each type of news. In addition, I examined one or two Associated Press reports in each issue of the NYT that I looked at.

Women were so seldom mentioned in The Wall Street Journal that it yielded no meaningful quantitative data, nor was the data in Ms magazine comparable to the two newspapers and the one news magazine, although an interesting

issue, to which I will return, arose in regard to first-name reference. Most of the results I will present are from the NYT and the WP, for which we have both quantitative data and stylebooks. We discovered as the project progressed that it would have been better had we concentrated on one or two publications. The data we gathered are sparse in several crucial places, and this makes it impossible to answer some of the questions that occurred to us. In spite of this, our data did shed considerable light on the effectiveness of one type of agent influencing 'language treatment'.

There have traditionally been substantial differences in newspaper references to men and women in headlines and in first and subsequent references. One of the most striking differences in headline usage has been the practice of referring to a married woman by Mrs. plus her husband's first and last name, Mrs. plus her husband's last name, or Mrs. plus her own first name and her husband's last name. References to unmarried women were by Miss plus her first and last name, or Miss plus her last name. Men, on the other hand, appeared in headlines by last name alone or by first and last name. If the man had a special status title, such as Dr. or Gen., that title might appear in a headline, but Mr. was never used.

The current policy in both the WP and the NYT, as well as for the Associated Press, is that the titles Mrs., Mr., and Miss are not to be used in headlines or in first reference. In the case of a married woman, her own first and last name are to be used, with a few exceptions that vary somewhat among the three manuals. The data on references in headlines were tabulated for 'early' publication (before the year the style manual was published) and 'late' publication (the year the manual was published and later). The results appear in Table 1. The data are sparse, but there is a marked tendency to refer to women by Mrs. or Miss and last name (less frequently by first name alone) and to refer to men by last name alone or with the use of a special title, such as President Nixon or the President. After the publication of the stylebooks documenting policies against differentiating men and women in this way, the distribution appears markedly more even-handed.⁵ It might be worth noting that all seven instances involving general courtesy titles were cases of Mrs. and the husband's name in the 'early' data, but the one case in the 'late' data was Miss with last name.

Table 1. 'Early' and 'late' references to men and to women in headlines in The New York Times (including items from the Associated Press) and The Washington Post (M = Mrs./Mr./Miss, FN = first name, LN = last name, Spec = special title).

	Early: M (FN) LN	FN	FN LN	LN	the Spec/ Spec LN
Women	7 43.8%	2 12.5%	4 25%	2 12.5%	1 6.2%
Men	0 0%	0 0%	4 11.8%	20 58.8%	10 29.4%
	Late: M (FN) LN	FN	FN LN	LN	the Spec/ Spec LN
Women	1 14.3%	0 0%	1 14.3%	5 71.4%	0 0%
Men	0 0%	0 0%	2 10.5%	14 73.7%	3 15.8%

The WP style manual (Webb 1978:33) stipulates that the first reference to an individual of either sex should be by first name and last alone with no title, unless the title is a special one, like Gen., or unless the subject is a married woman and only her husband's name is known, in which case Mrs. plus her husband's name will be used. This resulted in an immediate and dramatic shift in first references to women, as Table 2 shows.

Again we are hampered by sparse data, but it is clear that references to women using Mrs. and her husband's name disappear totally in the later data, although they were a substantial proportion of first references to women earlier. All first references in the later data are by first name and last name, unless a special title is appropriate. This corresponds well to the pattern for first references to men in both the early and late data, where the reference is by last name or full name unless a special title is involved, with a smattering of exceptions.⁶

Table 2. 'Early' and 'late' first references to men and to women in The Washington Post. (HFN = husband's first name, HLN = husband's last name, FN = first name, X = middle initial, middle name or maiden name, LN = last name, Spec = special title).

Women:	Mrs. (HFN) HLN	Mrs./Miss FN (X) LN	(Spec) FN (X) LN
Early (-1979)	9	0	12
Late (1979-)	0	0	12
Men	Mr. LN	FN	(Spec) (FN) (X) LN
Early (-1979)	1	0	32
Late (1979-)	0	2	35

In the data on first reference from the NYT, whether 'hard news', 'soft news', or an item from the Associated Press, there was never a single instance in which a man was referred to except by full name, or title plus full name (but only if the title was not Mr.).⁷ In the case of first references to women, the style manual is clear: 'In almost all first references to women--married or single, well known or not--given names should be used and the honorifics Mrs. and Miss should be dropped' (Jordan 1976:132). But there was an abrupt shift to this practice starting with the sample from 1970, not 1976 when the style manual was published. Before that year, first references to women were approximately evenly divided among Mrs. plus husband's full name, Mrs. or Miss and the woman's own name, and full name with no title or a special title (the same pattern used for men). This distribution is shown in Table 3.

If we can assume that the data are representative despite the small number of instances for the years previous to 1970, it seems that the first-reference policy had been in effect before the 1976 edition of the manual appeared.⁸ Once more, the policy laid down in the manual has apparently had the effect of sharply reducing a usage that discriminates against women.

Table 3. 'Early' and 'late' first references to women in The New York Times (HFN = husband's first name, HLN = husband's last name, FN = first name, X = middle initial, middle name or maiden name, LN = last name, Spec = special title).

	Mrs. HFN HLN	Mrs./Miss FN (X) LN	(Spec) FN (X) LN
Early (-1970)	4 30.8%	4 30.8%	5 38.4%
Late (1970-)	4 5.5%	2 2.8%	66 91.7%

The policies concerning second reference to people who have already been identified in an article are quite different in the WP and in the NYT. The WP stylebook makes it clear that last names alone are to be used on second reference for both men and women. This stipulation produced another dramatic change, as the data in Table 4 show.⁹

Table 4. 'Early' and 'late' second and subsequent references to women and to men in The Washington Post (FN = first name, LN = last name, Spec = special title).

Women:	LN	FN	FN LN	Mrs. HLN	Miss (FN) LN	Ms. (FN) LN
Early (-1979)	1 1.7%	0 0%	7 11.7%	29 48.3%	18 0%	5 8.3%
Late (1979-)	76 87.4%	5 5.7%	6 6.9%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Men:	LN	FN LN	Mr. LN	Spec (FN) LN		
Early (-1979)	175 89.3%	5 2.6%	4 2.0%	12 6.1%		
Late (1979-)	168 88.9%	16 8.5%	0 0%	5 2.6%		

Use of Mrs., Miss, or Ms. is the most common way to refer to women on second and subsequent reference in the 'early' data but these forms totally disappear in the 'late' data. Reference to women by last name alone is just as frequent in the later data as it had been and continued to be for men (a few instances of Mr. plus last name appear in the earlier data, but this form also disappears).¹⁰

The usage laid down by the NYT manual is not the same and shows no evidence of having changed over the 20-year period. Writers for the NYT are directed to use Mr. or Mrs./Miss plus last name for second and subsequent references, with a few exceptions that are discussed in some detail, including the use of special titles when appropriate (Jordan 1976:131-32). In fact, subsequent references are almost always of one of two kinds: either the prescribed Mr., Mrs., Miss or special title plus last name, or a general descriptive term (for example, the former Arizona senator, the tenant). There are a handful of cases in which a first name alone, last name alone, or first name and last name with no title are used, but in almost every case, plausible explanations for the particular instance immediately suggest themselves.

To take one example, in a 1982 story about the murders of three boys aged 15 and 17 in Kansas, the boys are referred to on subsequent reference by first name and last name. But the case of young men under 18 years of age is left indeterminate by the style manual: 'Some youths under the age 18 should have the Mr., and some should not. There can be no precise rule...' (Jordan 1976:132). In this case, the writer or editor apparently decided that first name alone, last name alone, and Mr. plus last name were all inappropriate.

In another example from a 1976 story about Chiang Ching, the widow of Mao Tse-tung, Mao and former Chinese Premier Chou En-lai are referred to as Mao and Chou on second reference, although several other Chinese officials are referred to, as the style manual explicitly directs, by Mr. and surname (Mr. Yao, for example). Chiang herself is referred to as Miss Chiang in six subsequent references. It seems that the newswriter could not bring himself to call Mao Tse-tung Mr. Mao. These cases strike one as genuine instances of exceptions that prove the rule.

Through the period of our survey, the NYT maintained a policy that called for the use of the traditional title plus last

name that distinguishes the marital status of women, but not of men. This policy was strictly followed except when a particular writer writing a particular story had compelling reasons to do otherwise. The case of second and subsequent references in the NYT, then, can be taken as an example of the successful planning of the maintenance of a language usage.

The printed news media were equally successful in planned language maintenance where compounds ending in -man are concerned, involving such words as chairman and policeman. We've already seen that the style manuals are unanimous in their resistance to the use of the corresponding compounds ending in -person. Figueroa found three instances of spokesperson in the WP, one of them in the 'late' publications and thus in violation of a policy statement. There was one case of spokeswoman and it occurred in the 'late' data. The word spokesman was used 11 times prior to 1979 and 23 times afterward. There was one instance of businesspeople, also in the 1979 and later issues, meaning its use was contrary to policy. In the NYT, spokesman is used rather frequently throughout the 20-year period and no alternative was ever found. The terms chairperson and chairwoman never appeared in the WP, and chairperson appeared in the NYT only in a 1975 article quoting Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's opening to a speech before a convention of welfare officials: Madam chairperson, chairpersons of the state Social Welfare boards. (The article, incidentally, had the headline: A War Cry of Feminists Echoed by Mrs. Gandhi).

All the manuals express concern about the possibility that compounds ending in -man might not always be appropriate. They suggest that compound words of this type be avoided altogether where possible. For example, a term like representative is recommended as an alternative to spokesman, spokeswoman, or spokesperson. We did not collect data that would clearly show whether alternatives of this kind become proportionately more frequent after the publication of the policy recommending them. The preliminary tabulations we performed do not give clear results. It seems that this is partially a case of every word having its own history. Some compounds in -man, most notably newsman, are quite common early in the period, but disappear later, although they are not treated any differently in the style manuals than spokesman is. The term seems

simply to go out of vogue. (Reporter is a frequent alternative.) In the WP, policeman becomes less common, but still occurs, in the 'late' data. The NYT policy concerning references to police is that the official term used in the jurisdiction involved in the story should be used. The New York City Police Department officially designates its officers of both sexes as police officers, and this term completely displaces policeman and patrolman in the NYT when it refers to police in New York. A 1982 article refers to 'a Phoenix patrolman', presumably because that was the official term used by the police department in Phoenix. The case of compounds ending in -man turns out to be much more complicated than we expected. At least part of the reason Cooper's project found compounds in -man the most resistant to change may be that language policy of the publications involved makes it difficult to use alternatives.

We attempted to test the effectiveness of the general statements encouraging fair treatment of both sexes in an unusual arena. As we reviewed the material we had collected, we noticed that men seemed to be identified on first reference by a full name, including a middle initial, more frequently than women were. On the assumption that the use of an initial lends the impression of importance or authority to an individual--Michael R. Richardson opposed to Michael Richardson, for example--the use of initials in references to men and to women were tabulated in an attempt to confirm our impression. If it turned out that men are more likely to be identified by a name including an initial, it might be taken as evidence of a general perception of women as less important.

A couple of pitfalls in drawing such a conclusion, even if the data were distributed in the way our hypothesis would predict, had to be faced at the outset. In the first place, women were more often mentioned in 'soft news' articles than in 'hard news'. At the same time, first references with initials, regardless of the gender of the referent, are less frequent in 'soft news'. To include the 'soft news' data on initials, then, might make it appear that women were less likely to be identified with a name including initials when the distribution might actually be due to the 'hard'-'soft' distinction. As a result, 'soft news' articles were not included in the tabulations.

A second issue concerned the possibility that men actually are in positions generally perceived as important more often

than women are. If this is true, it would be evidence for unequal treatment of women, but if news reports simply identify people who are really seen as important by using middle initials, and these individuals are more likely to be men, then it could be argued that the use of middle initials reflects an injustice in society rather than constituting evidence that the news report directly treats women unfairly.

A rough means of testing this hypothesis was available because we recorded names with special titles, like General or Senator. Since most of these special titles indicate prestigious positions in society, one might expect that holders of these titles might also be identified by a name including an initial. The data on first references to men in the NYT was the only set in which there were sufficient examples for a meaningful test.

It turned out that in the data from issues of the NYT prior to publication of the style manual, men with special titles were identified using their initials 54% of the time, while men without special titles were referred to by names with initials 46% of the time. This is a trend in the predicted direction, but a Chi-squared test of this distribution is not nearly significant at the 95% confidence level. In the later data, there is even less difference; initials appear in references to men with special titles 23% of the time and 19% of the time in references to men without special titles. This difference is also not statistically significant. We concluded, therefore, that we had no evidence that importance as indicated by special titles had any influence on whether or not names with initials would be used. In the rest of our tabulations, no distinction was kept between referents with special titles and those without.

Table 5 shows the distribution of first references with middle initials by gender for the combined 'hard news' data from the WP and the NYT before the publication of their respective style manuals. Table 6 shows the same distribution in samples of the newspapers after the publication of the stylebooks. The data on referents are too sparse for a Chi-squared test to be reliable, so we resorted to Fisher's Exact Tests of the actual distributions. The results indicate that names with initials are more frequently used to refer to men than to women in the 'early' data, with the Fisher's Exact Test probability well beyond the 95% confidence level.¹¹ In the 'late' data, however, the difference between references to men and to women is less

and the Fisher's Exact Test does not result in a significant probability level. It is possible to conclude that the general appeals for equal treatment of men and women might have led to a decrease in the disproportionate use of initials in references to men.

Table 5. First references using names with and without middle initials in The Washington Post and in The New York Times, by sex, prior to publication of the style manual (1979 for the WP, 1976 for the NYT).

	Names with initials	Names without initials
Women:	2 9.1%	20 90.9%
Men:	41 39.0%	64 61.0%

Fisher's Exact Test $p = .005$

Closer inspection of the data, though, shows that the decline is due entirely to a decrease in the later data in the use of initials to refer to men. The data on women are painfully sparse, but the proportions remain constant for the two time periods. Inspection of the data from the two newspapers separately for the two time periods shows that the ratio in Tables 5 and 6 for women is consistent with the data from both newspapers and for both time periods. The ratio for men in Table 6 is representative of both time periods for the WP and of the later data for the NYT. The 39% use of names with initials in referring to men in Table 5 is almost totally due to the NYT prestylebook samples. With more data, the practice of referring to about 10% of women and about 20% of men by the use of their initials might well prove statistically significant. Even if the data in Tables 5 and 6 are representative, the difference is entirely due to a decrease in the use of initials to refer to men, rather than to an increase in this way of referring to women.

We did not locate any documents similar to the news media style manuals for Time magazine or for Ms magazine.

Table 6. First references using names with and without middle initials in The Washington Post and in The New York Times, by sex, subsequent to publication of the style manual (1979 for the WP, 1976 for the NYT).

	Names with initials	Names without initials
Women:	2 10%	18 90%
Men:	23 21.5%	84 78.5%

Fisher's Exact Test $p = .192$

Nevertheless, a striking trend involving references to people by first name alone emerged from the data from Time. In the samples of Time articles over the 20-year survey period, women were very much more frequently identified by first name alone, both on first and second reference, than men were. Reference by last name alone was almost twice as frequent when the referent was a man, and there was also a slight tendency to refer to men as Mr. plus name than to use Mrs. or Miss in naming women. These data appear in Table 7.

Table 7. Reference formats used in Time magazine, 1966-1986, by sex (FN = first name, LN = last name, M = Mr./Mrs./Miss).

	FN	LN	M (FN) LN	FN LN
Men:	5 4.8%	30 28.6%	32 30.5%	38 36.2%
Women:	42 30.4%	21 15.2%	28 20.3%	47 34.0%

Chi-squared = 28.0, $p < .05$, $df=3$

The use of first name references to women was only slightly more common in references to entertainers or generally unknown people, as when Ali McGraw is referred to as Ali or when a stunt woman is initially identified by first name and last name and subsequently referred to only as Janet. Women who are mentioned in stories of political significance are very often referred to in the same way; Prime Minister Indira Gandhi is called Indira several times and Abigail McCarthy, Senator Eugene McCarthy's wife, is similarly referred to as Abigail.

An attempt to interpret these facts leads to the power and solidarity dimensions of address forms identified by Brown and Gilman (1960) and Brown and Ford (1964). In the case of names, the use of first name alone can convey either a feeling of solidarity and warmth, or a difference of power, as when an executive addresses a maintenance man by his first name, but is not addressed that way in return. Hye Sun Kim, the student who collected and did the preliminary analysis of the Time magazine data, felt that 'hard news' references to women by first name were perhaps a patronizing use of the power dimension, but that the same use in 'soft news' represented an attempt by the writer to establish a feeling of solidarity with both the subject and the readers. While that may well have been the writers' motivation, it remains to be explained why men's first names were so rarely used to establish solidarity.

Interestingly, the same phenomenon was informally observed in Ms magazine. First-name references were proportionately more frequent with women's names than with men's. In the case of Ms, a magazine essentially produced by women for women as women, the solidarity motivation is far easier to see than in a general news magazine like Time. In spite of that, the class spent considerable time discussing whether or not the power connotations of first name only reference could be kept entirely submerged.

This investigation into policy on language usage and equality brought home the limitations of language policy as a means of social change. No one can look at the tables in this study and fail to notice the vast difference in the sheer numbers of references to men and to women. If anything, news references to women are overrepresented in these data, since the researchers were instructed to look for articles about women. The huge disparity between the amount of news involving women and the amount involving men is not a

language-planning problem, or even essentially a news-reporting problem. Until women are more often in positions to influence events that are considered newsworthy, or, alternatively, until what women are already doing is more generally thought of as newsworthy, any organization in the business of selling newspapers will have to publish more news about men than about women. Still, perhaps the print-media could do more to reduce the gap.

I have less confidence in the patterns I have reported than I would like because many of them are based on data that are scanty. What we have, however, indicates that the language usage policies codified in newspaper style manuals are strikingly effective in the media to which they apply. This effectiveness, from the point of view of equality of the sexes, operates in both directions. Changes in language use policy over the years have succeeded in practically eliminating the discriminatory practice of referring to married women by their husbands' names only. In the WP, the use of last name alone on second and subsequent reference has eliminated usage that reveals the marital status of women, but not of men, although that usage persists in the NYT. On the other hand, the uniform resistance to the use of compounds in -person and the effort required to think of other alternatives seem to have led to the continued use of compounds like chairman and spokesman in the traditional manner.

It remains unclear whether general appeals for fair treatment of women in the manuals has a measurable effect on such factors as the distribution of the use of middle initials in first references, or the proportion of general terms such as executive or representative to sex-specific compounds like businessman and spokesman. From the point of view of the study of language policy and planning, it appears that newspapers for general readership do not take the lead in new usages, however motivated by fairness these changes may be.¹² On the other hand, if the new practices and the motivations that prompt them become sufficiently widespread in the general society, the printed news media may then introduce new policies and they will be carried out explicitly. When newspapers and magazines do this, a very considerable force for further change is introduced.

It is reasonable to ask, if the style policies of newspapers are a relatively successful kind of language planning, what there is about it that makes it successful. To answer the

more general question--what characteristics make a case of language planning successful?--would require that we have a collection of successful cases to consider and that we observe what features they have in common. Anything said about what contributes to successful language planning based only on this research on newspaper policy is no more than speculation. Nevertheless, to suggest that some of the ingredients of newspaper style policy might be general ingredients for success might be of use, if only to inspire others to develop arguments against my suggestions. In any event, the following characteristics seem plausible as contributing factors for successful language planning.

First, the domain of the policy is the written use of language. As Haugen (1966) has pointed out, written language is a more appropriate domain for language planning than spoken language. Writing generally involves more preliminary reflection than speaking, and in the case of published writing, the text can be reviewed by others besides the author before it is actually issued. Second, the scope of the plan is limited; the policy is directed only at writers for a particular news agency.¹³ The news agencies' capacity to enforce its policies is no doubt a third reason for the degree of success this kind of planning enjoys.¹⁴ The authority inherent in the editing process provides a virtual built-in enforcement mechanism for any planned usage. Finally, in view of the fact that the ultimate recipients of effects of the plan are not the newswriters, but the newspaper's readers, it may well be that the absence of innovation is itself a contributor to successful planning. Any planned changes cannot be too far ahead of what readers are prepared to accept or the newspaper risks losing them.¹⁵

These four factors combine to emphasize the limitations of language planning. If they are correct and generally applicable, the four characteristics suggest that success is increased if the plan is directed at written rather than spoken usage, involves a limited scope of application, does not exceed enforcement capabilities, and is not overly innovative.

Notes

1. On occasion, at least two of them have been for sale in multiple copies at the Georgetown University Bookstore,

on the same shelf with general stylebooks, spelling guides, and dictionaries.

2. I understand the current policy is more like that of the Associated Press.

3. A fifth member of the class, Dorcas Taylor, wrote a paper on another topic due to a requirement of her academic program. However, we are deeply indebted to her for making us aware of the existence of the news media style manuals.

4. For Time Magazine, the week in which the random date fell was used; for Ms, the month in which the date fell determined the issue chosen. Since The Wall Street Journal is not published on weekends, if the random date fell on a Saturday or Sunday, the nearest Friday or Monday was substituted.

5. Readers familiar with statistics will realize that the distribution is too scanty even for a Chi-squared test. However, a Fisher's Exact Test for a two-by-two table opposing the biggest differences between references to men and women in the 'early' headlines ('M (FN) LN' combined with 'FN' versus 'LN' combined with 'the Spec/Spec LN' by men versus women) gave a probability of 4.9×10^{-7} for the 'early' data and yielded a nonsignificant $p = .261$ for the 'late' data.

6. The small change from the early-to-late periods in the men's data in which there is a slight increase in FN LN subsequent references at the expense of Spec (FN) LN may also be due to the deskbook directive to 'use civic, military and professional titles as infrequently as possible after first reference' (Webb 1978:34).

7. The data from the years before 1970 are too sparse to be used to justify combining the three kinds of news we distinguished. Indications based on the later data, however, indicate that the data are distributed similarly enough so that it is appropriate to combine them. Broken down by the three sources, the data are:

	(Spec) FN (M) LN	Mrs. HFN HLN	Mrs./Miss FN (M) LN
--	------------------	--------------	---------------------

Hard:	28	2	0
	93.3%	6.7%	0%

Soft:	34	2	1
	91.9%	5.4%	2.7%
AP:	5	0	0
	100.0%	0%	0%

8. For the two-by-two table constructed by combining 'Mrs. HFN LN' and 'Mrs./Miss FN (M) LN' versus '(Spec) FN (M) LN' by the 'early' versus the 'late' data, the Fisher's Exact Test $p = .00006$.

9. A three-by-two table consisting of 'LN', 'FN LN', and the combined forms with Mrs., Miss, and Ms. by 'early' and 'late' publication yields a Chi-squared of 202.9, which with 2 degrees of freedom, is easily significant at $p < .05$.

10. Some readers may notice that a few subsequent references to women by first name only turn up in the later years, while there are no such subsequent references to men. On the other hand, Table 2 shows two first references to men by first name only, although there are no such first references to women.

11. The use of the nonparametric tests of independence in this study should be interpreted as only generally indicative, not as establishing any research hypotheses at a high level of confidence. For one thing, the data violate the assumption of independence, since several usages by the same newswriter are counted the same as usages by different writers.

12. Esther Figueroa points out that The Washington Post Deskbook appeals to tradition and the convenience of its readers in resisting innovations like Ms. and spokesperson. But these considerations have not prevented the WP from introducing the innovative spelling employe for the traditional employee.

13. For many elements of the policy specified in the style manuals, though, there seems to be tacit agreement among news agencies, so that in fact, several newspapers and wire services are following a similar language plan.

14. An article on doctors who address their patients by their first names was published in The Washington Post in March 1987 and provided a rare insight into the authority of the WP usage policy over a reporter. The reporter had just referred to a woman by last name alone on second reference, when he added parenthetically: 'This newspaper's rules

require that I call her merely that, though I would prefer Mrs. _____' (Cohen 1987).

15. This can be taken as a special case of what I have elsewhere (Fasold 1984) called the 'rowing downstream principle'.

References

- Angione, Howard, ed. 1977. *The Associated Press stylebook and libel manual*. Dayton, Ohio: Lorenz Press.
- Brown, Roger, and Marguerite Ford. 1964. Address in American English. In: *Language in culture and society*. Edited by Dell Hymes. New York: Harper and Row.
- Brown, Roger, and Albert Gilman. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: *Style in language*. Edited by Thomas A. Sebeok. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Cohen, Victor. 1987. Treating patients on a first-name basis. *Washington Post*, March 24, 1987, Health science and society, 11.
- Cooper, Robert. 1984. The avoidance of androcentric generics. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 50.5-20.
- Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Haugen, Einar. 1966. Linguistics and language planning. In: *Sociolinguistics*. Edited by William Bright. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jernudd, Björn. 1973. Language planning as a type of language treatment. In: *Language planning: Current issues and research*. Edited by Joan Rubin and Roger Shuy. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Jordan, Lewis, ed. 1976. *The New York Times manual of style and usage*. New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Book Company.
- Nichols, Patricia. 1987. *Language policy and social power: Gender and ethnic issues*. (this volume).
- Paulston, Christina Bratt. 1984. Language planning. In: *Language planning and language education*. Edited by Chris Kennedy. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Ray, Punya Sloka. 1968. Language standardization. In: *Readings in sociolinguistics*. Edited by Joshua Fishman. The Hague: Mouton.
- Webb, Robert, comp. and ed. 1978. *The Washington Post deskbook on style*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

THE SPREAD OF ENGLISH AND SACRED LINGUISTIC COWS

Braj B. Kachru

University of Illinois, Urbana

0. Introduction. The increasing expression of concern about the diversification and international standards of English, I believe, conveys a serious sociolinguistic message. And it is clear that the reactions to the message, and its interpretations, vary from one receiver to another.¹ One encouraging interpretation of this concern regarding diversification is that the English language has now actually gained a global penetration at various societal levels--an unprecedented feat in terms of 'depth'. And globally, English has attained extraordinarily wide functional domains--an unprecedented phenomenon in terms of its linguistic 'range'.² Sociolinguistically speaking, then, English has acquired multiple identities and a broad spectrum of cross-cultural interactional contexts of use--a purists' and pedagogues' nightmare and a variationists' blessing.³

The identities of English are multicultural in the sense that they involve linguistic interactions of three types of participants: native speaker and native speaker; native speaker and nonnative speaker; and, nonnative speaker and nonnative speaker. The consequence is that the spread of English has resulted in a multiplicity of semiotic systems, several nonshared linguistic conventions, and numerous underlying cultural traditions.

And, any speaker of English (native or nonnative) has access to only a subset within the patterns and conventions of cultures which English now encompasses. Within each subset, English has developed distinct functional varieties (e.g. basilect vs. educated variety in Singapore and Malaysia; bazaar vs. educated English in India and Pakistan; Nigerian Pidgin vs. educated Nigerian English in Nigeria). This, then, is the sociolinguistic reality of English in the global context.

The reactions of language specialists to this sociolinguistic reality, and the resultant diversity, are of two types. One group derives satisfaction from the fact that, at last, we have an international language which provides access across cultures and national boundaries. In their view, the dream of a universal language has finally been realized and diversity and acculturation are part of the blessing. There is, however, another group which views diversity among Englishes as a marker of divisiveness, as a sign of the decay of the language, and, perhaps more upsetting, as a threat to the traditionally perceived Eurocentric, Judeo-Christian ethos of the language, and a challenge to what English--in the perception of this group--should ideally represent. (This position, not, of course, in its extreme form, is articulated in Quirk 1987.) From this perspective, the cross-cultural linguistic innovations and various types of stratification in language use are seen as danger signals for the maintenance of an 'international' and 'universal' standard of English. And, therein lies the concern and controversy, and the appropriateness of a special session of this Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics devoted to 'The spread of English: Diversification and standards.'

I will not digress here to discuss the underlying causes for the spread of English. There is already an abundance of studies on this topic, though most of these studies address the subject primarily from a Western perspective: political, sociological, linguistic, sociolinguistic, and so on.⁴ It seems to me that most such studies have yet to recognize one major point concerning the wider implications of the spread of English, that is, how the diffusion of English, its nativization and acculturation, has been instrumental in slaughtering many sacred cows of different types: linguistic, attitudinal, sociolinguistic, and pedagogical.

In this paper my concern is with some of these sacred cows: how the global uses of English and its expanded and localized functions have affected several basic linguistic concepts, particularly those which have traditionally been accepted without serious questions.

But first, a crucial observation about conceptualizing the spread of English. Following Cooper (1982:6), it may be said that it is not languages that spread, but it is the increase in the number of users who acquire the language which marks the spread. In other words, English did not acquire its users, the users acquired English. And, ultimately, the uses

of English resulted in the modification of linguistic behavior of individuals and social groups. This way of looking at the spread of English has two advantages: it emphasizes the focus on the user, and it sees language as an activity within a sociolinguistic context. It is these two perspectives which help us in understanding the underlying reasons for diversification of English and in relating the diversity to two important functional concepts: the concept of 'meaning potential' suggested by Halliday (1978) and the concept of 'value-added meaning', as opposed to 'mere grammatical and lexical meaning', discussed by Quirk (1986:9-10).

What we see, then, is that as English spreads, and as more people include it in their verbal repertoire, it continues to absorb--and unfold--'meanings' and 'values' from diverse cultures, both as an international and intranational language. The increasing demographic gains of the language, and its immense current functional range (localized as in Singapore, regional as in South Asia and Africa, and international across the continents) certainly do not help to arrest the diversification.⁵ The English language has now acquired such important dimensions that the medium and its message have become the yardstick for the evaluation of other cultures and languages. However, this undaunted victory march of the language has also resulted in various theoretical and 'real world' attitudinal questions. I am examining some of these questions here.

1. Nature of the sacred cows. I shall specifically focus on certain conceptual and terminological sacred cows within theoretical and applied areas of the linguistic sciences. Some of these are accepted on faith, and others, hydra-like, have a way of vanishing and then reappearing in one form or another. I believe that these sacred cows have relevance to the issues related to the spread of English, and to our understanding of the daunting questions concerning diversity and standards. The issues are theoretical, acquisitional, sociolinguistic, and pedagogical. I shall first briefly discuss the acquisitional aspect, and then the others, ending with the theoretical aspects.

1.1 Acquisitional sacred cows. In second language acquisition research, the concept 'interference' seems to have become pivotal, providing the current major paradigm of research. However, unfortunately the way the term has been

used distorts many facts about the forms and functions of the varieties of English in the Outer Circle.⁶ This is particularly true in conceptualizing and describing the innovations and creativity in the institutionalized nonnative varieties of English. What is worse, the 'interference paradigm' has created a conceptual trap--obviously unintended--from which a nonnative user of English seems to have no escape.

There is a cluster of other concepts too--not all related to 'interference': 'interlanguage', 'error analysis', 'fossilization', to name just three. The unsightful use of these concepts has resulted in observations about the users and uses of English which have doubtful empirical bases if seen in the world context of the uses of English. The concepts *per se* are not necessarily to be attacked. Rather, we should seriously evaluate the validity of the generalizations made on the basis of these concepts. Detailed discussions of this topic are given in Sridhar and Sridhar 1986, and in Lowenberg 1984, 1986a, and 1986b (see also B. Kachru 1987a for a further discussion of this point).

1.2 Sociolinguistic sacred cows. One might ask at least two sociolinguistically significant questions here: What has been the result of the 'pluracentricity' of English? and, What has English contributed as an instrument of ideological change? A corollary to the second question would be: What kind of ideology does English represent in the Outer Circle?

The pluracentricity (or, what Steiner 1975:4 has termed the 'shifting' linguistic center of English) has had far-reaching consequences. The most important outcome has been that the traditional English canon has been demythologized (B. Kachru 1987a) and new canons have been established with their own identities: literary, linguistic, and cultural. These results, of course, have been contrary to the vision of the pundits like Macaulay.⁷ It is evident that, ultimately, the function of English as a catalyst for creating 'brown sahibs' and 'Afro-Saxons'--to use Mazrui's (1973) term--only partially succeeded.

What actually happened is that as an exponent of cultural and ideological contact and change, the English language acquired two faces: one face representing 'Westernness', the Judeo-Christian tradition; the other face (more pertinent to the present discussion) reflecting local identities: African, Asian, and others.

It is the second face of English which provided national and regional identities. In the former colonies it initiated a national discourse on what were the colonial extensions of the Western powers: their legitimacy and exploitation of various types. This discourse was not curbed by ethnic, caste, religious, or linguistic considerations. It is unfortunate that this second face of English--the face of local cultural revival, nationalism, collective soul-searching, regional and national integration--remained somewhat obscure. The nonnative users of English underplayed it, and the native users of English did not want to recognize it. From the native users' perspective, it was better not to recognize this face of English since it provided serious reasons for authentication of the diversification of English.

It is this second face of English--the more obscure face--that produced what, for some, is the elusive concept of African or Asian identities, or, for that matter, the Third World identity, of the language.⁸ What we see is that the Western-educated local elite turned the Western linguistic weapon into an effective tool of national uprisings against the colonizers. In ethnically diverse and linguistically pluralistic societies, English brought together the politically conscious local leaders who articulated local aspirations in a language which had international currency. At last, the linguistic weapon was backfiring! While English was used for fostering intercultural, interethnic, and interlanguage networks, the masses used numerous languages and dialects to participate in the national movements. In turn, the elite also used the local languages, when it suited them to facilitate mass communication, as did Mohandas K. Gandhi in India, in using Hindustani.

In the Outer Circle, then, the English-knowing elite provided a perspective which was both 'inward' looking and 'outward' looking. The inward look of these English-users contributed to creating a perspective of nationalism which was, by and large, above traditional caste, class, and regional politics. (That English created another social class takes us to another story which would be too lengthy to take up here.)

This 'integrative' role of English was diametrically opposed to the aims and political intentions of those who brought the language to the colonies: To the dismay of the colonizers, English became a valuable resource for understanding the dialectics of anticolonialism, secularization, and pan-regional

communication. It was indeed an important tool for 'Westernization'. What does the foregoing digression contribute to our understanding of 'diversification' and 'standards' of English? It shows that English became more and more localized as its regional roles expanded in the Outer Circle.

What, then, is the 'cultural identity' of English in the Outer Circle? I am not claiming that pluracentricity has obliterated the British or American identities of English. Rather, the English language has succeeded in gaining other identities: cultural, social, and linguistic. In some sense, these identities are endowed with great local power in the Outer Circle (see, for example, Chishimba 1983, B. Kachru 1986a, Lowenberg 1984 and 1986a, Magura 1984). Two related questions come to mind: Whose culture does the language represent, for example, in the African and Asian varieties? And, who are the intended users of the texts--spoken or written--produced in these varieties?

One answer to these questions is that English is now essentially an exponent of local cultures in the Outer Circle. In a majority of contexts, the shift is from the native speaker-oriented texts to the 'localized' texts in which the bilingual and bicultural competence of an interlocutor is taken for granted. As such local contextualization increases, the diversity becomes more marked (see B. Kachru 1986b). This sociolinguistic reality of English has not as yet been taken into consideration by language specialists. The professionals have generally ignored it, and the reasons for ignoring it are varied: economic, political, and attitudinal (see Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1986, B. Kachru 1986a, K. Sridhar 1986).

1.3 Pedagogical sacred cows. The complexities of the spread of English and specific local needs have not always been recognized in the pedagogical paradigms, nor does educational research generally show sensitivity to local sociolinguistic contexts. This indifference to the pragmatics of teaching English internationally is evident in the following areas, to give just a few examples: (1) models for teaching English; (2) methods of teaching; (3) discussions of the motivations for learning English; and (4) materials for what is called 'communicative language teaching', and for teaching English for specific purposes (see B. Kachru 1986d).

A number of studies, particularly during the last decade or so, have drawn attention to this aspect of English.⁹

1.4 Theoretical sacred cows. And now, let me revert to what I have mentioned as the first concern, that of the theoretical sacred cows. In view of the ongoing diffusion of English, identity with the language, attitudes toward it, its functions in the repertoire of multilingual societies, and creativity in it across cultures, three basic theoretical concepts need further consideration. The three concepts I have in mind are: (1) the 'speech community' of English; (2) the 'ideal speaker-hearer' of English; and (3) the 'native speaker' of English.

Let me discuss these one by one. The concept 'speech community' continues to be controversial in linguistic literature, and the use of this term with reference to English has become particularly elusive. One has a choice, as Hudson illustrates (1980:25-30), of at least six ways of looking at the concept 'speech community' and defining it--from Bloomfield's (1933:42) vague definition to Le Page's complex and elaborate definition (1968; cited in Hudson 1980:27).

Without embarking on an evaluation of the definitions of speech community, one has to recognize now that as the uses of English are institutionalized beyond the Inner Circle, as the multilingual communities consider English as part of their verbal repertoire, as users of English in such societies identify with the language, and as English acquires non-Western cultural and interactional roles, the concept of 'speech community' for English acquires a new meaning. One must pause and recognize that the textual and interactional expectations for the language have acquired new pragmatic contexts. For the extended speech community, one has to assume that a member has, at least, (a) bilingual competence in languages which have traditionally not been within the linguistic repertoire of the Inner Circle; and (b) multicultural competence, including cultural experiences not shared with the Inner Circle.¹⁰

These assumptions are not only useful for understanding the extended speech community of English; they are also insightful for investigating the challenging area of the bilinguals' competence and grammar.

The second concept, an 'ideal speaker-hearer' (Chomsky: 1965), is, of course, an idealization. However, it does have some relationship with the real world in that it entails

sharing cultural and pragmatic conventions, or, in other words, sharing certain sociolinguistic bonds. What are the 'shared conventions' of the users of English now? The spread of English shows two tendencies: first, a conscious attempt to resist identification with the 'shared conventions' of the Inner Circle, and thus a desire to break such 'bonds'; second, development of distinct linguistic and cultural conventions patterned after the social and cultural expectations appropriate to the Outer Circle. One cannot overemphasize the implications of these two underlying factors for the diversification of English.¹¹

The third concept, the 'native speaker', has become 'a cardinal tenet of our linguistic faith' (Paikeday 1985:viii). This term is an age-old sacred cow carrying an immense attitudinal and linguistic burden. It has been used by linguists, pedagogues, and generations of producers of teaching materials, essentially as an article of faith. Now, the spread of English has unleashed great cynicism about this venerable sacred cow as well.

The elusiveness of this 'linguistic myth' is clearly shown in an illuminating discussion with 'linguists, philosophers, psychologists, and lexicographers' by Paikeday (1985). The participants in the discussion include historian A.L. Basham, philosopher Willard Quine, and linguists Noam Chomsky, David Crystal, Victoria Fromkin, M.A.K. Halliday, Raven McDavid, and Randolph Quirk.

Paikeday's discussions bring to the forefront the conceptual and procedural difficulties in defining the term, specifically with reference to the Inner Circle. And, once the Outer Circle is included in the discussion, we have the proverbial can of worms. Consider, for example, complications of the following types.

The first complication is that the Outer Circle brings into the fold those users of English who belong to 'traditional' bi- or multilingual societies. In such societies, as Ferguson (1982:viii) rightly warns us, '...verbal communication takes place by means of languages which are not the users' "mother tongue", but their second, third, or nth language, acquired one way or another and used when appropriate.' And here the monolinguals' paradigm of looking at the users of English does not seem to be very insightful.

The second complication takes us to the multilinguals' creativity in English. Let me point out here that in spite of some linguists' beliefs, such creativity is not 'marginal' (see

Paikeday 1985:67). And Vladimir Nabokov and George Steiner, as David Crystal would like us to believe, are indeed not exceptions in their creativity in a 'nonnative' language (see Crystal's comments in Paikeday 1985:67). In traditionally multilingual societies, there is a long tradition of creativity in a 'nonnative' language. Indeed, there is an abundance of examples--Sanskrit and Persian in South Asia, English in the Outer Circle, Hindi in the South of India, Swahili in Africa, French in Francophone countries, and Bahasa Indonesia in Indonesia, to mention just a few.

The third complication is, of course, attitudinal: the attitudes both of those who consider themselves the 'native speakers' of the language, and of those who use the language as an 'additional' code in their verbal repertoire. Here I provide two examples to illustrate the point. The first example, from Paikeday (1985), vividly shows that the 'us/them' distinction in dividing the 'native' and 'nonnative' users is 'directly linked with the nationality in the legal sense'. Paikeday illustrates this point by an example of two Indian users of English with an excellent command of the language. Notice, however, the attitude toward their English, as narrated by Paikeday (1985:72).

As members of 'visible minorities,' they are not supposed to sound any different from the stereotype of speakers of so-called Indian English. They would be accused of conspicuous consumption or something similarly bad. For the same reason, when they are among people of their own nationality, they would rather affect features of Indian English than be looked down on as foreigners. In the movie Gandhi, did you notice the marked change in Ben Kingsley's accent between South Africa and India? I thought that was quite true to life.

The other example is that of my wife, a speaker of Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, and English. As her parental language, she was exposed to a diaspora variety of Marathi, 'Tanjore Marathi'. However, she feels most comfortable with Bengali, Hindi, and English. In fact, those Bengali and Hindi speakers who do not know her linguistic background consider her a 'native speaker' of Bengali and Hindi, respectively. However, once they know her linguistic biography, they immediately call her a 'native speaker' of Marathi, which, linguistically

speaking, is far from the truth. In her case, then, the parental history seems to determine her 'native language'.

The multilinguistic contexts, and the use of English in such contexts, clearly shows that Ferguson has a point when he suggests (1982:vii) that '...the whole mystique of native speaker and mother tongue should probably be quietly dropped from the linguists' set of professional myths about language.'

There is a message in the extended global uses of English. The presuppositions about English must take into consideration the following three implications of the spread of English: the change in the traditional linguistic periphery of English, extension of underlying shared and nonshared sociocultural conventions, and new norms for text organization and 'interlocutor expectancy'.

First, change in the traditional linguistic periphery of English. Since the 1930s, there has been a marked shift in the traditional linguistic periphery of the language, its main and expected sources of syntactic, lexical, stylistic, and other borrowings and innovations.¹² The main reason for this slow shift, of course, is the past sociopolitical history, mainly of the United Kingdom.

In one sense the 'periphery shift' is one of degree. In the past the Inner Circle Englishes have been influenced by elements which may be considered nontraditional for the language. Two examples immediately come to mind: the impact of American Indian languages on American English, and that of Mauri on New Zealand English. These influences, however, have been marginal. The periphery shift not only entails the development of new varieties in the Outer Circle, it also involves the transfusion of the linguistic innovations from the Outer Circle into the Inner Circle.

Second, extension of underlying shared and nonshared cultural conventions of English. This is closely linked to the culture of the users of English. Quirk (1986:19) appropriately reminds us about the close relationship between language and culture in the following words:

...even the simplest, shortest, least technical, least momentous texts have a structure involving profound interactions between language and the world, between individual and culture in which they operate: involving extensive assumptions about shared knowledge and shared attitudes, reasoned inferences about the degree to which

participants in even such simple communication are willing to cooperate [emphasis added].¹³

This fact and its implications for the institutionalized varieties of English are well documented in several studies (see, for example, Chishimba 1983, B. Kachru 1986b, Y. Kachru 1985a and 1985b, Smith 1981 and 1987). The range of textual presuppositions (intratextual, extratextual, and intertextual) encompass a variety of cultures and linguistic traditions, as is evident in Chinua Achebe, Raja Rao, Wole Soyinka, Punyante Wijayarathne, and others. Each institutionalized variety of English has developed its own linguistic resources appropriate to its cultural and sociolinguistic milieu.

Third, new localized norms for text organization and 'interlocutor expectancy'. The term 'interlocutor expectancy' refers to shared knowledge of culturally appropriate conventions, and awareness of identities which participants in a linguistic interaction desire to establish.

The diversification in textual organization often has a deeper meaning than merely that of minor stylistic adjustment. Additionally, a specific textual organization may be used as a device to reflect various types of 'power': linguistic, metaphorical, symbolic, and so on. In other words, it is a well-recognized stylistic device which the Russian formalists have termed 'making strange' (see Erlich 1965:176-78).

A specific type of text organization may be chosen to send a signal that the 'native speaker' is irrelevant to such stylistic experimentation. Indeed, an attempt is made to cross over the linguistic and cultural conventions traditionally associated with the Inner Circle of English. The text is 'particularized'. It is in this sense, then, that Achebe's creativity is 'local and particular' (Achebe 1976:69), Tutuola works within '...Yoruba thought and ontology' (Awoonor 1973-74:667), and Rao emphasizes his 'Indianness' (see B. Kachru 1986c). It is again in this sense that in a provocative study, Dissanayake (1985) is asking for the 'decolonization' of the language. However, the most forthright statement on localization is from Achebe (1976:11): 'I should like to see the word universal banned altogether from discussions of African literature until such a time as people cease to use it as a synonym for the narrow, self-serving parochialism of Europe.'

This statement may sound like a political credo, but it does reflect an attitude, a pragmatic motive for diversification. And linguists--even the purist kind--cannot easily sweep such attitudes under the rug.

2. Contexts of diversification. What we see, then, is that the contexts of diversification of English are not just acquisitional deficiencies, as generally presented in literature. There are far deeper sociological, linguistic, and cultural reasons. The diversification (conscious or unconscious) often is symbolic of subtle sociolinguistic messages, including the following.

2.1 Exponent of 'distance'. The message here is, 'I am distinct from you--culturally, socially, attitudinally--and let my variety of English (linguistic creativity) say it.' And equally important is the fact that one might want to convey that 'I will use English as a tool for my culture, my identity, my conventions.' In the Outer Circle, English is particularly used as an exponent of 'distance' if one wants to create a semiotic system which does not fall within the traditional cultural and linguistic canons of English. We see such uses in literary creativity, in a conscious use of local accents, in lexical and other choices made in media, and in the use of code-mixing and code-switching. This position is also evident in statements such as that of Achebe quoted earlier.

2.2 Marker of 'creativity potential'. Another reason for diversification is to exhibit, as it were, a linguistic chip on one's shoulder. However, that is a simplistic statement. Quirk (1986:9) provides another explanation. He says that the 'most abiding difficulty about human communication is that it is human.' Further, he adds, 'human communication is human too in its potential for creativity, for responsiveness to change, and to the demands of new conditions, new environments, new challenges.' This 'humanness' of language, emanating from multiple cultures from all the continents, is a major underlying motivation for the diversification of English.

2.3 Expression of the 'Caliban syndrome'. There is yet another side to 'conscious' diversification which may be termed the 'Caliban syndrome'. This is a linguistic reaction to what Ngugi (1981 [1986]:3) calls 'the effect of a cultural bomb'. The effect of such a bomb, as he says, is 'to

annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves.' However, in spite of such a reaction, one sees that the main carrier of the 'culture bomb'--the colonizer's language--continues to be used for a multitude of local and external reasons. One may ask: what does this have to do with diversification and standards? The perception seems to be--at least, in some quarters--that the linguistic 'bomb' is somewhat defused by giving it a local character of Indianized, Nigerianized, or Philippinized English. We have seen that the English language is well adapted to this cultural and linguistic localization.

However, this is not the whole story of the psychological responses to English. English continues to provoke psychological resistance even from those nonnative users who have excellent--shall I say, 'native-like'--competence in the language, or those who make the best English instruction available to their children. I have discussed the reasons for this reaction elsewhere (B. Kachru 1987a).

3. Diversification vs. international English. At the outset I said that the optimists are grateful that, at last, we have a universal language with international and intranational roles: international as in aviation, seaspeak, multinational corporations, intellectual exchange (scientific, technological), literary creativity, and travel, to mention just a few domains; and intranational as a localized extralinguistic arm in the verbal repertoire of multilingual societies in the Outer Circle. English has now become a medium of cross-cultural expression and, one hopes, of intercultural understanding, too.

The internationalization of the language has, obviously, come at a price. Several things come to mind: first, hesitation--or indifference--to the acceptance of the traditional literary and cultural canons of the English language; second, development of multiple varieties of the language (e.g., performance, social, regional, ethnic) in the Outer Circle. These varieties have acquired a 'cone-shaped' structure, showing considerable diversification at the base, or colloquial level, and less diversity as one advances to the apex, or educated level (see B. Kachru 1982:94-95). Third, the concepts related to communicative competence (e.g., acceptability, appropriateness) have acquired distinct meanings

in various English-using speech fellowships. Finally, there is an attitude blended with cynicism toward the traditional sacred linguistic cows.

4. Managing diversification. And now we come to the purists' nightmare: the need for management of diversification. This need may be traced to the following concerns. The first is well known and has resulted in shelves of literature produced over several centuries. It is the alarm about the decay of the language, its careless use, and the ultimate danger of the loss of intelligibility among its users across cultures. The reasons for the decay of the language are generally traced to indifferent teachers, irreverent media moguls, and sociolinguists. The second concern is directly related to the status of the language after its spread in the Outer and Extended Circles. These concerns are primarily related to the following questions.

4.1 Decay in proficiency in English. A comparison is made with an idealized past of the English language in the Outer Circle. It is then concluded that the standards of acquisition and teaching have gone down. This hypothesis is faulty on many counts--there is no empirical evidence to prove the point. In fact, the contrary may be true. With the unprecedented diffusion in education, the core of the English-knowing and English-using population has substantially increased during the postcolonial period, as has the number of semiproficient speakers and ill-equipped English 'teaching shops'. And, equally important, the learning of English is no longer restricted to the privileged urban segments of society; all social classes are keen to learn English and have access to 'some kind of' English instruction. If anything, the core of proficient users of English is fast expanding in the Outer Circle, as is, conversely, the number of those whose proficiency is highly restricted.

4.2 Decay in international intelligibility. There certainly is merit in the argument that if English is needed for international interaction, the users of the language should have international intelligibility. This position, for example, is articulated in more than one recent paper of Quirk (for example, Quirk 1985, 1987). The context for international uses of English, however, is complex. One has to accept this

position with several caveats. First, in the Outer Circle, English has primarily localized intranational functions, the international roles are restricted to only a few domains, and the number of people involved in such domains is proportionally very limited. Second, the concept 'intelligibility' has several levels and the burden of international intelligibility is a shared undertaking in which education has to be imparted about 'variety tolerance'.¹⁴ Here I am thinking of the education of professionals, particularly of those working in the field of English studies. Third, the degree of linguistic pessimism about the failure of intelligibility in international communication in English is rather exaggerated. The monumental and successful role which English currently plays in varied international contexts seems to be underestimated. The concern seems to be more about future (possible) danger of the loss of international intelligibility. Finally, there is a paradox in this concern. On the one hand, international uses of English are considered desirable; on the other hand, great concern is expressed about internationalization of the language. It is difficult to separate the two: internationalization of a language comes with nativization and acculturation, as we have seen in Europe as well as Asia.¹⁵

4.3 Indifference to the 'native speakers' role as the guardian of English. It is believed that the recognition of regional endocentric norms as pedagogical standards, and as linguistic resources for creativity, has underestimated the role of the native speaker as a norm provider, and the native standard as the model for creativity. Acceptance of an endocentric norm, in a way, implies breaking away from an almost sacrosanct dictum in language pedagogy that the 'native speaker' is the norm. However, it seems to me that the case of English is in many ways unique in the history of human languages. In this respect, too, the remarkable evolution of English has slaughtered yet another sacred cow.

5. Conclusion. In the preceding discussion I have attempted to show that the reactions to the diversification of English are only partially linguistic. A number of these are essentially attitudinal and ethnocentric; it is difficult to find pragmatic and sociolinguistic justification for some of the extreme reactions.

It seems to me, as I have said earlier, that there is much to celebrate in the spread of English as a world language. Where over 650 artificial languages have failed, English has succeeded; where many other natural languages with political and economic power to back them up have failed, English has succeeded. One reason for this dominance of English is its propensity for acquiring new identities, its power of assimilation, its adaptability to 'decolonization' as a language, its manifestation in a range of lects, and above all, its provision of a flexible medium for literary and other types of creativity across languages and cultures. A major question is: As a result of this global power and hegemony of English, are the cultures and other languages of the world richer or poorer? This is indeed a very tricky question to answer (see Kachru and Smith 1986).

Finally, for those who are concerned about diversification and standards, the past has a lesson for us.¹⁶ We have a continuous recorded history of language planning--both conscious and unconscious--that dates back many centuries. On the basis of the past experience, let us ask ourselves the following questions.

First, a pragmatic question: What are the educational, psychological, and other results of the elusive attempts to curb diversity in English, and to provide an exocentric (British or American) model in the classrooms of the multilingual world?

Second, a question of strategy: What methods, if any, do we have for controlling diversity (that is, of course, if we agree that it is possible and desirable to do so)?

Third, a sociolinguistic question: Is it possible to control diversity, particularly when it is motivated by underlying reasons of cultural, social, regional, and group identities, and other sociolinguistic considerations?

Fourth, a question of professional and social responsibility: What are our responsibilities as professionals, once we act as Cassandra and brood over the possible doom of the English language, its diversity, and imagined decay in standards?

In the vast body of literature on this topic, especially the literature written by those who are concerned about the diversity of English and its multiple identities, these questions have yet to be answered in a responsible way.

Notes

1. See, for example, Quirk (1987) in this volume.
2. The terms 'depth' and 'range' have been discussed in B. Kachru (1986b:92).
3. The 'multiple identities' of English are not recognized by all scholars; there is resistance to the acceptance of sociolinguistic reality. See, for example, Quirk (1987).
4. For selected bibliographies, see Bailey and Görlach (1982), Fishman et al. (1977), B. Kachru (1986b), Kachru and Smith (1986), and Platt et al. (1984).
5. A number of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and attitudinal reasons for diversification are given, for example, in B. Kachru (1986b) and Lowenberg (1986a and 1986b).
6. The international diffusion of English can be viewed in terms of three concentric circles--an 'inner' circle, an 'outer' or 'extended' circle, and an 'expanding' circle--representing types of spread, patterns of acquisition, and functional domains of English in its diverse sociolinguistic contexts of use.

The Inner Circle refers to the traditional sociolinguistic bases of English, where English is used as the primary language, including the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand.

The Outer Circle refers to regions formerly colonized by the Inner Circle countries, particularly Great Britain or the United States, where English is used as a second, often official, language for intranational communication in bi- or multilingual communities. In these settings, such as Nigeria, Kenya, and the Philippines, 'institutionalized' nonnative varieties of English have developed.

The Expanding Circle refers to regions which have not been colonized by the Inner Circle nations and where English is used in few intranational domains. In these countries, such as Egypt, Indonesia, and Japan, 'performance' nonnative varieties are developing.

Further discussion of these terms is found in Kachru (1985, 1986b).
7. T.B. Macauley, a British administrator in nineteenth century colonial India, favored the teaching of English in India to form a subculture which would consist of 'a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect' (cited in Kachru 1986b).
8. See, for example, Quirk (1987).

9. See, for discussion and references, Berns (1985).

10. It seems to me that the sociolinguistic reality of the uses of English across cultures is better captured by the term 'speech fellowship' originally suggested by J.R. Firth. I have used this term in several earlier studies (see B. Kachru 1983).

11. This position is, of course, not accepted by all. Consider, for example, two contrastive views. One is represented by Prator (1968) and Quirk (1985 and 1987), and the other is represented by B. Kachru (1985 and 1986b), Smith (1981 and 1983), Strevens (1977), Pride (1981), and Thumboo (1985).

12. This again is not unique to English. There is evidence from other 'linguistic areas' (Emeneau 1956), and 'sociolinguistic areas' (D'souza 1987). For example, in South Asia as a linguistic and sociolinguistic area, one finds substantial evidence of this phenomenon, both in the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian language regions. The traditional linguistic periphery may be 'violated' for cultural, historical, and political reasons, as happened to English. In the case of South Asia, these factors contributed to the Persianization of the local languages with the Muslim conquest, and the Englishization of the languages soon after the East India Company established its roots in the subcontinent. The Arabization of the African languages is another such example, as is the Sanskritization of some Southeast Asian languages (e.g. Thai, Indonesian, Burmese). For further discussion and references, see Hock (1986).

13. Note, however, that Quirk (1985 and 1987) takes a somewhat different position.

14. For further discussion from various perspectives, see chapters on this topic in Smith (1983).

15. For European case studies and references, see Kahane and Kahane (1979) and Kahane (1986).

16. In Quirk (1987), several concerns have been expressed. A number of his concerns reflect personal attitudes toward 'diversification' and 'standards'. However, he raises several other points, some of these specifically attributed to me. Quirk's interpretation of some of my earlier statements suggests misunderstanding, and consequently misinterpretation of my position. I am not able to discuss these here due to space limitations. I have, therefore, discussed them in another paper (B. Kachru 1987b).

References

- Achebe, C. 1976. *Morning yet in creation day*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Awoonor, K. 1973-74. Tradition and continuity in African literature. *Dalhousie Review* 53.665-71.
- Bailey, R., and M. Görlach. 1982. *English as a world language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Berns, M.S. 1985. Functional approaches and communicative competence: English language teaching in non-native contexts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chishimba, M. 1983. African varieties of English: Text in context. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Cooper, R., ed. 1982. *Language spread: Studies in diffusion and social change*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Dissanayake, W. 1985. Towards a decolonized English: South Asian creativity in fiction. *World Englishes* 4.2:233-42.
- D'souza, J. 1987. South Asia as a sociolinguistic area. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Emeneau, M.B. 1956. India as a linguistic area. *Language* 32:3-16.
- Erlich, V. 1965. *Russian formalism: History doctrine*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ferguson, C.A. 1982. Foreword. In: Kachru (1982).
- Fishman, J.A., R.L. Cooper, and A.W. Conrad. 1977. *The spread of English: The sociology of English as an additional language*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Hock, H.H. 1986. *Principles of historical linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hudson, R. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. 1982. Models for non-native Englishes. In: *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Edited by Braj B. Kachru. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.

- Kachru, B.B. 1983. *The Indianization of English: The English language in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In: *English in the world*. Edited by Randolph Quirk and H.G. Widdowson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. 1986a. The power and politics of English. *World Englishes* 5.2-3:121-40.
- Kachru, B.B. 1986b. *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B.B. 1986c. The bilingual's creativity and contact literatures. In: Kachru (1986b).
- Kachru, B.B. 1986d. ESP and non-native varieties of English: Toward a shift in paradigm. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 16.1:13-34.
- Kachru, B.B. 1987a. The past and prejudice: Toward demythologizing the English canon. In: *Language topics: Papers in honor of M.A.K. Halliday*. Edited by Ross Steele and Terry Threadgold. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kachru, B.B. 1987b. *World Englishes and applied linguistics*. Plenary paper presented at the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Sydney, Australia.
- Kachru, B.B., and L.E. Smith, eds. 1986. *The power of English: Cross-cultural dimensions in literature and media*. Special issue of *World Englishes* 5.2-3.
- Kachru, Y. 1985a. Discourse strategies, pragmatics and ESL: Where are we going? *RELJ* 16.2:1-30.
- Kachru, Y. 1985b. Discourse analysis, non-native Englishes and second language acquisition research. *World Englishes* 4.2:223-32.
- Kahane, H., and R. Kahane. 1979. Decline and survival of Western prestige languages. *Language* 55:183-98.
- Kahane, H. 1986. A typology of prestige languages. *Language* 62:495-508.
- Lowenberg, P.H. 1984. *English in the Malay Archipelago: Nativization and its functions in a sociolinguistic area*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Lowenberg, P.H. 1986a. Sociolinguistic context and second-language acquisition: Acculturation and creativity in Malaysian English. *World Englishes* 5.1:71-83.
- Lowenberg, P.H. 1986b. *Non-native varieties of English*:

- Nativization, norms, and implications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 8.1:1-18.
- Magura, B.J. 1984. Style and meaning in South African English: A sociolinguistic study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Mazrui, A.A. 1973. The political sociology of the English language: An African perspective. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o. 1986. Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature. London: James Currie; Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.
- Paikeday, T.M. 1985. The native speaker is dead! Toronto: Paikeday Publishing.
- Phillipson, R., and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. 1986. Linguicism rules in education. 3 parts. Denmark: Roskilde University Centre, Institute VI.
- Platt, J., H. Weber, and M.L. Ho. 1984. The new Englishes. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Prator, C. 1968. The British heresy in TESL. In: Language problems in developing nations. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman, C.A. Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Pride, J.B. 1981. Native competence and the bilingual/multilingual speaker. *English World-Wide* 2.2:141-53.
- Quirk, R. 1985. The English language in a global context. In: English in the world. Edited by Randolph Quirk and H.G. Widdowson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R. 1986. Words at work: Lectures on textual structure. [LKY Distinguished Visitor Series]. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Quirk, R. 1987. The question of standards in the international use of English. (In this volume.)
- Smith, L.E., ed. 1981. English for cross-cultural communication. London: Macmillan.
- Smith, L.E., ed. 1987. Discourse across cultures: Strategies in world Englishes. London: Prentice-Hall International.
- Sridhar, K.K. 1986. Sociolinguistic theory and non-native varieties of English. *Lingua* 68.1:39-58.
- Sridhar, K.K., and S.N. Sridhar. 1986. Bridging the paradigm gap: Second language acquisition theory and indigenized varieties of English. *World Englishes* 5.1:3-14.
- Steiner, G. 1975. Why English? Presidential address delivered in 1975. London: The English Association.
- Stevens, P. 1977. New orientations in the teaching of English. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Thumboo, E. 1985. Twin perspectives and multi-ecosystems:
Tradition for a Commonwealth writer. *World Englishes*
4.2:213-21.**

THE QUESTION OF STANDARDS IN THE INTERNATIONAL USE OF ENGLISH

Randolph Quirk
The British Academy

Most traditionally and endemically, language spread is caused and accompanied by population spread. Gujerati is spoken in England because groups of Gujerati-speaking immigrants have settled there. English is spoken in New Zealand because English-speaking immigrants settled there. I shall call this the 'demographic' model.

But language spread may reflect the spread of ideas without much population movement. This is how, centuries after the fall of Rome, Latin became the language of learning throughout Western and Northern Europe for more than a thousand years. There are analogies in the spread of Arabic as the vehicle of Islam (as distinct from its spread as the language of ethnic Arabs). There are analogies today in the spread of scientific information, computer technology, and indeed pop music, through the medium of English. Under this head too comes the spread of English in the conduct of multinational business in firms like Philips or Shell Petroleum. I shall call this the 'econocultural' model.

Third, language spread may reflect political domination with only sufficient population movement to sustain an administrative system and power structure. For example, German was used far and wide throughout the Austro-Hungarian Empire in administering all or part of what is now Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Yugoslavia. (Only in 1868 were the Poles of Galicia allowed to use Polish as an official language or Amtsprache.) In ancient times, this was the model too for the thin but powerful spread of the administrative languages wielded by the Greek and subsequently by the Roman Empire. It is the pattern for the spread of English in much but not all of the British Empire: and still to be found (until 1997) in Hong Kong. This third

type can appropriately be labelled the 'imperial' model, though it must be noted that we are using the notion of empire rather generically and abstractly, since this same model is evinced in the spread of Russian throughout the USSR, notably in the non-Slavonic republics.

I should like to look a little more closely at each of these three models in turn.

1. The demographic model. Now, although I studiously avoid in this label any implication of ethnicity, still less of nationality, we can never ignore the power of language as one of the prime bases of nationhood. Between 1800 and 1940, as Fishman (1982) reminds us, no fewer than three dozen new standard languages were recognized in Europe alone, resulting from the growth of nationalist movements that in turn resulted in such 'new' polities as Finland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. From the intensity of nationalism beyond Europe, especially during the past 30 or 40 years, came the recognition of analogous linguonational identities to be numbered not by the dozen but by the hundred.

Nonetheless, while nationhood realized through a single language is widely regarded as ideal ('Demographic Model A', let us call it), it appears to be rather rare in literal practice. Among major countries, perhaps Japan comes closest. More usually, we have the 'Demographic Model B', which results in multilingual nations--whether small, such as Switzerland and Singapore, or large, such as Indonesia, Nigeria, and the United States.

A less common product of demography-led language spread is the emergence of countries, politically separate but sharing a language. This 'Demographic Model C' includes examples as various as Arabic in Morocco, Egypt, Iraq, and elsewhere (cf. Ibrahim and Jernudd 1986); Chinese in China, Taiwan and Singapore; English in Britain, the United States, Australia; Spanish in Spain, Ecuador, and Chile (cf. Guitarte and Quintero 1974); Dutch in Holland and Belgium; French in France, Belgium, and Switzerland. Here is where the nation-specific variety of a language presents itself most readily as the vehicle for the printed and electronic media, in government, and in education. But of course, the formulation of the nation-model, its institutionalisation, varies enormously between, say, Iraqi Arabic, American English, and British English at one extreme; in contrast with New Zealand

English, Argentinian Spanish, Peruvian Spanish, etc.; not to mention 'Belgian Dutch' or 'Swiss French', where resistance to recognising an indigenous standard is very strong. We note, too, the promotion of Pudonghua, not only in China but (as Mandarin) in Taiwan and Singapore (cf. Kuo 1985, Jernudd 1986).

Linguists would do well to study the kind of variation arising through Demographic Model C and the sociopolitical dynamic that promotes it. We cannot attribute the difference to size, power, or geographical remoteness alone. These might seem to account for America's self-confidence in recognising an American English in contrast to New Zealand's relative modesty of linguistic independence. But there are counterexamples with Portuguese in vast, populous Brazil in contrast to what a few settlers in South Africa did in boldly evolving Afrikaans from their Cape Dutch. This last instance is perhaps of special interest: a new standard language appropriates the name of the country, thus seeming to expose other inhabitants--black, brown, and pink--as being immigrants, a policy neatly endorsed by referring to them with such labels as Bantu and English, the latter not just speaking English but being English, their language having its standard rooted not in the courts, churches, and classrooms of Johannesburg, but in London W1, as any listener to SABC is constantly reminded (cf. Lanham 1982). For the 'verkrampste', the only 'Africans' in South Africa are the Afrikaners, speaking Afrikaans.

2. The econocultural model. While the demography model is relevant in some degree to all languages, and among them the spread of English is no more remarkable than several others, the 'econocultural' model of language spread applies in our time more to English than to any other language. The only remotely relevant comparator in Western history is Latin: not Latin through imperial rule, but Latin introduced much later as the vehicle of religion, medicine, science, culture, and retained for a thousand unchallenged years. (Cf. Kahane and Kahane 1979, Kahane 1986.) Moreover, where the demography-led extension of English is in recent decades so modest as to be regarded as effectively in stasis, the extension of spread by econocultural motivation (appropriately called the 'expanding circle' by Kachru, cf. 1985c) has been almost exponential over the past 40 years, and such growth seems set to continue for the rest of the millennium.¹ It

constantly raises questions relating to standards--questions in which, I suppose, everyone attending the present Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics has been involved. Oversimplifying, these questions concern two broad areas, the general (2.1) and the restricted (2.2).

2.1. The general area. In the general area, we are concerned mainly with the authorities responsible for setting standards in the education systems. Here, again oversimplifying, we have seen, and will doubtless continue to see, a shift in orientation from British English to American English. The political or regional labels retain their relevance for the very reason that we are primarily concerned with education systems that combine a language-teaching interest with what the Germans call a Landeskunde interest. But in my own experience, the issue that worries education ministers is not the choice between American and British standards but (1) what they detect as an increasing unwillingness or inability to identify standards in America or Britain, and (2) what they infer from the false extrapolation of English 'varieties' by some linguists. Thus in Japan last September I was asked in Mombusho whether it was my view that Japanese learners were incapable of mastering English as expertly as Germans and Russians do and that therefore they should settle for the relaxed and clearly insulting goals of 'Japanese English', called by some foreign 'expert' advisers 'Japlish'. I was reminded of a seminar in Hachioji some eight years earlier when the same issue stimulated Clifford Prator to emerge in print again on the theme he had so forthrightly addressed in his 'heresy' paper (Prator 1978, cf. Prator 1968).

2.2. The restricted area. The other area of standards raised by the econocultural model I called 'restricted'. Here I seek to bring under one head such special uses of English as Soviet broadcasts to Third World countries, the English used in transnational corporations, the English used in the Asahi Evening News, in service manuals for electronic equipment, in air navigation, and in such new communication systems as the Seaspeak devised by Strevens and his colleagues (cf. Weeks et al. 1984). Of special interest here, and in my view of growing importance, is the irrelevance of a Landeskunde dimension. More than that: an American or a British or Australian orientation is not just irrelevant, it is

rightly felt to be undesirable. English for these purposes has to reflect not only what is going on in America and in Britain, but equally what is going on in Japan and the Soviet Union. English for these purposes has to be understood not only by Americans and Britons, but equally by English-speaking Japanese and Russians. In short, it is under this head that the motivation is strongest for the establishment of standards that are genuinely and usefully international.

3. The imperial model. Finally, I come to what I called the 'imperial' model of language spread, which shares with the econocultural one a lack of dependence on, or correlation with, population spread. This can be seen from the best-researched example of this model, India. The importance of English in India could not possibly be inferred from the statistics of those who use it: only about three percent of the population, even on a fairly liberal assessment (cf. Kachru 1986a, for example).² Numerous other languages in modern times have been spread by the imperial model (French is a particularly interesting example), but pressure of time restricts me to the discussion of English.

The working of the imperial model during the period of actual empire is clear enough. The Romans ran Britannia and Germania in Latin; the British ran Nigeria in English; the Germans ran Tanganyika in German. Local elites spoke the imperial language and became the more elite in so doing. When the Roman legions withdrew from Britannia and Germania, some place-names remained but, within a century, few other traces of Latin. When the Germans withdrew from Tanganyika in 1918, their linguistic footprints were obliterated with comparable rapidity and completeness. But counterexample: when the British legions withdrew from Lagos and Kaduna, did not English remain? To the extent that it is a counterexample (and as such, after all, it can be readily paralleled by French in nearby Côte d'Ivoire or Sénégal), there are several possible explanations. (1) English serves as an ethnically neutral link language between Ibo and Yoruba. (2) The British were in Nigeria longer than the Germans were in Tanganyika. (3) They evolved complex educational, administrative, and communicational structures--and, especially, they involved the indigenous population in running these systems. (4) English seems to the Nigerians to be a more useful language econoculturally in communication

with the rest of the world than did German to the Tanganyikans (or Dutch to the Indonesians).

Such a range of possible explanations is not of mere academic interest, but of deep concern to the policymakers in Nigeria, to whom we, as linguists, must be ready to give competent advice. If a dispassionate needs analysis suggests that Nigeria's long-term interest in English is econocultural, like Japan's, then they need an international standard of English, and we have the problem of helping Nigeria to implement it and its consequences. If the needs analysis puts internal communication at the top of Nigeria's priority list, then we have a much bigger problem, for here alone is where the desirability and feasibility of a local standard arises, and its acquisition by a very large fraction of its population.

Now it is obviously controversial to call in question, as I have just appeared to do, 'the desirability and feasibility of a local standard' within the imperial model of linguistic spread. It may indeed seem to be flying in the face of established fact to question 'feasibility' when all of us here present have for years talked pretty freely of 'Nigerian English', 'West African English', 'South Asian English', 'Singaporean English',³ hypostatizing what remain at best rather general abstractions. What I believe to be a misleading, if not entirely false, analogy from designations like American English, or Iraqi Arabic, has of course been carried much further (as I have mentioned in connection with 'Japlish'), and the taxonomic implications are desperately different between 'computer English' (e.g. English Today 1.29), 'Queensland Kanaka English' (an area 'recently explored' in English World-Wide), 'Ashkenazic English' (Am.Sp. 60, 1985), 'Chicano English' and 'Anglo English' (both in Fernando Peñaloza 1980). As well as 'Black English', tout court, we have 'British Black English' (Ferguson and Heath 1981; Trudgill 1984). On the one hand, we can be told that the 'English of Québec is a genre in its own right' (English Today 1.16); on the other, we can be invited (by Bokamba, in Kachru 1982:78) to consider examples of what he calls 'African English' where little or no linguistic common ground is predicated, but only the anecdotal fact that all were written in Africa by black Africans. When, in his Foreword to Ferguson and Heath 1981, Hymes uses 'Indian English', it refers to North America and appears to cover the English used by, say, Cherokees in Oklahoma, Hopis in Arizona, Navahos in Utah, and it is not clear to me how far the

designation seeks to capture linguistic features held in common.

But more usually, of course, 'Indian English' is applied, notably by Kachru, to the English used by the Indians of India, a variety, or set of varieties, or cline of varieties, more seriously studied than any other product of the imperial model of English spread. For Kachru, this is indeed part of a still broader variety which he calls 'South Asian English', in use, he says, by about 29 million people:⁴ 'My use of the term South Asian English', he explains (Kachru 1982), 'is not to be understood as indicative of linguistic homogeneity in this variety nor of a uniform competence. It refers to several broad regional varieties such as Indian English, Lankan English, and Pakistani English.' But within the regional variety, Indian English, he makes an equal disclaimer of 'homogeneity' and 'uniform competence'. In his recent book The Alchemy of English (and I cannot forbear to recall that the medieval alchemists never did manage to turn copper into gold), he notes that 'Indian English maintains varying degrees of Englishness which is graded from pidgin to educated Indian English'. The fact that a similar situation obtains in other nonnative varieties of English produces a cline within each to complicate the differences between each. 'On the cline of Englishness these may be low', he concedes, but they exist, they work, and they call for the replacement of 'pedagogical models' that have become 'suspect'. Indeed, 'The pragmatics of the uses of the English language can be understood only if a dynamic polymodel approach is adopted' (Kachru 1986a; cf. also Kachru 1983, 1985a, b, and c, 1986b).

We have a vision of education systems confronting a complexity undreamed of in Germany or Japan, where there is unquestioning acceptance of an external (i.e. native) standard for the teaching of English. And I wonder how realistic the vision is. How likely is it that a minister of education in Delhi or Lagos will provide resources for teaching to a model derived from nonnative norms--especially any that could be characterized as low on the cline of Englishness? It is not encouraging to reflect that, although Kachru has been publishing on Indian English for 25 years--prolifically, eloquently, elegantly--there is still no grammar, dictionary, or phonological description for any of these nonnative norms that is, or could hope to become, recognized as authoritative in India, a description to which teacher and learner in India

could turn for normative guidance, and from which pedagogical materials could be derived.

If, of course, a national needs analysis in India, or Nigeria, or Singapore convinced ministers of education and other government colleagues that resources should be found for the promotion of nonnative norms low on the cline of Englishness, we might be in a different ballgame. But I see little sign of this. I had the privilege of speaking with Mrs. Indira Gandhi only a few weeks before her death. She was caustic on what she saw as the declining standards of English in India and was horrified at the idea of India establishing its own standard. Alan Maley (English Today 1.32, 1985) has reported how Mrs. Gandhi summoned her Minister of Education to complain after failing to understand the English of a fellow Indian at an international conference. The Prime Minister of Singapore has made it just as abundantly clear that his interest in English is to provide 'direct access to the knowledge and technology of the industrialized West' (Speeches I.9, 1978), and for him the 'slovenly' use of a 'Singapore dialect English' will not serve.

In short, whatever uncertainties we may feel about the standards of and the needs for English as an intranational language, residually fulfilling the role of English in imperial times, we know that English continues to be desirable for the purposes of international access. But this is my econocultural model of language spread, and I believe it is as applicable in India, Singapore, and Nigeria as it is in Japan, Germany, and Russia. Indeed, this seems to be tacitly acknowledged in that those who speak of local norms always identify a desirable acrolectal one which bears a striking resemblance to the externally established norms of Standard English.

But, it may be objected, this is to ignore the distinction between English as a foreign language and English as a second language. I ignore it partly because I doubt its validity and frequently fail to understand its meaning. There is certainly no clear-cut distinction between ESL and EFL. Overtly, it is an instrumental distinction, but it is not applied to the highly instrumental use of English in (for example) air navigation; and in any case, is English used instrumentally and intranationally among Norwegians and among Germans less heavily than among Indians? And if so, is it more a difference of degree than of kind? Covertly, of course, the distinction has referred to the Commonwealth,

and this is why India and Nigeria have been regarded as ESL countries but not Norway or Germany. In consequence, Strevens (1985) can refer in the same sentence to 'Educated West African', 'Educated Singaporean', and 'Educated Hong Kong' English--though on linguistic criteria English is surely a foreign language in Hong Kong, as it most certainly will be, institutionally, in ten years' time: probably far more so than in Malaysia, where the emphasis on promoting Bahasa with the New Economic Policy of 1970 entailed the official relegation of English from its 'second language' role.

Such changes do not apparently reduce the spread of English, but they change our perception of the English that is being spread, the purposes for which it is being spread, and the standards required in its spread. Moag's paper on the 'Life-cycle of non-native Englishes' (in Kachru 1982) contemplates the possibility of a contraction in the language spread that has proceeded from the imperial model, and this seems to me at least plausible. It is borne out in the same volume of papers edited by Kachru by the sobering reflections of Bokamba on English in Commonwealth Africa (cf. also Rogers 1982; Banjo 1985).

And this brings me back to the question of desirability of nonnative norms that I raised earlier (and have raised before: cf. Quirk 1983, 1985, 1986). If we accept with Kachru that the majority of India's 23 million English-users (or 28 million, according to his most recent estimate: Kachru 1987) have a norm that is low on the cline of Englishness; if we further assume success in the creation of a matching polymodel for pedagogical and other promotional purposes, who gains? There was a struggle in the United Nations about 30 years ago over a language policy for Papua New Guinea (Quirk 1972). Australia's policy was to institutionalize the native (pidgin) model because it seemed more democratic and because, after all, it was already there. In the UN this was condemned as neocolonialist, relegating an emergent people to a 'debased patois'.⁵ Australia went ahead and the territory achieved its independence with Tok Pisin as the language of parliament and administration. I was one who applauded the bold pragmatism. What I have heard and read in the past two or three years is less than reassuring. Tok Pisin is displaying gross internal instability and is being rejected in favour of an external model of English by those with power and influence (cf. Mühlhäusler 1986).

To sum up, we have looked at three models in terms of which human language may be spread. So far as English is concerned, it is to the econocultural model that we can attribute the remarkable degree of recent and current spread. As for countries affected by the imperial model, it is likely that a long-term demand for English will be related equally to econocultural factors, with consequences accordingly for the standards to be observed.

Notes

1. But it must not be exaggerated, as it sometimes is by enthusiasts for English who do damage alike to international relations and their own credibility as observers. In a recent lecture in Paris, John Honey raised eyebrows and hackles alike by predicting the replacement of French by English in France itself. Meanwhile, however, foreigners go on stubbornly using foreign languages and the losers are the Anglo-Saxons who stubbornly decline to learn them. It took NASA more than 20 years to learn of a vital ophthalmological discovery long familiar to German scientists who had read the work of Jörg Draeger (which was, of course, in German).

2. Nonetheless, the dissociation of the imperial model from demography in the present treatment may come as a surprise in view of some recent estimates of English users in the countries concerned. This is an area of linguistic crystal-gazing like that mentioned in relation to econocultural demand, where even the best-informed of colleagues have a tendency to go over the top. For Crystal (1985), 'There is a sense in which English is the language of most of the population of the sub-continent', and his table credits (for example) Pakistan with over 85 million, and India with a staggering 700 million speakers of English as a 'second language'.

3. In fact, such descriptions as exist suggest rather that this refers to common 'performance' features of the English attained by Chinese-speaking Singaporeans--rather than, say, the ethnic Indians of Singapore. This makes it difficult to distinguish in linguistic principle from the recognizable 'accent' remaining in the English learned by, say, Greeks or Germans.

4. Of which 23 million were estimated as being in India. Kachru has more recently put this Indian figure at 28 million

(Kachru 1987), which entails his increasing South Asian English to at least 34 million. Kachru would accept of course that these numbers would include speakers of severely pidginized English (cf. Hymes 1971).

5. Cf., in a different context, Taylor (1985) pressing for better teaching of Standard English to speakers of 'Black English'.

References

- Bailey, R.W., and M. Görlach, eds. 1982. *English as a world language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Banjo, A. 1985. Issues in the teaching of English literature in Nigeria. In: Quirk and Widdowson (1985).
- Bokamba, E.G. 1982. The Africanization of English. In: Kachru (1982).
- Cazden, C.B., and D.K. Dickinson. 1981. Language in education: Standardization vs cultural pluralism. In: Ferguson and Heath (1981).
- Crystal, D. 1985. How many millions? The statistics of English today. *English Today* 1.7-9.
- Ferguson, C.A., and S.B. Heath, eds. 1981. *Language in the USA*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, J.A., ed. 1974. *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J.A., 1982. Sociology of English as an additional language. In: Kachru (1982).
- Greenbaum, S., ed. 1985. *The English language today*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Guitarte, G.L., and R.T. Quintero. 1974. Linguistic correctness and the role of the academies in Latin America. In: Fishman (1974).
- Hymes, D. 1971. *Pidginization and creolization of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ibrahim, M.H., and B.H. Jernudd, eds. 1986. Aspects of Arabic socio-linguistics, vol. 60 of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- Jernudd, B.H., ed. 1986. Chinese language planning, vol. 59 of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- Kachru, B., ed. 1982. *The other tongue*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. 1983. *The Indianization of English*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Kachru, B. 1985a. Institutionalized second-language varieties. In: Greenbaum (1985:211-26).
- Kachru, B. 1985b. Attitudes and usage: English in the world context. Greenbaum (1985:207-10).
- Kachru, B. 1985c. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism. In: Quirk and Widdowson (1985).
- Kachru, B. 1986a. *The alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B. 1986b. ESP and non-native varieties of English. Mimeo.
- Kachru, B. 1987. The past and prejudice: Toward demythologizing the English canon. Mimeo.
- Kahane, H. 1986. A typology of the prestige language. Lg. 62.495-508.
- Kahane, H., and R. 1979. Decline and survival of Western prestige languages. Lg. 55.183-98.
- Kuo, E.C.Y. 1985. Language and identity: The case of Chinese in Singapore. In: W. Tseng and D. Wu, eds., *Chinese culture and mental health*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lanham, L.W. 1982. English in South Africa. In: Bailey and Görlach (1982).
- Moag, R.F. 1982. The life cycle of non-native Englishes. In: Kachru (1982).
- Mühlhäusler, P. 1986. English in contact with Tok Pisin. In: W. Viereck and W.D. Bald, eds., *English in contact with other languages*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Peñaloza, F. 1980. *Chicano sociolinguistics*. Cambridge, Mass: Newbury House.
- Prator, C.H. 1968. The British heresy in TESL. In: J.A. Fishman et al., eds., *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Prator, C.H. 1978. The pronunciation of English as an international auxiliary language in Japan. JACET Bulletin 9.
- Quirk, R. 1972. That's their pidgin. Chapter 6 of *The English language and images of matter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, R. 1983. Language variety: Nature and art. In: R.B. Noss, ed. *Varieties of English in S.E. Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Quirk, R. 1985. The English language in a global context. In: Quirk and Widdowson (1985).
- Quirk, R. 1986. Speculations on the future role of English in Hong Kong. In: V. Bickley, ed., *Future directions in English*

- language teacher education. Hong Kong Education Department.
- Quirk, R., and H.G. Widdowson, eds. 1985. English in the world. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers, J. 1982. The world for sick proper. *ELT Journal* 36.144-57.
- Stevens, P. 1985. Standards and the standard language. *English Today* 2.
- Taylor, O.L. 1985. Standard English as a second dialect? *English Today* 2.9-12.
- Trudgill, P., ed. 1984. Language in the British Isles. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weeks, F., et al. 1984. Seaspeak reference manual. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

INTELLIGIBILITY AND ACCEPTABILITY IN VERBAL COMMUNICATION

Eugene A. Nida
American Bible Society

The closely related but distinct factors of intelligibility and acceptability are crucial elements in all interlingual and interdialectal communication, as well as being highly significant in both oral and written discourse within any language. Too often people assume that there is a strict correlation between intelligibility and acceptability, in the sense that the greater the intelligibility of a text, the greater will be its acceptability. But in many instances this is distinctly not the case. For example, many people prefer obscure translations of the Bible since they seem to reflect better the esoteric nature of the contents and to carry more authority in view of their archaic and traditional form of language. Some politicians and statesmen also prefer unintelligible verbal communication as a means of avoiding commitments.

In order to appreciate more fully the numerous and diverse relations between intelligibility and acceptability, it may be useful to examine various phases of these relations between languages, between dialects (both geographical and social), between registers, and in literary discourse.

Between languages. The issue of intelligibility and acceptability is especially acute in the relations between languages, since the very definition of languages implies mutual unintelligibility. Nevertheless, for some subcultures and for restricted contexts an unintelligible language may be more acceptable than an intelligible one (de Waard and Nida 1986). For example, many Christians prefer their liturgy in a language either completely unintelligible or only very inadequately understood, for example, the use of Latin, Old Church Slavonic, Syriac, and Geez in numerous traditional

churches. A similar situation occurs in Islam, in which Koranic Arabic is the standard for religious expression despite the fact that many worshippers have only a very limited idea of what the words mean. In some instances, Muslim devotees have memorized the entire Koran without really understanding the meaning of what they so conscientiously recite.

The principal reason for people preferring an unintelligible text is simply that the form of the language communicates associative values which far outweigh the lack of cognitive content. In some instances, however, compromises are made so that people can have their verbal cake and eat it too. For example, in most Christian churches in the Arabic-speaking world, believers would not think of having a translation of the Bible in anything other than standard Arabic, even though the language of such a translation is almost unintelligible unless people have had several years of education. But instead of having editions of the Bible with full pointing, they prefer unpointed texts, so that the Scriptures can be read with numerous spontaneous adaptations in the direction of colloquial usage. In this way the associative value of the accepted tradition and the communicative value of colloquial intelligibility combine to produce a relatively useful vehicle for communication.

The use of foreign languages for their associative values is not, however, limited to religious contexts. In the United States, radio and television advertising has made extensive use of entire sentences and even short paragraphs in such foreign languages as Italian, French, and Japanese as a means of enhancing the acceptability of certain products, usually foodstuffs, luxury items, and travel bargains. Relatively few persons are able to comprehend the utterances, but the languages themselves have enough associative meaning so as to 'carry the message' of Italian for rich pasta, French for expensive wines, and Japanese for the latest in electronic equipment. In some instances, the use of a foreign language has strong snob appeal, as when, for example, some opera devotees denounce the use of spoken parts in translation.

Glossolalia is, of course, another phenomenon in which the unintelligible use of speech has great associative value for many people. In numerous cases, however, it is not the actual verbal performance which is important, but rather the capacity of a person to produce such a flow of sounds. By this means a person may become acceptable to the inner

circle of the religious community. The fact that the speakers of 'tongues' often borrow Hebrew words, though practically never in modern or biblical pronunciations, illustrates further the importance of acceptability as over against intelligibility.

Between dialects. One might assume that in the case of verbal communication between dialects there would be a close correlation between intelligibility and acceptability, but this is by no means always the case. Spanish and Portuguese are relatively close dialects, and though it is true that because of certain phonological differences, Portuguese speakers can usually understand Spanish more readily than Spanish speakers can understand Portuguese, the degrees of acceptability do not correlate with degrees of intelligibility. Spanish speakers are generally much less tolerant of Portuguese texts, whether spoken or written, than are Portuguese speakers of Spanish texts. The differences of acceptability clearly reflect cultural attitudes and are largely unrelated to linguistic factors.

In assessing the factors affecting intelligibility, whether between languages or between dialects, one must recognize a number of different levels of comprehension--at least three, if the semiotic insights of Peirce are to be taken seriously. But the issue of intelligibility becomes far more complex if one considers the problems posed by different cultures and subcultures. Words which may appear to be perfectly understandable in one's language and culture may give rise to serious misunderstanding or puzzlement in another cultural setting. For example, Chitonga speakers of Zambia (Wendland 1987) who are educated in English can readily understand the biblical words 'Oh that you would kiss me with the kisses of your mouth' (Song of Songs 1:2), despite the fact that the expression sounds somewhat odd and artificial. But the real significance of this statement is seriously altered by the fact that Chitonga speakers regard kissing as culturally very inappropriate between adults of either sex, and the reference to the 'mouth' makes the statement particularly unacceptable. Chitonga speakers can only conclude that the woman speaking must be one of the notorious prostitutes in some tavern in an urban center--certainly no the heroine of a famous love poem.

These same Chitonga speakers with a good knowledge of English can also understand a reference in the same poem to

a woman's teeth being like a 'flock of ewes' (Song of Songs 4:2), but they are very unlikely to understand this as a compliment, for in the Tonga culture sheep are not culturally valued and instead of being white, they are usually a dirty, muddy color. If the teeth of a Tonga woman are to be compared to any animal, and by implication to the teeth of such an animal, it would have to be the teeth of a cow, not a sheep, for Tonga women have their four upper front teeth knocked out precisely so that their teeth will resemble those of a cow. Intelligibility is much more than being able to comprehend a series of words on the basis of their dictionary meanings, for meaning, and hence intelligibility, is always a matter of context, both linguistic and extralinguistic.

Not only are there vast differences in the degrees of intelligibility, but there are also striking differences in gradations of acceptability. At one extreme a text may produce a complete rejection, and even abhorrence, on the part of hearers and readers. At the other extreme, however, a text may excite an ecstatic response, the kind of reaction of which Longinus spoke so passionately in his book On Sublimity.

A close examination of some of the problems of intelligibility between geographical dialects reveals some significant differences in the manner in which diverse linguistic features affect comprehension. For example, differences in sounds seem to be the most decisive obstacles to comprehension, though these differences may be less of a problem if the phonological distinctions are systematic and the hearers can make quick and easy adjustments. The next most important factor in limiting intelligibility is diversity of lexical units, that is, words and idioms, and cognates with quite distinct or even opposite meanings can be especially misleading and disruptive.

Differences in grammar seem to constitute less acute problems than distinctions in words and idioms, since people can often guess satisfactorily at relations, provided they understand the words. Finally, differences in rhetorical structures seem to provide the least number of difficulties for the understanding of the text by receptors. These gradations relating to the phonology, lexicon, grammar, and rhetoric parallel in a highly significant way the corresponding differences in degrees of optionality, that is to say, phonological features are increasingly less determined or restricted as to options.

Though differences in rhetorical organization and devices may constitute the least number of obstacles to intelligibility, they do, however, account for the greatest number of factors affecting acceptability. In fact, the relative importance of factors affecting acceptability is in the reverse order to what it is in the case of intelligibility.

Though the differences between geographical dialects have often been treated almost entirely in terms of relative intelligibility, it is clearly a mistake to restrict oneself to such a narrow perspective. In dealing with social dialects, such a point of view is even more dangerous and misleading. Although for the most part social dialects tend to be mutually comprehensible, this does not mean that they are correspondingly more mutually acceptable. In fact, almost the opposite seems to be the prevailing situation. People always seem to be more opposed to that which is closer and therefore presumably more threatening--a typical phenomenon in any pecking order.

Social dialect, however, should not be treated merely in terms of 'high' and 'low', for there are almost always a number of gradations, even as in the case of levels of language (Platt 1977). Even in a diglossic situation involving Caribbean English Creole and Standard English, much depends on differences between addressees and audience. For example, waiters and clerks in tourist hotels on English-speaking islands normally speak to one another in Caribbean English Creole, which is almost totally incomprehensible to tourists who know only Standard English. But when speaking to tourists these same waiters and clerks generally employ the vocabulary, grammar, and intonation of Standard English, though with certain distinctive phonological differences typical of local educated speech. When, however, they address fellow workers in the presence of Standard English speakers, they often employ standard lexicon and grammar but a typical creole intonation. In this way they can be assured of a double type of acceptance by not offending Standard English speakers while at the same time identifying with coworkers.

Jargons are best treated as social dialects, in which lexical specialization is the dominant feature. Most jargons are employed primarily for the documentation of professional and technical data and are typical of the professional language used by scientists, doctors, lawyers, bureaucrats, and even some linguists, who use this kind of lexical shorthand to deal

with complex phenomena or find jargons to be helpful devices for impressing the uninitiated or hiding their ignorance. Although these jargons may be characterized as deviating from general usage almost entirely through lexical specialization, in some instances technical jargons may involve distinctive rhetorical devices, as used, for example, in the elaborate academic styles typical of traditional university lecturing in Germany and Japan.

Between registers. The use of different registers relates primarily to the roles of participants and the circumstances of the communication. It may, however, be misleading to make a distinction between high and low social dialects (diglossia) and registers, since so many of the controlling factors are similar (Fishman 1967 and Gumperz 1964). In the case of diglossia, many speakers do not control the two or more forms of the language, while in the case of registers, the majority of persons within a speech community do control and effectively use at least several levels: ritual, formal, informal, casual, and intimate.

Despite the fact that ritual language is often so elaborate and archaic as to be almost unintelligible, it is often highly valued, whether employed by an American politician in a funeral eulogy or by a Zulu praise poet thanking a chief for putting on a dance festival. On the other hand, even vulgar, scatological expressions can also be highly acceptable to certain constituencies and under particular circumstances—for example, the recent popular use of such words and phrases by disk jockeys commenting on hard rock and punk music.

In literary discourse. Perhaps the most interesting and certainly the most ancient area in which the factors of intelligibility and acceptability in verbal communication have been focal is literary criticism (Preminger, Golden, Hardison, and Kerrane 1974), the issues of intelligibility and acceptability were discussed under somewhat different rubrics, but the fundamental relations and corresponding formal features are all essentially the same. Plato's extensive discussions of these issues (particularly in *The Republic*, Book III) are considered primarily in terms of 'matter and manner', in other words, content and form. Aristotle's concerns are put into a framework of 'thought' (*dianoia*) and 'diction' (*lexis*), while Demetrius expanded the frame of reference to 'content, diction, and arrangement of words'. Horace dealt

with substantially the same literary problems in terms of subject matter and poetic form, and in the discussion of diction Longinus distinguishes between 'thought' and 'expression'. In all of these treatments the basic and underlying distinction is between conceptual intelligibility and emotive acceptability.

The aim of most literary theory has been the delineation of those factors which can jointly maximize both intelligibility and acceptability, but most theorists acknowledge that, depending upon the type of literary genre, a writer or speaker must make certain trade-offs in order to accomplish certain practical goals. A technical article on nuclear fusion will certainly lack the kinds of rhetorical devices that a politician must employ in winning the support of a hostile crowd.

Within any single literary genre, however, there are also distinct styles. In fact, no speaker or writer can escape stylistic factors (Sperber and Wilson 1986). Within any genre or even register, the style consists of the distinctive ways in which a source exploits the range of available rhetorical devices which the language provides and the culture values. In addition to the overall arrangement of the content, largely determined by the broader patterns associated with specific genres, there are also several types of enhancement which may be employed by the use of various rhetorical processes, such as repetition, expansion, condensation, transposition, cohesion, and conceptual shifts (e.g. figurative language, irony, hyperbole, and paradox), all of which are designed to increase both impact and appeal.

For most linguists intelligibility has far outdistanced acceptability as a focal element in the study of language. There are a number of reasons for this, but perhaps the dominant cause for this somewhat one-sided interest in language is the fact that features of intelligibility seem to be so much more tractable to analysis, and the relations between linguistic forms and intelligibility seem to be so much more evident than are the relations between formal features and varying degrees and kinds of acceptability. Because language seems so close to logic, linguists have normally employed methods of analysis which rely heavily upon propositional logic. As a result, we have tended to overlook some of the more subtle aspects of style and aesthetics. Because acceptability seems to be so subjective and so dependent upon changing fashions, some linguists have tended to lump

such seemingly 'peripheral' elements into the wastebasket of language performance, despite the fact that people's responses to verbal communication are far more conditioned by factors of acceptability than by those of intelligibility. Perhaps the really exciting and relevant data about language is now to be found in this somewhat neglected aspect of verbal communication.

References

- de Waard, Jan, and Eugene A. Nida. 1986. From one language to another. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- Fishman, Joshua. 1967. Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 32.29-38.
- Gumperz, John. 1964. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist* 66 (Part 2).137-53.
- Platt, John. 1977. A model for polyglossia and multilingualism (with special reference to Singapore and Malaysia). *Language in Society* 6.361-78.
- Preminger, Alex, Leon Golden, O.B. Hardison, Jr., and Kevin Kerrane. 1974. *Classical literary criticism*. New York: Frederick Ungar.
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.
- Wendland, Ernst R. 1987. *The cultural factor in Bible translation*. London, New York, Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.

CROSS-LINGUISTIC AND CROSS-CULTURAL INTELLIGIBILITY

Kari Sajavaara

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

0. Introduction. Cross-language and cross-cultural understanding is not very often discussed with due attention to what goes on between the speaker and the hearer in communicative interaction. There is a fair amount of evidence in the literature dealing with sociopsychological issues of language use--both within cultures and across cultures--about the interactive nature of linguistic, pragmatic, or other information. In the light of this information, attempts at specifying intelligibility as an autonomous linguistic phenomenon restricted to word or utterance recognition taking place before the establishment of referential meaning may be highly misleading.

The major arguments presented here are as follows:

1. The purpose of communication in interactional situations is not transference of messages alone; interpersonal interactions can often be simply seen as a form of self-presentation, which has important links with various affective factors.

2. The view that communication means encoding and decoding of messages in terms of a mirror-images type of process cannot be accepted. Participants in communicative interaction are involved in a negotiation process whose goal is an agreement on mutual understanding (whether people really understand each other is a different question). At initial stages, particularly between strangers, one of the major functions of the process is uncertainty reduction aimed at seeking common bases of understanding, which, later on, is replaced by speech accommodation directed towards alleviating the interlocutor's task of interpretation.

3. Recognition of elements embedded in the interlocutor's speech signal is not simply a linguistic phenomenon. The

input speech signal, all kinds of other information available at the speech situation, and various types of knowledge embedded in the receiver's memory, linguistic or other, interact heterarchically in the process of interpretation in terms of an incremental time-sharing system. There is no possible way to predict which type of cue leads to the right or, preferably, most probable interpretation.

4. The processing of language information does not take place hierarchically from phones up to text, or vice versa: potentially interpretations are accessed through a multiple-code system, which adapts to the requirements of each particular incremental bit of the incoming message; processing may be partly speaker-specific, partly personality-type-oriented, and partly dependent on cues available. The accessing of linguistic elements takes place mostly through larger entities, lexical percept skeletons, which could be called 'Gestalts'; only when the processor runs into problems is a closer analysis taken up.

5. The receiver's processing modality is always geared to establishing a potential meaning, which may be corrected retroactively in the light of subsequent information. If necessary, the receiver tries to make up a context in which a potential interpretation is possible. Since arriving at a potential interpretation and agreement on understanding is not hierarchical, it is not possible to posit a set of stages of interpretation either: word recognition, word and utterance meaning, and utterance function are interlinked to a degree which makes it impossible to distinguish between them.

The foregoing arguments are discussed in more detail in what follows. The discussion of this theoretical framework will be combined with suggestive references to some findings of the Finnish-English Cross-Language Project at the University of Jyväskylä.

1. Communication and recovery of meaning. The major issue here is not so much the possibility of distinguishing, at a theoretical level, intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability, as suggested by Smith and Nelson (1985), but the question of such distinctions being feasible in descriptions which try to deal with comprehension of messages across language and cultural boundaries. Is it possible to single out intelligibility, for instance, and consider its occurrence without the other two? Is it possible to have contexts where intelligibility in the recognition sense

depends on comprehension and/or interpretation, i.e. we first comprehend and interpret and only then are able to recognize the language items? The present study starts from the conception that the three are inseparably interlinked in communication and do not have distinct identities. This is certainly true for spoken language; under certain circumstances, written language may work differently.

For the purposes of conceptual analysis, it may be possible to single out and decontextualize certain phenomena or sets of phenomena. This should not take place, however, at the cost of losing touch with the complexity of the phenomena involved. If what takes place in the world is not simple, we should not deceive ourselves by trying to make the issues simpler than they actually are. Idealizations based on decontextualization are severe simplifications of phenomena which take place when human beings talk to each other in communicative interaction.

One of the most problematic issues relates to the dynamism of psychological and social processes and of interactional exchanges as against the static character of linguistic descriptions. It is widely recognized today that many linguistic structures are fuzzy by nature, but it has not often been seen what the psycholinguistic implications of this fuzziness could be. Therefore due recognition is seldom given to the fact that linguistic structures do not necessarily have fixed representations in the human mind (cf. Sajavaara and Lehtonen 1980a). Linguistic structures interact with other cognitive parameters, and they are dynamically controlled by a large number of factors which fall beyond the limits of what is normally considered the realm of linguists. When we move from the language domain over to the culture domain, we are faced with even greater problems, as is very illustratively presented by Verschueren (1984) in a breakdown of illusions governing our conceptualizations.

Verschueren, for instance, recognizes the relative value of comprehensibility and points out that the illusion of comprehensibility 'blocks the road to approximate understanding'. He also mentions the illusion of language dependence of communicative success, a point to be discussed in detail.

In communicative interaction, speech reception and speech production take place incrementally in real time. To date, we still lack insight into the kinds of procedural knowledge (cf. Faerch and Kasper 1984) which are necessary for

speaker-hearers to be able to combine internalized rules and structures with the intra- and interpersonal on-line phenomena in process during communicative activities. It is impossible to deal reasonably with comprehension without at least trying to consider them in the framework of the cognitive processes which underlie our capacity of what is normally seen as language understanding.

There are a large number of other phenomena related to cognitive processing which await explanation. One of the most interesting is the interrelationship between automaticity and control, on the one hand, and levels of consciousness, on the other. The major impetus for such a discussion comes from cognitive psychology (see Garrod 1986), whereas linguists have, for the most part, tried to cope with a rather superficial level of processing without entering the truly complex issues deeper down (a great deal of the discussion round Krashen's Monitor serves as a good example of this; see, however, McLaughlin et al. 1983; see also Lehtonen and Sajavaara 1985a).

Research in human information processing is seriously handicapped by severe constraints on the types of experimental research methodology available. This situation has resulted in product-based research strategies being overemphasized at the expense of process-based ones. It is not easy to interfere with what goes on in the human mind, and the ways in which on-line incremental processes can be studied are not many. This should not, however, mislead us to make post hoc explanations on the evidence from language products. It is all too easy to equate products of cognitive processes with the processes themselves, but a product does not necessarily reveal much about how it originally received its final shape.

2. Communication as negotiation. Under the influence of traditional theories of communication, it has been rather common--perhaps also as a reflection of some lay opinions on the question--to visualize transference of messages from one speaker to another as a sequence of an encoding process and a decoding process, which are seen to be mirror images of each other: the sender is supposed to encode the message, which is then passed over to the receiver, who decodes it. Reception is far too often treated as if its major task were to recover the linguistic structure of the original message (cf. Garrod 1986:230).

Communication should be primarily seen as a process of negotiating relevant information between two or more interactants. Both production and reception are creative processes: the establishment of a communicative fit, i.e. an agreement on the exchange of messages having been successful and the information having been found relevant on both sides, is partly based on shared rules and shared information, but it may as well be a product of 'rules' created ad hoc during the process of interaction. Brown (1986:287) writes about the speaker wishing 'to perform a successful act of reference' and the listener also being 'endowed with intentions in the context of communication'.

The purpose of interpersonal communication is not always--maybe not even in the majority of cases--to transmit messages, or even find a common solution to a problem, but to establish social contacts or to present oneself in a particular social situation. Whatever the case, a decisive factor for the outcome is what is termed communicative satisfaction (see Hecht et al. 1984). It means a subjective impression of how successful the communicative exchange has been, and it has an impact on the communicator's attitudes toward self and others. It is obvious that such satisfaction is only partly dependent on the intended message having been transmitted: in many cases the interactants have no way of knowing what the actual status of comprehension is; they simply reach an agreement that they have come to terms as to what they mean.

What has been said here also means that communicative competence should be seen to comprise 'an evaluation, a criticism of behavior rather than behavior itself' (Parks 1985:171). For Parks (1985:195), communicative competence 'represents the degree to which individuals perceive they have satisfied their goals in a given social situation' (my emphasis), which implies that it includes a clearly interactional component.

In this context it should not be forgotten that the communicator makes use of a large number of signals other than language relating to more or less everything that is present in the situation. When meanings are negotiated, everything counts.

It is also interesting to consider the interrelationship between the view of communication as negotiation of meaning, on the one hand, and uncertainty reduction theory, on the other. Uncertainty reduction theory (see, for

example, Gudykunst 1985) explains success in initial interactions between strangers (originally members of the same culture but more recently also in intercultural encounters): uncertainty here refers to 'the ability to predict how strangers will behave during an encounter and the ability to explain strangers' behavior' (Gudykunst 1985:79). The process of uncertainty reduction works in two directions: both proactive predictions and retroactive explanations about strangers' behavior are created. The whole meaning negotiation process could be seen as an attempt at uncertainty reduction.

After uncertainty has receded and been replaced by more certainty as to the other's intentions and personality, uncertainty reduction strategies are superseded by various procedures of speech accommodation. They derive from a focus 'upon the cognitive process mediating between the individuals' social perceptions of the environment and their communicative behaviors' (Beebe and Giles 1984:7). The interactants' speech behavior converges linguistically as a function of the extent of their speech repertoires and under the influence of various factors relating to individual difference and environment (Beebe and Giles 1984:8). (A reverse process of divergence is also possible under the influence of certain ingroup and interindividual factors.) The adaptation to the interlocutor's speech may take place by means of a wide variety of linguistic or extralinguistic features such as pauses, speech rate, utterance length, pronunciation, etc. There are interesting, although not yet widely explored, aspects of adjustment in interactions between native and nonnative speakers (see, for example, Long 1983).

3. The role of language in interpretation. In linguistic discussions of communication, the importance of language for communicative success is often exaggerated. Language parameters are, however, highly insufficient to explain success in communication: language use is not a 'linguistic' problem. In message processing, the speaker-hearer makes use of all the available information which he thinks is relevant, irrespective of whether it is embedded in the language code or just present in the context; at the same time the perception of messages is also a function of both the input available in the speech situation and the knowledge which is found in memory. The knowledge which is used in

this process is language knowledge but also information about discourse history and interrelationships between language and the world, and facts and beliefs (see Lehtonen and Sajavaara 1983).

The speaker-hearer makes use of all the incoming and existing information in a fashion that could be described as heterarchical (as against the regular 'linguistic' theories of language, which are hierarchical). In a heterarchical model of processing, it is not possible to predict what data available to the processor give the right cue leading to the most probable interpretation of the message. In many cases the process of interpretation boils down to the question of whether it is possible to conceptualize a 'world' for the potential message. The comprehension system is to be seen 'as a procedure for interpreting utterances rather than as a procedure for establishing their linguistic structure and hence subject to somewhat different constraints from those suggested by linguistic theory' (Garrod 1986:230). The predictions given by the processor on the basis of the data stored in memory are compared with the incoming message, which results in the most probable interpretation or possible retroactive corrections to earlier interpretations. It is important to remember that perception and recognition of new information presuppose existence of previous knowledge.

Dynamic processes interact with rather static structural knowledge about the language and about other relevant factors. Acceptance of a dynamic view of language processing makes it impossible to see language structures such as they are normally described by linguists as mental models of processes: they are only descriptions of regular structures of language and function as constraints on possible strings. This information interacts heterarchically with other types of information, e.g. phonological, semantic, pragmatic, and collocational, in terms of a time-sharing system. The constraints make it possible for the speaker to produce grammatically acceptable strings and to predict incoming bits of discourse. Phonological, lexical, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic knowledge restricts the number of guesses as to the potential identification of the acoustic speech input. The processes through which this takes place are on-line phenomena and proceed incrementally; interpretations are arrived at successively all the time and there is no delay 'until after some larger unit has been sampled' (Garrod 1986:235).

The most important point for the argument in this paper is the fact that recovery of meaning is a global, holistic phenomenon, and it is not possible to give context-free meaning of utterances any special significance. Such context-free interpretation does not precede a referential one (Garrod 1986 includes a wealth of experimental evidence for this). This means that distinctions such as the one suggested by Smith and Nelson (1985) between intelligibility, interpretability, and comprehensibility cannot be made because there cannot be such a thing as intelligibility as a distinct phenomenon in interpersonal encounters.

4. The multiple code. Lehtonen and Sajavaara (1984) have argued for the existence of a dual-code system in receptive processing. It may be that there are not only two but a much greater number of codes available for speech processing.

The processes through which segments of language are perceived operate over stretches of speech which are longer than single elements, and the cues for the establishment of the information for the recognition of certain elements may be spread over several elements. The elements which are used as cues for such a detection procedure need not necessarily correlate with elements which are traditionally abstracted for, for instance, phonological analysis.

For the most part, language processing seems to take place through lexical elements, and lexical items, i.e. words with all the syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and collocational information that they carry with them, are accessed in fluent speech processing on the basis of 'percept skeletons'. The receiver of the message need be exposed only to the beginning of the item and he is able to recognize it on the basis of various predictions derived from the process of interaction. Detailed phonological analysis, for instance, is not necessary under normal circumstances; it is resorted to only if the direct access route fails to give an acceptable answer.

Internalized knowledge of possible language strings reduces the number of potential guesses. As was pointed out above, lexical items seem to play an important part in this process, and it may be the case that language knowledge is stored in memory through the lexicon: thus it may be lexical items that activate syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and other sets of linguistic information.

It is also possible to hypothesize that there are many other routes to potential interpretations on the part of the hearer. Some types of cues may result in right reaction through a rather simple stimulus-reaction sequence in a true behavioristic fashion.

Different persons may work out 'meanings' in different ways: there are more analytic or more holistic types of personality who process information in different ways.

One of the advantages of the application of multiple codes for recovering the meaning of messages is that this kind of system can easily adapt to the fuzziness and variability of physical target values. Changes in the exact physical shape of the acoustic speech signal do not necessarily undermine the chances of meaning recovery.

Not much is known of language-specific differences in language reception and production. There are a number of phenomena which might be interpreted as signs of differences between English and Finnish, which is a non-Indo-European, highly synthetic, agglutinating language. It may be the case that Finns' detection mechanism is geared to picking out cues from the flow of speech which are different from those of speakers of English.

In the early work of the Finnish-English Cross-Language Project with what is pretheoretically called fluency (see Sajavaara and Lehtonen 1978, 1980; Lehtonen 1981), certain interesting types of 'disfluency' were found with Finnish speakers of English which could not be interpreted in any other way but as resulting from processing differences; this data was derived mainly from narrative-type monologues. More recent research seems to imply that similar problems may be found in even more global aspects of interactional discourse, i.e. distribution of talk between speakers, silence, turn exchange signals, etc. (Lehtonen and Sajavaara 1985b, Sneek 1987). Here we are again approaching global differences in communicative style (cf. Scollon and Scollon 1983:157-58), which may again be related to a person's view of himself as a communicator (see Laine 1987).

In Finnish, moreover, there are various features at the surface which may be reflections of a certain type of processing mode; these include stress on the first syllable, word-internal vowel harmony, phonological marking of the verb, and linking of the nodes within NPs through the repetition of case endings. In short, the most important information in Finnish utterances is morphotactic. All these

features seem to be there to help lexical recognition. In English, stress and intonation patterns combined with changes in speech rhythm and chunking seem to draw the hearer's attention mainly to certain key lexical items, which function as pivots for larger meaningful entities.

The same phenomena are also evident when a Finn speaks a foreign language such as English: the most obvious difficulties can be seen in speech rhythm, sentence stress, variation between stressed and unstressed parts of utterance, and marking of lexical boundaries through misleading boundary signals and stress on the first syllable (Finns have, typically, glottalization before every word beginning with a vowel). Finns seem to process utterances word for word, while speakers of English have to rely on larger chunks (for differences between Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking Finns, see Ringbom 1979).

5. Worlds of interpretation. Garrod (1986) points out that

...the weight of the psychological evidence certainly does not favor the view that there are two types of comprehension process, one aimed at recovering 'meaning' in a context-free sense, and another responsible for imposing a full interpretation in terms of what the speaker or writer actually meant. On the contrary, it seems to suggest that comprehension is always aimed at recovering significance, even under circumstances where the reader-listener has to conjure up a context in which to do this [my emphasis].

When in experiments with reaction-time tests with native and Finnish speakers of English (see Lehtonen and Sajavaara 1983, 1985b) the subjects were exposed to both acceptable and unacceptable context-free sentences tachistoscopically, there were instances of acceptable sentences which required longer processing times for the native speakers than they required for Finns (these sentences were mainly of the type There was the accident on the street or My favourite drink is the wine). The main reason for the delay in the native reactions was an attempt to work out a possible context for a sentence which did not initially look acceptable. The first reaction by speakers always seems to be an attempt to recover some significance.

6. Foreign language communication. It is rather easy to see why a foreign-language speaker is handicapped as against a native speaker in situations of communicative interaction. Normal speech recognition and interpretation are automatic processes which progress without the person concerned being conscious of the phenomena which are taking place. Conscious analytic procedures are needed only when problems are encountered through there being unfamiliar items present or the system running into other types of problems.

Most foreign-language speakers have learnt the language in the classroom, and it soon becomes evident as a result of discussions like the foregoing that knowledge of the linguistic structure and a list of words cannot alone be sufficient for fluent communicative interaction. What is needed in addition is experience of real language use for real communicative and meaningful purposes. Otherwise, the foreign-language speaker's capacity to 'imagine' the right kind of words that fit the context remains seriously defective. Gaps in linguistic and cultural knowledge leave the foreign-language speaker handicapped but, at the same time, since he has less experience with the variation of the physical speech signal, he is also more prone to run into problems with the bottom-up processes starting from the speech input. All this means that delays will occur since he has to use conscious problem-solving strategies to fill the gaps. Such problem-solving processes may also result in the use of linguistic and pragmatic information relating to the mother tongue: the speaker-hearer may not be able to recognize the true origin of all the elements because he is only concerned with the recovery of the message's significance. Even translation schemata between L1 and L2 are used, and they may become fossilized under certain circumstances.

In what ways the linguistic and other knowledge of the FL speaker can be defective is beyond the scope of this study. The literature on cross-cultural communication is full of information about problems between a wealth of cultures (an illustrative list of potential areas of trouble can be found in the bibliography and suggestions for research needs provided by Smith and Nelson 1985; Tannen 1984 is also very relevant here); similarly, a fair amount of contrastive linguistic analysis could be reinterpreted in terms of interactional communication, but what is needed in addition is experimental

evidence from contexts where the languages are used for purposes of communication.

It is often said that, at the early stages of second language learning, learners mainly rely on the bottom-up mode, i.e. on the incoming speech signal, and only later make use of the top-down one, i.e. data stored in memory. There is some evidence now (see Tammola 1985, Lehtonen and Sajavaara 1983) that both modes are equally important irrespective of the stage of learning, but learners at different stages make use of the two modes in different ways.

7. Conclusion. A brief summary is needed about the foregoing framework's significance for cross-cultural and cross-linguistic understanding.

If it is the case that people negotiate approximate meanings between themselves, also by creating ad hoc rules or by referring to information available in the context, it is not always necessary to be able to analyse all the linguistic information available in the speech chain. If problems of understanding are approached through an individual's abstract communicative competence without any consideration of the interactional aspect, the result can only be defective. An individual's performance is affected by the interlocutor's performance, and it is fluent if the interlocutor experiences it as fluent.

A human being is highly capable of dealing with uncertainties, and interpersonal communication is full of them. It is one of the supreme aspects of the human communicative system that meanings can be negotiated through percept skeletons by means of a multiple-code system. It is simply not necessary to recognize everything: much less is sufficient. Interpersonal communication can be successful, and people can understand each other, at a stage where linguistic word recognition is still highly defective.

English is often seen at the early stages of the foreign-language learning process as an easy language, and the importance of this attitude cannot be underestimated for the spread of English as a language of international communication. English is felt to be easy because the pivotal items in the speech chain can more easily be recognized than in languages such as Finnish, for instance, in which a great deal of the information necessary for picking

out the cues for subsequent processes is embedded in a complex system of bound morphemes.

It has been possible to discuss here the importance of the speaker's attitude towards his mother tongue, foreign languages, self and others, and society in which these all come up. Everything begins with how the speaker sees himself as a communicator. The cornerstone of an understanding of what goes on in communicative situations is to realize the fundamental value of the differences in the ways in which members of different cultures conceptualize communication in itself and see themselves as participants in it.

References

- Beebe, Leslie M., and Howard Giles. 1984. Speech-accommodation theories: A discussion in terms of second language acquisition. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46.5-32.
- Brown, Gillian. 1986. Investigating listening comprehension in context. *Applied Linguistics* 7.284-302.
- Faerch, Claus, and Gabriele Kasper. 1984. Pragmatic knowledge: Rules and procedures. *Applied Linguistics* 5.214-25.
- Garrod, Simon. 1986. Language comprehension in context: A psychological perspective. *Applied Linguistics* 7.226-38.
- Gudykunst, William B. 1984. A model of uncertainty reduction in intercultural encounters. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 4.79-98.
- Hecht, M.L., K. Sereno, and B. Spitzberg. 1984. Communication satisfaction with self and other: The relevance of relationship level and topic level. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 10.376-84.
- Laine, Eero. 1987. Affective factors in foreign language learning/teaching: A study of the so-called filter. *Jyväskylä Cross-Language Studies* 13. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Lehtonen, Jaakko. 1981. Problems of measuring fluency and normal rate of speech. *Proceedings of the 5th Congress of L'Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée*. Edited by Jean-Guy Savard and Lorne Laforge. 322-32.
- Lehtonen, Jaakko, and Kari Sajavaara. 1983. Acceptability and ambiguity in native and second language message

- processing. In: Psycholinguistics and foreign language learning. Edited by Hakan Ringbom. Publications of the Research Institute of the Abo Akademi Foundation 86. Turku: Abo Akademi. 101-25.
- Lehtonen, Jaakko, and Kari Sajavaara. 1984. Phonology and speech processing in cross-language communication. In: Theoretical issues in contrastive phonology. Edited by Stig Eliasson. Heidelberg: Julius Groos. 85-99.
- Lehtonen, Jaakko, and Kari Sajavaara. 1985a. Psycholinguistic testing of transfer in foreign-language speech processing. LAUT Papers B117. Trier: University of Trier.
- Lehtonen, Jaakko, and Kari Sajavaara. 1985b. The silent Finn. In: Perspectives on silence. Edited by Deborah Tannen and Muriel Saville-Troike. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. 193-201.
- Long, Michael H. 1983. Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 5.177-93.
- McLaughlin, Barry, Tammi Rossman, and Beverly McLeod. 1983. Second language learning: An information-processing perspective. *Language Learning* 33.135-58.
- Parks, Malcolm R. 1985. Interpersonal communication and the quest for personal competence. In: *Handbook of interpersonal communication*. Edited by Mark L. Knapp and Gerald L. Miller. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications. 171-201.
- Ringbom, Hakan. 1979. The English of Finns, Swedes and Swedish Finns: Some concluding remarks. In: *Perception and production of English: Papers on interlanguage*. Edited by Rolf Palmberg. AFTIL 6. Abo: Department of English, Abo Akademi.
- Sajavaara, Kari, and Jaako Lehtonen. 1978. Spoken language and the concept of fluency. In: *Language Centre News, Special issue, focus on spoken language*. Edited by Liisa Lautamatti and Pirkko Lindqvist. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. 23-57.
- Sajavaara, Kari, and Jaakko Lehtonen. 1980a. Language teaching and acquisition of communication. In: *AFinLA Yearbook 1980: Papers in language learning and language acquisition*. Edited by Kari Sajavaara, Anne Räsänen, and Tuula Hirvonen. Publications of the Finnish Association of Applied Linguistics 28. Jyväskylä: AFinLA. 25-35.
- Sajavaara, Kari, and Jaakko Lehtonen. 1980b. The analysis of cross-language communication: Prolegomena to the theory and methodology. In: *Towards a cross-linguistic assessment*

- of speech production. Edited by Hans W. Dechert and Manfred Raupach. Frankfurt am Main: Lang. 55-76.
- Scollon, Ron, and Suzanne B.K. Scollon. 1983. Face in interethnic communication. In: Language and communication. Edited by Jack C. Richards and Richard W. Schmidt. London: Longmans. 156-90.
- Smith, Larry E., and Cecil L. Nelson. 1985. International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes* 4.333-42.
- Sneck, Seppo. 1987. Assessment of chronography in Finnish-English telephone conversation. *Jyväskylä Cross-Language Studies* 14. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1984. The pragmatics of cross-cultural communication. *Applied Linguistics* 5.189-95.
- Tommola, Jorma. 1985. Context effects on the processing of English as a foreign language. *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis* B169. Turku: University of Turku.
- Verschueren, Jef. 1984. Linguistics and crosscultural communication (review article). *Language in Society* 13.489-509.

LANGUAGE SPREAD AND ISSUES OF INTELLIGIBILITY

Larry E. Smith
East-West Center, Honolulu

Introduction. In the recorded history of mankind, there has never been a language to match the present global spread and use of English (Strevens 1982, Quirk and Widdowson 1985, Kachru 1986, Smith 1983). Crystal (1985) has estimated that as many as 2 billion people have some ability in English. Whether we accept Crystal's figure or not, it is certain that whatever the total number is, nonnative users of English outnumber the native users.

With such spread of the language, a frequently voiced concern is the possibility that speakers of different varieties of English will soon become unintelligible to one another. My response to such a statement is that for at least the last 200 years there have been English-speaking people in parts of the world who have not been intelligible to other English-speaking people in other parts of the world. It is a natural phenomenon when any language becomes so widespread. It is not something that is 'going to happen' but something which has happened already and will continue to occur. I take the position that it is unnecessary for every user of English to be intelligible to every other user of English. Our speech/writing in English needs to be intelligible only to those with whom we wish to communicate in English. For example, there may be many people in India who use English frequently among themselves and who are not intelligible to English-speaking Filipinos who also frequently use English among themselves; members of these two groups may not, as yet, have felt the need (or had the opportunity) to communicate with one another. These Indians and Filipinos may use English to communicate only with fellow countrymen and have little or no difficulty in doing so. If that is so, neither of these groups needs to be concerned about their

international intelligibility. Of course, there are many Indians and many Filipinos who use English to interact internationally, and they are the ones who must be concerned about mutual intelligibility on an international scale.

Perhaps the question dealing with the spread of English and the concern about intelligibility can be rephrased in the following way: 'In international situations where people wish to communicate with one another in English, how intelligible are speakers of different national varieties? With the global spread of English, is the problem of understanding across cultures likely to increase in frequency?'

Elsewhere (Smith and Nelson 1985) I have argued that native speakers are not the sole judges of what is intelligible nor are they always more intelligible than nonnative speakers. I have taken the position that the greater the familiarity a speaker (native or nonnative) has with a variety of English, the more likely it is that s/he will understand, and be understood by, members of that speech community. I have suggested that understanding is not speaker-or-listener centered but is interactional between speaker and listener, and that understanding should be divided into three categories:

(1) intelligibility:	word/utterance recognition;
(2) comprehensibility:	word/utterance meaning (locutionary force);
(3) interpretability:	meaning behind word/utterance (illocutionary force);

and that these three could be thought of as degrees of understanding on a continuum, with intelligibility being lowest and interpretability being highest.

This paper reports on a pilot study which was designed to help determine: (1) what differences, if any, there are in the intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability of selected taped material of nine national varieties; (2) how familiarity of topic and familiarity of national variety influence the listener's understanding of these varieties; and (3) if the language proficiency of the speaker and/or listener influence/s the intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability of these varieties.

For this study, the nine national varieties, represented on tape, were spoken by educated speakers (at the graduate level at the University of Hawaii) from China, India,

Indonesia, Japan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The tests of intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability which were based on these recordings were administered to three different groups of native and nonnative educated users of English.

Subjects. To test the assumptions concerning the effects of proficiency in English and familiarity with topic and speech variety on understanding (intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability), I wanted to have both native and nonnative educated English users as subjects. I wanted these subjects to range in their proficiency in English and in their familiarity with the content of the selections, as well as familiarity with the national variety of English being used by the speakers. The three groups were: (1) nonnative speakers (NNS), (2) native speakers (NS), and (3) mixed (NS and NNS).

Group 1: Nonnative speakers. This group was made up of ten nonnative English speakers from Japan whose English proficiency ranged from scores of 375 to 600 on the TOEFL test; four of these were students in the Hawaii English Language Program (HELP) at the University of Hawaii and six were students at the Japan-America Institute of Management Science (JAIMS), which is located in Honolulu. Subjects in this group were familiar with the Japanese variety of English, as well as the content of the Japanese speaker's presentation on 'Forms of Address' (i.e. how Japanese address non-Japanese in English at international meetings). Since they had studied English for at least ten years and were presently students in the United States, they were also somewhat familiar with the American and British varieties of English and with the content of the U.S. and British speakers' presentations on 'Forms of Address' (i.e. how British and Americans address outsiders in English at international meetings). However, these subjects were not familiar with any of the other speech varieties or with the topic of forms of address used in the other countries.

Group 2: Native speakers. This group was made up of ten native speakers of American English who were undergraduate students at the University of Hawaii. All were quite familiar with the American English used by the American speaker on

the tape, as well as the content of her presentation on 'Forms of Address'. They were not totally familiar with any other of the speech varieties on the tapes but had had greater exposure to the Japanese and Filipino varieties than to any of the others. They knew little or nothing about forms of address in any country other than the United States.

Group 3: Mixed. This group was composed of one native and eight nonnative speakers, each of whom came from a different country. There was one each from Burma, China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, and the United States. Each of these people was fully fluent in English (better than 600 on the TOEFL test) and as East-West Center graduate students, they had all become familiar with several different national varieties of English. They were also familiar to some extent with the forms of address used in different countries because of their interactions at the East-West Center with people from many parts of the world.

All three groups were balanced for age, sex, and educational background. The subjects with the lower TOEFL scores were highly intelligent and well educated, but they had not had much experience interacting in English.

Test materials. In order to have educated English speakers of the nine national varieties interacting with one another, I used graduate and postgraduate students of the University of Hawaii who were fluent in English. The speakers were asked to explain to an interactor who was of another national variety the forms of address used by the speaker's countrymen when they used English to address outsiders. The respondent was, in each case, a person whom the speaker did not know and who knew little about, but was interested in, the speaker's country. The respondent was instructed, in the speaker's presence, to listen to the speaker, interrupt with questions of clarification when necessary, and give evidence of understanding the speaker by paraphrasing the important points the speaker made. The speaker was instructed to make sure the respondent understood how people in his/her country would address an outsider in English, for example, at international meetings both inside and outside his/her country. Both were told that the recording session was to be informal but real. That is,

they were to speak to each other as peers in an informal situation. They were not to pretend that they were other people or that the setting was another place. They were to recognize and accept the fact that they were two people in a recording studio at the East-West Center in Honolulu. Once the speaker was satisfied that the respondent understood what the speaker had said about the topic, the conversation should stop. The interactors were told that they could make notes but that neither was to read directly from the notes. The sessions were totally unrehearsed and lasted from 20 to 40 minutes. The tapes of these sessions were edited down to ten minutes of conversation which could be used as material for the comprehensibility and interpretability tests. For the intelligibility test the subjects heard a part of the preedited conversation, not chosen as part of the ten-minute selection. This was done so that the subjects would not hear any part of the conversation twice. In addition to the conversations with speakers of the nine national varieties mentioned above, one tape involving a speaker from Burma and a respondent from Thailand was also made to use in a demonstration of the testing procedure for all three subject groups.

Although no formal attempt was made to evaluate the difficulty level of the interactions, all were judged to be approximately equal in that: (1) both speaker and respondent were fully proficient in English and believed themselves to be educated speakers of their national variety of English, (2) each person spoke clearly, and (3) the number of embedded sentences and the speed of delivery were approximately the same for all interactions. Of course, the setting and topic were always the same and there was never any technical jargon used. In each case, if the speaker was male the respondent was female, and vice versa, so that on each tape both sexes were represented.

Three types of test questions were developed. The cloze procedure was used to test intelligibility (word/utterance recognition). Multiple choice questions were written to test comprehensibility (word/utterance meaning). Subjects were asked to paraphrase a small portion of the conversation they had heard in order to test their level of interpretability (meaning behind word/utterance). The test questions and directions were recorded by the same speaker.

Procedure. I began each testing session by saying to each of the three subject groups that I was doing a study on the

degrees of understanding of different national varieties of English and that I appreciated the subjects' willingness to cooperate. I said that the results of the tests would have no effect on their academic work but that I was sure that they would do their best. I then told them we would have a trial test and that they could ask any question about the procedure during this sample test. Each subject group then listened to the tape about forms of address in Burma and filled out the sample test items for the cloze procedure (intelligibility), multiple choice (comprehensibility), and paraphrasing (interpretability). During this time I encouraged the subjects to ask any questions and I answered them. After the sample test, I asked them to fill out the more subjective questionnaire (see Appendix) and allowed them to ask questions about it. On that form they were asked to state such things as (1) how easy/difficult it was for them to understand the speaker and respondent; (2) how much of the total conversation they had understood; (3) the nationalities of the speaker and the respondent; and (4) the English proficiency level of the speaker and the respondent.

For each of the five paired recordings, each subject group first listened to a ten-minute conversation between two people about how people in the speaker's country address outsiders in English, with the respondent asking questions and paraphrasing the important points of what had been said. At the end of each conversation about forms of address in a particular country, the subjects were given a test which consisted of (1) a cloze procedure of a passage with ten blanks (one at every seventh word) to be filled in as they listened, phrase by phrase, to a part of the original, longer conversation that they had not heard before; (2) three multiple-choice questions based on the ten-minute conversation that they had heard; and (3) three phrases taken from the ten-minute interaction which were to be paraphrased according to the meaning of the phrases in the conversation. This system was followed for each of the five paired recordings. (That is, (1) the subjects heard a tape about a country; (2) the subjects were tested on that country; (3) the subjects heard the next tape about another country; (4) the subjects were tested on that country. This continued until all five paired recordings had been heard and tested.) The order of the five pairs of taped conversations was different for each of the subject groups to ensure that any practice effect was balanced across varieties.

I administered all of the tests to the three subject groups on separate days within a two-month period (October/November, 1986). Identical playback equipment was used for each group, always in quiet surroundings. The tests were all graded by the same individual within a few days after they were completed and given to me for analysis.

Results and discussion. Listed in Figures 1, 2, and 3 are the tabulated results of the three parts of the text (i.e. cloze for intelligibility (word/utterance recognition); multiple choice for comprehensibility (word/utterance meaning); and paraphrasing for interpretability (meaning behind word/utterance)) for each of the three groups. The speakers (with respondents in parentheses) that the subjects heard are listed in alphabetical order of country on the left-hand side of each figure. In each case, the percentage listed is the percentage of the subjects in that group which answered 60% or more of the test items correctly. For example, from Figure 1 we learn that when listening to the speaker from the United Kingdom interacting with her respondent from Papua New Guinea, 70% of the nonnative subjects got 60% or more of the intelligibility test items correct, whereas 100% of the native speaker subjects and 100% of the mixed subjects got 60% or more of the intelligibility items correct.

When we examine the results as tabulated in Figures 1, 2, and 3, it is evident that all three subject groups did best on the test of intelligibility. Ninety-two percent of the nonnative subjects, 100% of the native subjects, and 100% of the mixed subjects got 60% or more of the intelligibility test items correct. It appears that all of the interactions were highly intelligible to the three subject groups but that the most intelligible were those with the speakers from Japan (respondent from China), India (respondent from the Philippines), and the United States (respondent from Indonesia). The pair with the speaker from China (respondent from Taiwan) and the pair with the speaker from the United Kingdom (respondent from Papua New Guinea) were somewhat less intelligible. Language proficiency may have made a difference in the results of the intelligibility test, but being a native speaker was not a deciding factor since the mixed group--with eight nonnatives and one native--performed equally well on the test.

Figure 1. Intelligibility: 60% and above.

Test material	Subjects			
Speaker (respondent)	NNS: 10, all from Japan	NS: 10, all from U.S.	Mixed: 9 (1 NS and 8 NNS, each from a dif- ferent country)	Average
China (Taiwan)	90%	100%	100%	97%
India (Philippines)	100%	100%	100%	100%
Japan (China)	100%	100%	100%	100%
United Kingdom (Papua New Guinea)	70%	100%	100%	90%
United States (Indonesia)	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average	92%	100%	100%	

When examining Figure 2, concerning the comprehensibility (word/utterance meaning), we note that the averages for all three groups were lower. Sixty-two percent of the nonnative subjects, 82% of the native subjects, and 70% of the mixed subjects got 60% or more of the comprehensibility test items correct. The speaker from the United Kingdom with the respondent from Papua New Guinea were the most comprehensible, with 90% of the nonnative group getting 60% or more of the test items correct, and 100% of the native group and 100% of the mixed group doing the same. This is interesting because this is the pair that was the least intelligible. It is also interesting that the Japanese speaker with the Chinese respondent was the second most comprehensible pair, with the pairs from India/Philippines, U.S./Indonesia, and China/Taiwan being about equal in difficulty for comprehensibility. I had expected all of the subject groups to comprehend the tapes about forms of address in the United States, as well as the one about forms of address in the United Kingdom, more easily than the others because each of the groups had studied English for at least ten years and had learned a great deal of cultural information about both countries.

Figure 2. Comprehensibility: 60% and above.

Test material		Subjects		
Speaker	NNS (10)	NS (10)	Mixed (9)	Average
China (Taiwan)	40%	80%	60%	60%
India	40%	90%	60%	63%
(Philippines)				
Japan (China)	80%	80%	70%	77%
United Kingdom	90%	100%	100%	97%
(Papua New Guinea)				
United States	60%	60%	60%	60%
(Indonesia)				
Average	62%	82%	70%	

In other words, they knew the topic and were somewhat familiar with each of these speech varieties. I also expected the Japanese group and the American group to comprehend more easily the tapes about forms of address in their respective countries since they obviously knew the information upon which the test for their country was based. A possible reason for the subjects not doing this is that although new information was given on each tape, the general topic was the same. This may explain why familiarity with topic was not a major factor in the subjects' ability to comprehend the interactions. If the topics had been Noh theater, nuclear physics, or anything else general rather than forms of address, the effects of familiarity with topic might have been greater. As I tabulated the subjective questionnaire about each pair of interactors, I found other information which offered another possible reason. In both cases dealing with the American and Japanese subjects listening to a speaker from their country interacting with a respondent from another country, the responses of the subjects to the respondents may have been a factor in the somewhat surprising results. All (100%) of the native-speaking subjects (i.e. the Americans) responded that they could easily understand the American speaker but only 30% said that they could easily understand the respondent, who was from Indonesia. Sixty percent of the nonnative group (i.e. the Japanese) responded that they could easily

understand the Japanese speaker but 70% said that they had some difficulty with the respondent, who was from China. It may have been their difficulty in understanding the respondent ('accent too heavy') which caused them to have comprehensibility problems with the entire conversation.

Figure 3 provides some insightful information. It is evident that the mixed subjects (one native and eight nonnatives, each from a different country), who had the greatest familiarity with different speech varieties, were best able to interpret correctly (i.e. know meaning behind word/utterance) the interactions of the five pairs of interactors. Twenty-six percent of the nonnative speakers, 50% of the native speakers, and 89% of the mixed subjects got 60% or more of the interpretability test items correct. The mixed subject group was better on all five pairs than the native or nonnative subject groups. This is an important finding since I believe interpretability is at the core of communication and is more important than mere intelligibility or comprehensibility. This part of the study offers supporting evidence that familiarity with several different English varieties makes it easier to interpret cross-cultural communication in English. No doubt this is influenced by the fact that familiarity with different speech varieties also involves an awareness of cultural differences and some knowledge of different cultures. This is not to say that proficiency in the language is unimportant. The mixed group was fully fluent in English although not at the native speaker level, except for one. Additional evidence that proficiency is important is the fact that the native-speaker subject group was better at interpreting all five interactions than the lower-in-proficiency, nonnative subject group. The nonnative subject group and the native subject group found the China/Taiwan and the Japan/China pairs easiest to interpret and all three subject groups found the India/Philippines pair the most difficult to interpret. Only the mixed group found the U.S./Indonesia pair to be the easiest to interpret, perhaps because they were the only ones familiar with many varieties of English. The native-speaker group and the nonnative-speaker group were not familiar with the Indonesian speech variety and this may have been a factor in their inability to interpret the U.S./Indonesia interaction correctly.

Figure 3. Interpretability: 60% and above.

Test material	Subjects			
Speaker	NNS (10)	NS (10)	Mixed (9)	Average
China (Taiwan)	40%	60%	89%	63%
India (Philippines)	10%	40%	78%	43%
Japan (China)	40%	60%	89%	63%
United Kingdom (Papua New Guinea)	10%	50%	89%	50%
United States (Indonesia)	30%	40%	100%	57%
Average	26%	50%	89%	

The other responses from the subjective questionnaires were also of interest to me. Figure 4 shows the percentage of each subject group which thought they understood 60% or more of the conversations between the five sets of interactors.

Figure 4. Percentage of subject groups which thought they understood 60% or more of the conversations between the five sets of interactors.

Test material	Subjects		
Speaker	NNS (10)	NS (10)	Mixed (9)
China (Taiwan)	30%	100%	100%
India (Philippines)	10%	90%	100%
Japan (China)	90%	90%	100%
United Kingdom (Papua New Guinea)	30%	90%	100%
United States (Indonesia)	40%	100%	100%

It is clear that the mixed group of subjects, which was most familiar with different national varieties of English, had the most confidence in their ability to understand the conversations. Note that 100% of the native-speaker subject group thought that they understood the U.S./Indonesia pair and that 90% of the nonnative-subject group (i.e. the Japanese) thought that they understood the Japan/China pair. It seems that familiarity with topic and familiarity with at least one of the speech varieties being used in a conversation cause one to believe that s/he understands a majority of what s/he hears. Figure 5 shows the percentages of subjects making accurate guesses as to the nationalities of the pairs in the conversations.

Figure 5. Percentage of subjects making accurate guesses as to the nationalities of the pairs in the conversations.

Test material	Subjects		
Speaker	NNS (10)	NS (10)	Mixed (9)
China	50%	100%	100%
(Taiwan)*	70%	60%	100%
India	20%	90%	100%
(Philippines)*	60%	100%	100%
Japan	90%	100%	100%
(China)*	80%	100%	100%
United Kingdom	70%	70%	89%
(Papua New Guinea)*	10%	20%	100%
United States	90%	80%	100%
(Indonesia)*	0%	0%	10%

* The country of origin was actually mentioned on the tape.

Again, the mixed subject group was best followed by the native-speaker group and the nonnative speakers. I was surprised, however, that although four of the ten interactors on the tapes identified themselves as being nationals of a particular country, only the mixed group identified their nationalities accurately. I was not surprised that few subjects recognized the Indonesian speaker since they had

been exposed to so few Indonesians. I believe it would have been the same for the person from Papua New Guinea if he had not identified himself. It is interesting to note that the native-speaker group was not as able to identify correctly their fellow American as well as the nonnative subject group or the mixed subject group did. The native speaker subjects were better able to identify the nationalities of the interactors from China, Japan, India, and the Philippines than they were the speaker from the United States. The nonnative subject group identified the speakers from Japan most easily and identified speakers from the United States more easily than they did speakers from the United Kingdom. I believe that the native-speaker subject group would be surprised to learn of their low percentage of accuracy and that the nonnative subject group would be surprised at their high degree of accuracy. The mixed subject group did well and, except for the Indonesian respondent, they seemed confident in making their responses. They would perhaps be surprised that they didn't guess the British person's nationality with greater accuracy. Responses from two other questions on the questionnaire deserve reporting. The questions dealt with the subjects' perceptions of the interactors' level of education and proficiency in English. Each question (numbers 7 and 8 in the Appendix) was identical except that number 7 was about the presenter and number 8 was about the respondent. The question was as follows:

Based on what you heard, it seems that the _____
 (question 7 had 'presenter' here, question 8 had
 'respondent') is (check as many as you wish.)
 highly educated _____ educated _____ not well educated
 _____ a native English speaker _____ a nonnative English
 speaker _____ a speaker of standard English _____ a
 speaker of nonstandard English _____

Figure 6 gives the tabulated results of these two questions. It is evident that the interactors were always perceived by a great majority of the subjects to be educated or highly educated. A small percentage (10%) of the nonnative-speaker subjects thought the speaker from India was not well educated and an equally small percentage (10%) of the native-speaker subjects thought the respondents from Papua New Guinea and Indonesia were not well educated. Subjects

in the mixed group thought that all of the speakers and respondents were highly educated or educated.

Figure 6. Subjects' perceptions of interactors' level of education and proficiency in English.

Countries of interactors NNS (10):	Subjects' perceptions		
	HE/E/NWE	NS/NNS	SE/NSE
China	50/50/0	20/80	50/10*
Taiwan	30/70/0	10/70*	50/20*
India	30/60/10	0/100	30/50*
Philippines	50/50/0	30/70	50/30*
Japan	40/60/0	20/70*	60/30*
China	40/60/0	10/90	80/0*
United Kingdom	40/60/0	70/20*	50/30*
Papua New Guinea	50/40/0*	40/50*	40/20*
United States	50/50/0	80/20	70/20*
Indonesia	10/90/0	40/60	50/30*
NS (10):			
China	70/30/0	0/100	70/10*
Taiwan	40/60/0	30/70	50/20*
India	10/90/0	20/80	40/40*
Philippines	10/90/0	0/100	50/30*
Japan	10/90/0	0/100	40/40*
China	0/100/0	0/100	70/10*
United Kingdom	50/50/0	90/10	70/0*
Papua New Guinea	20/70/10	60/40	60/20*
United States	40/40/0*	100/0	80/0*
Indonesia	20/60/10*	20/80	60/30*

Figure 6 (continued)

Countries of interactors Mixed (9):	Subjects' perceptions		SE/NSE
	HE/E/NWE	NS/NNS	
China	67/33/0	0/100	78/22
Taiwan	33/67/0	0/100	22/78
India	56/44/0	33/67	67/33
Philippines	56/44/0	22/78	67/33
Japan	11/89/0	0/100	11/89
China	22/78/0	0/100	50/50
United Kingdom	56/44/0	89/11	89/11
Papua New Guinea	22/78/0	33/67	33/67
United States	44/56/0	78/22	67/33
Indonesia	11/89/0	11/89	11/89

Key: HE Highly educated
 E Educated
 NWE Not well educated
 NS Native speaker of English
 NNS Nonnative speaker of English
 SE Standard English
 NSE Non-Standard English
 * Some subjects did not reply.

Generally, all three subject groups did well in correctly identifying the interactors as native or nonnative English speakers. The majority was accurate in every case except for one. Sixty percent of the native speaker subjects guessed that the respondent from Papua New Guinea was a native speaker of English. In spite of this, the native-speaker group was able to label correctly more of the interactors as native or nonnative than either of the other two subject groups. The mixed group was a close second, however.

What I find most interesting about Figure 6 is the final listing, which concerns the subjects' perceptions about the interactors using Standard or non-Standard English. Most of

the native-speaker subject group and the nonnative-speaker subject group thought everyone used Standard English. The only exceptions were the speakers from India and Japan. Fifty percent of the nonnative subject group thought that the speaker from India used non-Standard English. The native-speaker subject group was equally divided about the speaker from India and the speaker from Japan in that 40% thought they used standard and 40% thought they used nonstandard. I was pleased to learn that many native and nonnative speakers of English would label most educated speakers of nonnative English as users of Standard English. The mixed subject group was more critical and seemed to have had a stricter criterion for Standard English. Thirty-three percent of this group thought that the speaker from the United States used non-Standard English. I had thought that many nonnative speakers and most native speakers would label people who were clearly nonnative users as speakers of non-Standard English. It seems clear that nonnative English speakers do not have to be indistinguishable from native speakers in order to be judged as using Standard English. These results support the interpretation that it is possible for Standard English to be spoken with many different accents. I believe that this is one of the very positive results of the vast spread of English across the globe.

Conclusion. In order to check whether or not the spread of English is creating greater problems of understanding across cultures, this pilot study was done with three types of subject groups (i.e. nonnative, native, and mixed) involving nine different national varieties. Understanding was divided into three parts on a continuum: intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability. There is evidence from the study which supports the position that there are major differences between intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability as defined in the study. Intelligibility (word/utterance recognition) is easier than comprehensibility (word/utterance meaning) or interpretability (meaning behind word/utterance). Being able to do well with one does not ensure that one will be able to do well with the others. They are not interchangeable. Having a familiarity with the information presented did not seem to affect any of the three groups, but those subjects having a greater familiarity with different varieties of English performed better on the tests of interpretability than those who did not have such

familiarity. Being familiar with topic and speech variety did have an effect on the subjects' perceptions of how well they had understood. Language proficiency does influence intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability, but it seems to be most important for comprehensibility. Native speakers (from the U.K. and the U.S.) were not found to be the most easily understood nor were they, as subjects, found to be the best able to understand the different varieties of English. Being a native speaker does not seem to be as important as being fluent in English and familiar with several different national varieties. These results are interesting but more importantly, they indicate that the increasing number of varieties of English need not increase the problems of understanding across cultures if users of English develop some familiarity with them.

Appendix

Directions: Answer the following questions by putting a check mark (✓) in the appropriate space provided, according to how you feel about the taped material that you have just heard.

1. Could you understand what the presenter said?

:	:	:	:
easily	: with some	: with great	: not at all
	difficulty	: difficulty	

2. Could you understand what the respondent said?

:	:	:	:
easily	: with some	: with great	: not at all
	difficulty	: difficulty	

3. How much of the conversation did you understand?

:	:	:	:	:	:
90% >	: 75%-89%	: 61%-74%	: 50%-60%	: 34%-49%	: <33%

4. Did you have difficulty understanding the conversation?
 Yes _____ No _____ If Yes, check the appropriate reasons. (You may check as many as you wish.)

_____ I could not understand the meaning of what was said.

_____ One or both speakers did not speak clearly.

_____ One or both speakers spoke too quickly.

_____ The accent of the presenter was too heavy.

_____ The accent of the respondent was too heavy.

- ____ Other (please write) _____
5. What is the presenter's nationality? _____
6. What is the respondent's nationality? _____
7. Based on what you heard, it seems that the presenter is
... (check as many as you wish.)
highly educated _____ educated _____ not well educated
_____ a native English speaker _____
a nonnative English speaker _____ a speaker of Standard
English _____ a speaker of non-Standard English _____
8. Based on what you heard, it seems that the respondent
is ... (check as many as you wish.)
highly educated _____ educated _____ not well educated
_____ a native English speaker _____ a non-native
English speaker _____ a speaker of Standard English _____
a speaker of non-Standard English _____

References

- Crystal, David. 1985. How many millions? The statistics of English today. *English Today* 1:7-9.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1986. *The alchemy of English: The spread, models and functions of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, and H.G. Widdowson, eds. 1985. *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Larry E., ed. 1983. *Readings in English as an international language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Smith, Larry E., and Cecil E. Nelson. 1985. International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes* 3:333-42.
- Stevens, Peter. 1982. World English and the world's Englishes; or, whose language is it, anyway? *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* 5311:418-31.

PARTICULAR TREASURES: ON BEING AND BECOMING A SPEAKER OF ENGLISH

John J. Staczek
Georgetown University

0. Introduction. In a departure from the classical and traditional rhetorical norms for the introduction to a paper, I wish to take some license and introduce the topic in not one but a variety of ways. I want to discuss a number of issues that relate to language choice, language maintenance, language shift, language neglect, and language conservation as they affect the speakers of English in a speech community that can be traced back four and even five generations. These issues involve not only the status of English and choices made to shift to English, but also relate to issues in second or foreign language learning in the United States. The speech community represents a case study for this paper; the languages of its various members are Polish, Spanish, Hungarian, German, and English. This is the general framework of my remarks and the first of the ways to introduce them.

The title of this paper intends a certain ambiguity in that it might have taken the path of discussing how one becomes a speaker of English and what an English speaker, or any other language speaker, for that matter, is. It might have taken an alternate path and discussed, in this speech community, what changes were required as generations of other language speakers began to choose English and what happened with their linguistic heritage. It is the latter I intend because I believe there is a need to celebrate linguistic heritage, to rediscover it, and to restore, as a richness of human resource, what is retrievable linguistically and culturally. It was in the preface to the first edition of Haugen's The Norwegian Language in America that I found encouragement about how such personal '...homely materials could become the subject of scientific study...' (1969:ix).

Returning to the title, let me simply say that the first part comes from a recent issue of the New York Times Magazine. It reads:

The Sophisticated Traveler
Particular Treasures
A Global Compendium of Small Worlds

This part of the title is appropriate because it conveys the meaning of personal reaches into several languages and cultures. The second part of the title derives not only from an eagerness to pay tribute to linguistic heritage but also from a personal and professional desire to try to account for adaptations, choices, changes, and results in the speech community of my heritage, the characteristics of which are not unusual for immigrant language groups as a whole. The heritage of different languages, as I will show, evolves into a new and different heritage, a shift, in varying degrees, to English. In his discussion of the 'bilingual problem' and the 'bilingual dilemma', Haugen clearly defines an aspect of the bilingual issue, namely, the individual and community bilingual in the United States:

As for the bilinguals themselves, some have accepted their lot with enthusiasm, others with resignation, but many more have sought to evade it by becoming anglicized as soon as possible. However prominent bilingualism may be as a trait of American life, it is eclipsed by the continual flight of the bilinguals themselves from bilingualism. Very little prestige has been attached to the having of bilingual capacities. It has usually not been considered good form to make much of one's European background, particularly not of the linguistic accomplishments (Haugen 1969:2).

There has been little change since 1952 and 1969, little change in the individual, community, and societal attitude toward immigrant bilingualism and what positive effects it could have today. In the 1940s and 1950s it was easier to have a national linguistic myopia than it is today; we are, after all, living in a different, more globally interdependent world.

1. **Language conservation.** If we look at linguistic and cultural heritage, as a work of art that has been created in

color and composition, we find today that many of these works of art have begun to lose their detail through conscious and unconscious choices and neglect in a setting where English is the principal language. Earlier, I briefly alluded to the question of conservation, or as Campbell and Schnell put it in a forthcoming (1987) article in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, in which they discuss the concept of language conservation in an experiment with Korean-American students:

It is our contention that the principles of conservation... especially 'planned management' and prevention of 'destruction or neglect', have not, in any logical manner, been applied to the conservation of the extraordinarily valuable language resources that substantial numbers of linguistic minority children bring to our schools. Rather we regularly, as a matter of unspoken national policy, squander these resources in a manner that is clearly contrary to our own best interests and detrimental to the education and welfare of the minority populations affected (Campbell and Schnell, forthcoming).

While Campbell and Schnell's definition of 'conservation' is based on the fashionable and popular ecological analogy, I wish to return the analogy to an art world source which says that, once a work of art has been created, the problem of its conservation begins, conservation that includes maintenance, preservation (even protection from neglect, damage, or deterioration, as some might choose to call it), and restoration. I view language and culture as an architectural artifice with structure, form, organization, strength, and power. Its conservation must rest on the responsibilities of individuals, communities, and societies to protect or maintain their linguistic and cultural heritage. These responsibilities, if not rightly assumed, diminish over generations; and in the English-speaking world of American communities, with immigrant ties to a different linguistic and cultural past, we find, as Neusner (1987) writes in a recent Washington Post article, 'Is America the Promised Land of the Jews?':

The immigrant generations of Jews built good lives in America, and their great grandchildren are still Jewish. True enough, they are Jewish in ways different from what

their great grandparents understood. For example, they speak unaccented American, not Yiddish...they also maintain the marks of a highly distinctive community. Every social study has turned up strong evidence of Jews' communal cohesiveness (Neusner 1987:B5).

We see the linguistic and cultural heritage celebrated in many places, including Steinmetz's Yiddish and English (1986) and in a recent article (Berger 1987:38) in the New York Times about the preservation of the Yiddish archives of the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, among whose staff

...there are survivors of the destroyed communities of Eastern Europe and younger American Jews who insistently clung to Yiddish within a society that goaded them to neglect the language as musty and decaying. They labor...in the unglamorous task of reclaiming the cultural heritage of Yiddish-speaking Jews and preserving a language that is surprising doomsayers by blossoming at one end--among younger Jews--while it appears to wither at the other.

This reference to the Yiddish language in the United States is not to be misinterpreted as exclusivist with regard to attempts at conservation of a minority language but rather as exemplary of the results.

2. Language mixing in literature. Among other examples in recent literature, two world-class authors have chosen, in their own subtle ways, to demonstrate not only linguistic heritage but also the admixture of languages in a single individual. Umberto Eco (1980; translation by Weaver 1983), on the one hand, in the scene he creates with the glossolalic speech of Salvatore in The Name of the Rose, dramatizes the speech in related languages in what appears to be fabricated and nonmeaningful speech:

Penitenziagite! Watch out for the draco who cometh in futurum to gnaw your anima! Death is super nos! Pray the Santo Pater come to liberar nos a malo and all our sin! Ha, ha, you like this negromanzia de Domini Nostri Jesu Christi! Et anco jois m'es dols e plazer m'es dolors....Cave el diabolio! Semper lying in wait for me in some angulum to snap at my heels. But Salvatore is not stupidus! Bonum

monasterium, and aqui refectorium and pray to dominum nostrum. And the resto is not worth merda. Amen. No? (1983:46).

In a masterful English translation (and preservation of the original) of a carefully crafted speech by Salvatore, Eco transports us through a historical process of code switching, dialect switching, code mixing, if you will.

And, Juan Goytisolo (1975; translation by Lane 1977), in his Juan sin tierra or John the landless, through his translator, also dramatizes, for other purposes, the richness of the linguistic heritage of Spanish through its association with an Arabic past:

from this point on, break the habit of the language that was yours, begin by writing it in accordance with simple phonetic intuitions, without troubling yourself to ask the permission of Dona Hakademe, in order to foller from now on the trew speach patters of millyuns of spikers who youse it everie day without reelizing their vilating the penile code imposed by its mendarins, fergetting lil by lil everythin they taut you, in a deliverate and lused effert to illiterate yerself that will lede you to renownse the wurd of yer naytive tung one by one and finally replace them by that lugha al arabya el tebda tadrus chuya b-chuya lugha uara bissaf ualakini eli tjab bissaf, knowing verie well that from now on lassmek t-takalem mesyan ila tebghi tsafar men al bildan...(Goytisolo 1977:268).

Eco and Goytisolo, in the original and in the translation of their works, might be accused of portraying a character as linguistically and culturally schizophrenic. Yet, upon further reading of the texts, we are struck by the attention to detail in what is at once a deteriorative and restorative portrayal of the state of language in the minds of two different characters, two speakers whose mental images reflect changes in linguistic heritage.

3. Sample accounts of language shift and language choice. Through yet another descriptive introduction, I have chosen to remark about the linguistic heritage of a sample¹ of college students, some 43 students who were asked to prepare a written account of the linguistic choices in their families as far back as three and four generations. Not surprisingly,

the responses only served to reinforce my own reflections on the linguistic heritage and later choices in my own family. Many of these students recounted linguistic odysseys that have produced English as a primary language of the family; it has replaced other languages that were once the first languages of the great grandparents, their grandparents, and their parents. Their choice of English is neatly summed up in part of Strevens' concluding remarks in an address to the British Royal Society of Arts:

So, whose language is English, anyway? The answer must be that it belongs to everyone who wants or needs it, and that it belongs exclusively to no nation, no community, no individual. Being a native speaker of English may sometimes be convenient in practical terms, but the fact bestows no moral virtue on the individual concerned (Strevens 1982:427).

The family as a speech community, in these cases, has adopted English and, if I might use so strong a term, forsaken to a large extent the languages of their ancestors. In some cases, there are only vague memories of another linguistic past, for example:

Five generations ago...the linguistic history of my family is very clear-cut: Russian on my father's side and German on my mother's...Russian has completely disappeared in the language of my father's family...The first language I chose to study was German...I chose to study Russian to help my career...

...My ancestors all came from Spain...My great grandfather...spoke Catalan...My mother never learned English...My father had no other choice but to learn English...Although we are all native speakers of Spanish...I am now a French major...and will probably minor in German and would like to learn Italian and Portuguese...

...growing up on a farm in the rural Midwest is not exactly a fostering environment to spark a desire to learn a foreign language...I am the fifth generation of a group of Swiss emigrants [sic]...when Albert, my great greatgrandfather overheard some derogatory comments about the fact that his family spoke a language that sounded a lot like

what the German enemy spoke...he said that they were in America now. They would act like Americans and speak English; it was forbidden to speak anything else in the house. Unfortunately, this is when the Swiss German language died for my family...

The histories abound in this small sample of combinations of Russian, Polish, and Yiddish, of French and Spanish, of Turkish, Albanian, and Polish, of Italian; and, when the students talk of the present and the language shift that has occurred, they also discuss their own academic and personal choices to return or to change. There are two other cases among these samples that are worth recounting:

...I discovered that I have linguistic roots [back nearly five generations] in England, Ireland, Czechoslovakia, France, Denmark, and Sweden...[my grandmother] spoke a little Czech, but mostly English...[my father] learned Czech prayers and hymns...Czech was lost, replaced by English...[my mother's linguistic heritage goes back] to family in Denmark, France and Ireland...My mother... received her degree in French and taught for several years...I have decided not to major in French, but in Russian...

And, finally, the case of the young woman whose family now speaks English but whose cultural White Russian tradition, for religious unity, continues to support Russian within the nuclear family:

My family is a Russian one, and the Russian language plays a unifying role within the family...My father's first language was English...He was taught Russian at an early age and learned French so that he could go to school...My mother's first language was Russian, but she learned French quickly and then tackled English... stationed in West Germany with the U.S. Air Force, my parents learned German, too...[my niece] is four years old and English is her first language although she will start learning French soon. She'll probably get some basic Russian training, too, because like the rest of us, she is Russian Orthodox, and she needs it to understand a little of what is going on in the church services...Russian is the main language that everyone in the family has some knowledge of. It is

necessary...to get the most out of the Orthodox traditions, and it is useful because some of the older relatives speak heavily accented French and English, so it is easier to converse with them in Russian...

These smaller, informal case studies indicate a wealth of linguistic and cultural resources in a segment of our university population. They represent choices and shifts, maintenance and loss, recovery and restoration; they also make a statement about what Fishman (1966:30) calls 'the role of the English language in American nationalism':

...Just as there is hardly an ethnic foundation to American nationalism, so there is no special language awareness in the use of English. The English language--as a symbol, as a cause, as a supreme good--does not figure prominently in the scheme of values, loyalties, and traditions by which Americans define themselves as 'American'. English is spoken because it is the accepted medium of communication...Even the fact that so few Americans command any other language than English...is largely a result of educational failure, cultural provincialism, and the absence of pragmatic utility for bilingualism...

4. Personal case study in linguistic shift. Central to my remarks is a different and more specialized case study about a mix of linguistic heritages which, over a period of some four and five generations, exhibits the already-common language accommodations, choices, and shift. The case study involves Polish, Hungarian, German, Spanish, and English as these languages have evolved within the speech community, in their family subgroups, in their intermarriages, in their geographic dislocations, in their attitudes toward English, in their attitudes toward foreign languages for academic purposes, in their communication between generations, and in what the future holds for any kind of reconciliation.

Table 1 attempts to depict five generations in several families, related through marriage, which independently have no shared linguistic heritage. The generation span of 25 years (G1-G6), is somewhat arbitrary, yet it comes closest to identifying by a factor of ± 5 years, at least chronologically, the members of the specific generations. As a further explanatory note, the numbers 1 and 2 are to be interpreted as L1 and L2, respectively. Degree of control of language

use and extent of overlapping domains vary from individual to individual. My generation is G4 and includes my sister and her spouse, my spouse, our cousins, and their spouses.

Through migrations for the long-accepted reasons of economic opportunity, escape from political and religious oppression, 'overpopulation of the Polish village by an agricultural proletariat...insufficient industrial development... and linguistic persecution' (Fox 1970:59), the families emigrated to the United States just before the turn of the nineteenth century. Hungarians and Germans left for similar reasons. The immigration patterns, as I have stated earlier, are neither uncommon nor unusual. What drew the shared communities together from Europe (Poland, Germany, and Hungary) in the United States were obviously linguistic, cultural and religious traditions, in addition to industry and opportunity, the chance for a new life.

Table 1. Case study data showing language shift (loss vs. gain) in successive generations of immigrant families.

Language shift:	Monolinguals and Bilinguals Groups:						Monolinguals	
	Pol. Eng.		Hung. Eng.		Germ. Eng.		Span. Eng.	Pol. Eng.
Immigrants								
G1: 1851	L1		L1		L1		L1	L1
G2: 1876	L1	L1	L1		L1		L1 L1	L1
G3: 1901	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1 L2	L1
	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1		L1
G4: 1926	L2	L1		L1		L1	L1 L2	L1 L2
G5: 1951		L1		L1		L1	L1	L1 L2
G6: 1976:								

The language of the home and the close circle of family, of other intimates, and members and participants in other institutions of the church, the community, and the towns was Polish, German, and Hungarian. The language of the society-at-large was universally English because of other established

traditions. Socially, however, because of greater independence from the family as a nucleus, the natural language choice, and therefore shift, began to occur. Although the language of the home received some support in religious, educational and social institutions, the children of the immigrants began to adopt English. Ties to Poland, Germany, Hungary were still close and the language of what I have labeled G1 and G2 (fifth and fourth generations) remained intact largely through the mails and occasional new movements of relatives. The G1 did not emigrate; the G2, according to most accounts, did. G3 children (American-born) received reinforcement for spoken language in the home and for written language sometimes in the school and family settings. And, as is customary, as the representatives of older generations (G1 and G2) began to disappear, the reinforcement began to diminish. It began to diminish for other reasons, too: attitudes toward 'americanization'; adaptation to a new culture with its increasing societal pressures for linguistic conformity outside the home and limited social institutions; and, geographic dislocation from the homeland. Moreover, in the 1940s and 1950s there were fewer institutions to support language maintenance outside the home. In the G3 speech communities intergroup communication was easily established through regular social (family) and educational (school and church) institutions to such an extent that intermarriage was inevitable. Again, I hasten to point out that this situation is not unique among immigrant groups as they become established in the larger society.

An effect of this intermarriage, however, between linguistically different groups is the eventual breakup of the linguistic bond. While there have been informal attempts to learn the language of the G2 speech community, they were not in any way structured, organized, or reinforced. The result in the cases of the English-Polish bilingual who would marry the English-Hungarian bilingual or the German-English bilingual who would marry the Polish-English bilingual was the eventual and total shift to English. Of course, some phrases and ritual language, the product of social contact, were learned on each side. One partner of each marriage became the intermediary to the family of the other partner. The transitional generation, G3 in this case, begins to effect the shift to English; the G2 remains, for the most part monolingual.

Shifts in the G3 generation follow natural patterns. Parent-child domains undergo change as the children begin to adopt the language of the larger society. Siblings tend to use English out of a concern for identity with peers and also because of parental pressure toward linguistic conformity. In the intimate setting of the family, Polish, Hungarian, and German diminish and are intermixed with English. Parent-child language becomes ritualized because the children are unable to maintain their proficiency. Grandparents, the G2 generation, use their first language with their newly born grandchildren but the necessary modelling gradually comes to a halt. Shift and eventual monolingualism of the G3 and G4 become commonplace.

The children of the 1901-1925 generation were raised as L1 speakers of English and maintained only a moderate level of Polish language proficiency through ages 7-11; my sister and I, and our cousins, studied Polish as a second language through grade 2; Polish language instruction was later eliminated from the curriculum in the early 1950s. Except for one cousin who had very limited passive knowledge of Hungarian through age 3-4 from contact with the paternal grandmother, aunts and uncles, we shifted to English monolingualism. The Polish language program that was available through the second year of parochial school and in such social organizations as the Polish National Alliance disappeared largely because of the inability of the religious and educational agencies (1) to find qualified instructors (religious or lay community members), (2) to fund such programs, and (3) to change the attitude of the transitional community toward the teaching of Polish. In my own case, once my maternal grandfather died, Polish ceased to be spoken in the home except for occasional exchanges with my mother, and she with her siblings.

Years later, after studying other languages, I revived my Polish language study to a level sufficient to understand my mother's musings in Polish. By that time, however, while she was still quite proficient in Polish, her American variety contained a number of English borrowings. My father's Polish, except for the occasional lexical items and some ritualized expressions, disappeared. My mother continued to write Polish well and attempted to speak Polish with her brothers and younger sister, who eventually married the Hungarian-English bilingual. During their shift to English, my mother continued to make efforts to retain her level of

proficiency and did so until her death at age 68. Other opportunities for language study were provided as academic alternatives at the high school and college levels for offspring of the G3.

As the only G4 male of the one branch of the family, I married the American-born daughter of Polish immigrants to the United States. Polish was the language of the home for the immigrants and their parents. The daughter was raised as a monolingual speaker of English with some early domain-specific Polish proficiency. Communication between the G4 daughter and her G2 grandparents was usually conducted, in the absence of parents, in Polish and English: the grandparents spoke Polish and the granddaughter spoke English. Yet each had enough proficiency to comprehend the language of the other. She, too, has become an English monolingual with some vague memories of sounds, vocabulary, and spellings.

Children (two sons) of the union were raised as monolingual speakers of English. Subsequent language choices (Latin, French, and Russian) were academic.

My sister, the G4 female, married an L1 speaker of Spanish; their language choices will be described later.

During this stage, it is worth noting, there is a branch that descends from the Polish heritage that finds its way to postwar England. G3 cousins (Polish-English, column 5, Table 1), independent of the their American counterparts, continue their Polish monolingualism and eventually, through closer group cohesiveness in the Polish community in London (and continuing contact through travel, written and telephone communication with family in Poland) adopt English as a second language. I should note here that this branch of the family was not discovered, I mean really discovered, until 1980. The discovery was genuinely fortuitous, the details of which, while anecdotally of interest, are not important to this paper. An expectation that the London-based G3s might begin to shift to English and become more like the American-based G4s does not materialize. Offspring of the London G3s use Polish as an L1 in the home and in the extended Polish community. English is indeed a second language in the larger community. And, where does this lead? One of the sons marries a monolingual speaker of Polish and reinforcement and maintenance are the outcome. The other son, for reasons of career choice in international business and trade with Poland, remains bilingual.

Column 4 in Table 1 represents the Spanish language element of the case study. Its G1 through G3 generations are monolingual speakers of Spanish from Colombia. The three offspring (1 male, 2 females) of the G3 generation married L1 speakers of English: an American of Polish descent; a Canadian of Scots-Irish descent, and an Englishman, respectively. Of concern to this study is the marriage of the G4 couple: for professional reasons the husband, a monolingual speaker of Spanish, came to the United States and has since become bilingual; the wife is an L1 speaker of English with domain-specific proficiency in Spanish. Children of the union were raised as monolingual speakers of English. Spanish language use was limited in the home and, because of geographic dislocation from the Spanish-speaking grandparents, except for occasional annual visits, there was no measurable Spanish-language reinforcement. Academic choices for language study, however, include Latin and Spanish; practice, nevertheless, is limited to the annual short visit.

At this point, the G5 generation of 1951-1975, the seven American children, now young men and women in the 18-32 age bracket, are monolingual speakers of English with minimal to moderate second language domain-specific proficiency, by individual, in Spanish and Russian. One of the American-born young men, from a background in English and Spanish, is about to marry a young woman who is now a monolingual speaker of English whose mother is a monolingual speaker of British English, and whose father, before his death, was a first language speaker of Farsi and second language speaker of English. Two are absolute monolingual English speakers. Additionally, there are four children of the G5 generation who live outside the United States: three are bilingual Spanish-English speakers living in Colombia; one is a bilingual English-Spanish speaker living in Canada.

As monolingual speakers of English today, these G5 generation young men and women had choices made for them usually within one or the other of the two previous generations (G4 and G3). The earlier choices, in the most common case, were shift to loss to English monolingualism. Their own choices, given the proximity to the generation of their earlier linguistic heritage, were somewhat different. In any event, none of the American-born G5 generation can be characterized as having been nurtured in their linguistic

heritage to the point of achieving any measurable level of bilingualism. The non-American-born have achieved a level of proficiency in the language of their linguistic heritage by virtue of residence in an English-as-a-second-language environment. The two G4 generation males in England maintain their Polish-English bilingualism and their progeny may postpone the shift to loss to English monolingualism for perhaps one or two generations.

5. Summary and conclusion. Although it is not easy to draw a simple conclusion from the evidence presented here in the case studies, I feel confident in restating my original introduction, namely, that I would present, within a case study framework, a number of facts that relate to language choice, language maintenance, language shift, language neglect, and language conservation. The conclusion is that there is indeed in the United States a wealth of resources that derive from a broad inventory of linguistic and cultural heritages which, if they remain untapped, unrejuvenated, unrestored, and unconserved, will continue to disappear and abide as faint memories in the minds of young men and women. Haugen (1966:10-11), in his introduction to Fishman's Language Loyalty in the United States, very articulately draws the appropriate conclusion:

Dr. Fishman has pointed out two not unrelated vistas which are opened up by his studies. One is pragmatic: that there may still be time to salvage some of these resources for general American life, that indeed the success of our foreign policy may depend on our doing so...The other vista is theoretical: in an even more closely reasoned appendix he beckons the scholar in to the green pastures of future sociolinguistic research. He makes the point that the American development has a world setting and a long perspective. Language shifts and the resistance to them have been going on and are still going on wherever languages impinge on one another. Through studies of our problem we may cast light on the problems of the world.

As researchers and scholars we have a responsibility not only to our disciplines but also to the memory of man and the futures of our children. In my view, that responsibility is as much to our other linguistic and cultural heritages as it is to our English language and American cultural heritage.

Note

1. At this point I wish to express my gratitude to the students in my Spring 1987 Introduction to Language course. The essays they wrote on their linguistic heritage allowed me to confirm many of my suspicions about language conservation, language shift, and language loss. For the histories these essays portray I would have liked to include all of them. The five excerpts I have chosen are representative of the wealth of linguistic heritages.

References

- Berger, Joseph. 1987. Broadway to aid Yiddish archives. New York Times, March 1, p. 38.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bloomfield, Morton, and Einar Haugen, eds. 1974. Language as a human problem. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Campbell, Russell N., and Susan Schnell. (in press) Language conservation. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March 1987.
- Coulmas, Florian. 1981. Introduction: The concept of native speaker. In: A festschrift for native speaker. Edited by F. Coulmas. The Hague: Mouton.
- Eco, Umberto. 1983. The name of the rose. (William Weaver, trans.). San Diego, Calif.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. (Original work published in 1980.)
- Fishman, Joshua A., ed. 1966. Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, Joshua A., ed. 1968. Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Robert L. Cooper, and Andrew W. Conrad, eds. 1977. The spread of English. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Michael H. Gertner, Esther G. Lowy, and William G. Milan, eds. 1985. The rise and fall of the ethnic revival: Perspectives on language and ethnicity. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Andree Tabouret-Keller, Michael Clyne,

298 / Georgetown University Round Table: 1987

- Bh. Krishnamurti, and Mohamed Abdulaziz, eds. 1986. *The Fergusonian impact*, vol. 2. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fox, Paul. 1970. *The Poles in America*. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times.
- Goytisolo, Juan. 1977. *Juan the landless*. (Helen R. Lane, trans.) New York: Viking Press. (Original work published in 1975).
- Greene, Victor. 1975. *For God and country: The rise of Polish and Lithuanian consciousness in America*. Madison, Wis.: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
- Grosjean, Francois. 1982. *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hakuta, Kenji. 1986. *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Haugen, Einar. 1956. *Bilingualism in the Americas: A bibliography and research guide*. University, Ala.: American Dialect Society.
- Haugen, Einar. 1966. *Language conflict and language planning: The case of modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, Einar. 1969. *The Norwegian language in America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hockett, Charles F., ed. 1970. *A Leonard Bloomfield anthology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hofstadter, Douglas R. 1985. *Metamagical themas: Questing for the essence of mind and pattern*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hofstadter, Douglas R., and Daniel C. Dennett, eds. 1981. *Fantasies and reflections on self and soul*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hornby, Peter A., ed. 1977. *Bilingualism: Psychological, social, and educational implications*. New York: Academic Press.
- Laird, Charlton. 1970. *Language in America*. New York: The World Publishing Company.
- McCrum, Robert, William Cran, and Robert MacNeil. 1986. *The story of English*. New York: Viking.
- Mencken, Henry L. 1937. *The American language*, 4th ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Mencken, Henry L. 1945. *The American language: Supplement I*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Neusner, Jacob. 1987. *Is America the promised land of the Jews?* *The Washington Post*, 8 March, B1, B5.

- Paikeday, Thomas S. 1985. The native speaker is dead! Toronto: Paikeday Publishing Inc.
- Steinmetz, Sol. 1986. Yiddish and English: A century of Yiddish in America. University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press.
- Strevens, Peter. 1982. World Englishes and world's Englishes--or, whose language is it anyway? Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, June.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. Languages in contact: Findings and problems. The Hague: Mouton.

LANGUAGE VARIATION, ATTITUDES, AND RIVALRY: THE SPREAD OF HINDI IN INDIA

S. N. Sridhar

State University of New York at Stony Brook

1. Introduction. Hindi, the single most widely spoken language of India, was chosen to be the symbol of India's emerging nationalism during the struggle for independence from British colonial rule. The Constitution adopted it as the official language of independent India and made it the duty of the central government to propagate its knowledge among Indians. However, the broad appeal that the language enjoyed in the struggle against the colonizer waned in the postindependence period as the regional languages began to consolidate their power and constituencies and feared the hegemony of the numerically strong Hindi. This revisionism was aided by the uncompromising stand taken by the Hindi purists and the propagandists, who insisted on propagating an artificial variety of the language and were insensitive to the rights of the non-Hindi speakers. The ensuing struggle led to indefinite postponement of the switch-over to Hindi as the official language, thus putting the clock back on the spread of Hindi by several decades. In the current situation, with the regional languages and English becoming more powerful in a democratic setup, Hindi faces a much more difficult task than it did at the time of independence. This paper discusses the issues in the rise and fall and readjustment in the status of Hindi with particular reference to the role of language variation, language attitudes, and language rivalry in the context of the multilingual sociolinguistic situation in India and its democratic political structure. The case of Hindi has, I believe, important implications for language spread in general, and the spread of languages like English, especially in terms of the role of the native speakers of the spreading language and their attitudes toward its varieties and toward its consumers.

2. Hindi as the language of integration. India has had several contact languages in the past--Sanskrit, Persian, and English. However, they have all been contact languages for elite functions: scholarship, literary composition, higher level administration. There has never been a truly pan-Indian contact language used by the masses, at the grass-roots level as it were. The policy of spreading Hindi as an all-India link language which every Indian would know is an unprecedented experiment in the history of India.

As is well known, India is a nation of linguistic minorities. About 90% of the population speak one of the 15 major languages, including Hindi. In addition, there are at least a couple of hundred distinct languages, spoken by sizeable numbers of people--for example, Gondi, a 'tribal' language, is spoken by about four million speakers. Among the major languages of India, Hindi is spoken natively by the single largest section of Indian population--about 32% (Pattanayak 1973). The languages with the next highest number of speakers are Telugu and Bengali, each of which is spoken by about eight percent of the population. Urdu, whose grammar and basic vocabulary are essentially the same as those of Hindi, is spoken by about six percent of the population. Hindi and Urdu differ sharply in their scripts (Hindi employing the Devanagari script and Urdu the Persian script) and in literary vocabulary (High Hindi drawing on Sanskrit and High Urdu on Persian and Arabic). The common core of Hindi and Urdu employed in most informal situations is often referred to as Hindustani (Kachru 1987).

The movement for the adoption of Hindi as the official language began as an agitation for substitution of Urdu with Hindi in administration and the law in the so-called 'Hindi heartland' in North India during the second half of the nineteenth century (see Gopal 1966 for details). This demand was immediately opposed by the Muslims, who enjoyed an advantage over the Hindus by virtue of their knowledge of the Persian script, as well as of the Persianized vocabulary employed in the bureaucracy. The proponents of Hindi argued that the Persianized and Arabicized Urdu was as alien to the common people as English, and that justice is best served when administered in the language of the people. The British colonial administrators conceded these demands in the 1830s, leading to an era of unprecedented pride in and intensive cultivation of the regional languages. In the

decades to follow, this revival of interest in the vernacular was fed by and in turn fed the movement for religious reform and cultural revival that swept North India, calling for a restoration of the pre-British, and pre-Muslim Indian (primarily Hindu) culture (see Das Gupta 1970). One aspect of the revivalism was that the Hindi leaders embarked on a program to purge Hindi of Perso-Arabic vocabulary and to draw on Sanskrit for lexical development.¹ This move was, understandably, interpreted as a threat by the Urdu speakers.

Hindi shot into national prominence in the early decades of this century, when several leaders of the independence movement, both Hindi and non-Hindi speakers, designated it as the symbol of Indian nationalism. The earliest reference to this nationalist role of Hindi is in a speech given in 1905 by the Marathi-speaking leader Bal Gangadhar Tilak, who was Mahatma Gandhi's mentor in the early stages of the independence movement. Gandhi, himself a Gujarati speaker, not only endorsed the idea, but turned out to be its strongest advocate.

Gandhi's language policy steered clear of revivalism and emphasized unity and compromise. He preferred the term Hindustani to Hindi, and endorsed both the Nagari and the Persian scripts for the common medium, and advocated the common core variety that eschewed highly Persianized or highly Sanskritized vocabulary. His catholicity and pragmatism are evident in his proposals for the common language, given here (see Gandhi 1956).

2.1 Gandhi's proposals for a common language

- (1) That our common language be called 'Hindustani,' not 'Hindi'.
- (2) That Hindustani shall not be considered to have any particular associations with the religious traditions of any community.
- (3) That the test of 'foreign' and 'indigenous' shall not be applied to any word, but only the test of currency.
- (4) That all words used by Hindu writers or Urdu and Muslim writers of Hindi be deemed current. This of course shall not apply to Urdu and Hindi as sectional languages.
- (5) That in the choice of technical terms, especially political terminology, no preference be given to Sanskrit terms as such, but as much room as possible

be allowed for natural selection from among Urdu, Hindi and Sanskrit terms.

- (6) That the Devanagari and the Arabic scripts shall both be considered current and official... (Ahmed 1941)

The same emphasis on inclusiveness and integration is seen in Jawaharlal Nehru's pronouncements on the subject as well. Consider the following excerpt from his long and extremely insightful essay on the language issue in India, which anticipated most of the dimensions of the language policy that emerged in postindependence India.

2.2 Nehru on Hindustani

[Basic Hindustani]... with a little effort from the state will spread with extreme rapidity all over the country and will help in bringing about that national unity which we all desire. It will bring Hindi and Urdu closer together and will also help in developing an all-India linguistic unity. On that solid and common foundation, even if variations grow or divisions occur, they will not lead to separatism (Ahmed 1941).

It is clear that Hindi--or Hindustani--was promoted as a language of integration. In this role, it received widespread support from all parts of the country. Prominent non-Hindi speakers such as Bal Gangadhar Tilak from Maharashtra, C. Rajagopalachari from Madras, and Subhash Chandra Bose from Bengal and, of course, Gandhi himself (a Gujarati speaker), lent active support to the Hindi movement. The Indian National Congress adopted Hindustani as the primary language of its deliberations in 1925. Learning Hindustani became a gesture of patriotism and participation in the national movement. A large number of organizations for the teaching and propagation of Hindustani were started all over the country, and many thousands learnt the language. There was much good will toward Hindustani and pride in one's association with it during the pre-independence period.

3. Conflict over choice of variety. Even during the period of the nationalist movement, the issue of which variety of Hindi should be preferred and promoted was a bone of contention. Initially, the dominant Hindi organizations sensed that it was in their interest to be associated with the rising

tide of Gandhi's popularity and went along with his advocacy of Hindustani. The most important of these groups, the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, even made Gandhi its president.

However, the leadership of the Hindi movement was in the hands of literary personalities who were more concerned with the language as a cultural symbol than with its practical, pragmatic, or political aspects. The purists, with their program of Sanskritization, never really accepted the Hindustani program. They felt that Hindustani might at best succeed as a link in simple, oral communication, but not in complex tasks which needed technical vocabulary. Moreover, they viewed the concept of Hindustani as Gandhi's concession to Muslim reactionaries. Eventually, the purists came to dominate the Hindi movement and Gandhi resigned his leadership of the Sammelan in 1942. At the same time, supporters of Urdu suspected that the concept of Hindustani was a thinly veiled attempt of the Hindus to sabotage a separate Muslim constituency which they had been advocating all along and which eventually led to the partition of India and the formation of Pakistan. Gandhi's attempt to launch an independent organization for the promotion of Hindustani did not meet with success.

The issue of 'the purity of Hindi' as opposed to its function as an all-India language came to a head during the framing of the Constitution of India following independence. The subject of the official language turned out to be the most controversial of all the subjects discussed in the Constituent Assembly. The protagonists of Hindi, led by Purushotham Das Tandon and Seth Govind Das, resisted the provision of a transitional period during which English would be used alongside Hindi as the official language of the Central Government: they demanded an immediate switch-over to Hindi, and denounced the non-Hindi-speaking members' pleas for moderation as lack of will and patriotism. They were adamant that Hindi in the Devanagari script, not Hindustani, should be designated as the official language of the nation. They argued that with the formation of a separate Pakistan, no more concessions need be made to Urdu (although the majority of Urdu speakers remained in India). They insisted that even the numerals employed in the official language should be the Devanagari numerals, although the international numerals, widely used all over India, are ultimately of Indian origin. The Hindi lobby won on the question of the name of the language and the script and was

defeated on the question of the transition period and the numerals, but their intransigence left a bitter taste among the non-Hindi speakers, who viewed this attitude with alarm as language tyranny, linguistic chauvinism, and imperialism. The zealotry of the protagonists of Hindi managed to erode the broad support and good will enjoyed by Hindi during the independence movement. From this point on, Hindi came to be viewed by the non-Hindi population, especially in South India and in West Bengal, as a threat to the survival and growth of the regional languages rather than an essential instrument of national unification.

The main article in the Indian Constitution dealing with the official language issue is given in section 3.1.

3.1 Constitutional provisions (Article 343)

(1) The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script. The form of the numerals to be used for official purposes of the Union shall be the international form of Indian numerals.

(2) Notwithstanding anything in clause (1), for a period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, the English language shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement.

The Indian Constitution is perhaps unique among its world counterparts in specifying not only a language policy but also in providing a detailed blueprint for the development of the official language. Consider Article 351.

3.2 Constitutional provisions (Article 351)

It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as the medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in other languages of India specified in the Eighth schedule, and by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages.

This article not only makes language spread a government responsibility, but also specifies the lines along which the language is to be developed. Although the goal is still to make Hindi serve as the vehicle for the expression of the composite culture of India, its enrichment is to be accomplished by drawing 'primarily on Sanskrit'. Hindi is to assimilate elements from Hindustani and other languages but 'without interfering with its genius'--i.e., its Sanskritic character. The ambivalent phraseology of this article has been invoked to support as well as to oppose the massive Sanskritization that took place in the name of language development under official auspices in the decades following independence.

This provision is in contrast with an alternative proposal, made by a member from South India, S.V.K. Rao, that was rejected. That proposal (see 3.3) asked that the Central Government appoint a permanent commission consisting of experts from the major regional languages.

3.3 Constituent Assembly proposal

...to appoint a permanent commission consisting of experts from [the major regional languages]...

- (i) to watch and assist in the development of Hindi as the common medium of expression for all in India;
- (ii) to evolve common technical terms not only for Hindi but also for other [major regional languages]...
- (iii) to evolve a common vocabulary acceptable to all the component parts in India.

This proposal stressed the need to ensure maximum commonality between Hindi and the major Indian languages. Instead, the version adopted in the Constitution stresses the purity of Hindi.

The committees and commissions for the development of terminologies in science, technology and administration appointed by the Government of India over the years have consistently resorted to what many critics--including many prominent native speakers of Hindi--regard as excessive classicalization, that is, Sanskritization. This policy is justified by its proponents on the ground that Sanskrit is the common heritage of India, that all the major Indian languages have borrowed heavily from Sanskrit, and, therefore, drawing on Sanskrit roots for new terms promotes a pan-Indian

vocabulary. However, there is a fallacy in this argument, which Gandhi had exposed long ago: even the North Indian languages, descendents of Sanskrit, have modified their Sanskrit heritage; moreover, centuries of phonological, semantic change have resulted in the fact that derivations and borrowings of the same Sanskrit words have different denotations and connotations in different modern Indian languages. Thus, a common Sanskrit source is no guarantee of pan-Indian intelligibility (see Gandhi 1956; for a recent argument, see Sridhar 1987).

That the policy of Sanskritization is motivated as much by extralinguistic considerations as by considerations of corpus-planning is evident from the following excerpt (3.4) from Dr. Raghuvira, the foremost scholar in charge of the development of Hindi terminology.

3.4 The purists

Shall we be anglicized, shall we be turned into Greeks and Latins and shall we then alone pick up the few crumbs thrown to us as refuse... by the West? We have a grain of sense. We have our respect to attend to... Our languages will again go into the lap of mother Sanskrit, the language of India, when she was free. We shall have again our own words... When this is done, Indians will be free of the thralldom of the European languages (Raghuvira 1965:39).

This deliberate policy of Sanskritization has resulted in the creation of the so-called 'High Hindi', opaque and unrecognizable, far removed from the current usage in the varieties of Hindi employed in everyday transactions in various parts of India and in the other Indian languages. Even native speakers of Hindi complain about the excessive classicalization of their language. Nehru once complained that he could not comprehend one word of the Hindi version of the Constitution. The Hindi national news broadcasts, relayed by all the stations of the government-controlled All-India Radio, are hardly listened to by the non-Hindi audience, who continue to rely on English for their news. Some of the newly coined terms, such as abhiyanta for 'engineer', arakshak for 'police', employed by government or government-aided organizations, are ridiculed in the non-Hindi areas, and instead of strengthening Hindi and making it more acceptable, have provided more grist to the opposition.

4. Conflict generated by the attitudes of protagonists of Hindi. The manner in which the spread of Hindi is sought--in particular, the attitude of the protagonists of Hindi in the process--has also contributed to the increase of resistance to Hindi. An issue of the widely circulated Illustrated Weekly of India (Bombay, December 21-27, 1986) carried interviews with a wide spectrum of intellectuals and politicians who repeatedly stressed that, together with the variety of Hindi being propagated, it was the attitude of the protagonists of Hindi that was hindering the spread of Hindi. The attitudinal problem is best illustrated by an analysis of two sets of proposals made in the decades following independence.

4.1 The report of the Official Language Commission. The Constitution (Article 344) directs the president to appoint a commission every five years to review the progress in the implementation of Hindi as the official language. The recommendations of these commissions are to be reviewed by a committee drawn from both Houses of Parliament, and the president is to act on their recommendations. The report of the first Official Language Commission, chaired by a prominent Hindi leader, was highly critical of what it characterized as the government's tardiness in making preparations for replacing English with Hindi for official government functions. It felt that at that rate, there was no prospect of Hindi replacing English as the sole official language by the constitutionally mandated deadline of January 1965. It made a number of specific proposals, such as making knowledge of Hindi mandatory for candidates competing for the much sought-after All-India Civil Service examinations, and employing Hindi in the judgments handed down by the State High Courts, among others. Two members of the commission from non-Hindi areas--the famous linguist S.K. Chatterjee from Bengal and P. Subbarayan from Madras--submitted dissent notes highly critical of the commission's work. They wanted the change-over to Hindi to be gradual, not hasty. They felt that the commission had been undemocratic in adopting a pro-Hindi outlook at the expense of the interests of non-Hindi speakers. They warned that mandating a knowledge of Hindi in a number of administrative, educational, and judicial spheres would condemn non-Hindi speakers to a permanent second-class

citizenship. The statements by the two members (4.1.1) reflect the sentiments of the non-Hindi speakers at the time.

4.1.1 Opposition to Hindi

a. The acceptance of Hindi in the Constitution was done in an atmosphere of certain hasty beliefs and impressions, and was thought to be a very simple matter by its enthusiastic supporters... Now that the people in non-Hindi areas are faced with the task of learning Hindi with the idea of making it replace English and they are being asked to help in the development of Hindi as something of a sacred duty, they are naturally getting anxious and nervous and are reviewing their attitude towards Hindi (P. Subbarayan).

b. The situation has changed since the passing of the Constitution, specially in Bengal and in Madras, where large sections of the people would like to keep English as the official language of India both because of their love for their own languages which have benefited through English and also for reasons of Indian unity (S.K. Chatterjee).

The intolerant and aggressive attitude of the supporters of Hindi was also vehemently criticized by Frank Anthony, the spokesman for the English lobby and a member of the Parliamentary Committee that reviewed the commission's report. On the other hand, two other members of the committee, Seth Govind Das and P.D. Tandon, thought the committee, which advocated a slightly moderate version of the recommendations of the commission, was pusillanimous in its promotion of Hindi.

The publication of the reports of the commission and the committee, in 1956 and 1958, respectively, led to widespread agitation all over the country. The Hindi lobby demanded accelerated measures for the switchover. They accused the advocates of continuation of English or lack of patriotism and slavish adherence to the colonial past. The vehemence of the agitation sweeping over North India in favor of Hindi caused apprehensions among the non-Hindi speakers, who mobilized under the banner of resistance to Hindi imperialism. Especially in the state of Madras (now Tamil Nadu), which traditionally had a representation in the All-India Civil

Services disproportionate to its population, the loss of government jobs due to a lack of knowledge of Hindi was viewed as a real and present danger; but the sentiment against Hindi was widespread (see Kumaramangalam 1965; Ram 1968; Sundara Reddi 1973; Prakash 1973). The situation was not diffused until Prime Minister Nehru gave his famous 'assurance' in the Parliament in 1959 (4.1.2).

4.1.2 Nehru's assurance

There must be no imposition. Secondly, for an indefinite period, I don't know how long, I should have, I would have, English as an associate additional language. I would have it as an alternate language as long as people require it and the decision for that I would leave not to the Hindi-knowing people but to the non-Hindi knowing people (1964 vol. 4:59).

Nehru's assurance assuaged--at least temporarily--the apprehensions of the non-Hindi group. Nehru has been severely criticized for making this 'overly generous' concession, and in particular, for giving the non-Hindi states a virtual veto on the official language question. By postponing indefinitely the date of the switchover, this assurance, according to some critics, arrested the development of the spread of Hindi. On the other hand, there are many who feel that Nehru's statement was consistent with the highest traditions of liberal democracy and may have saved the unity of India.

Nehru's assurance was given legislative sanction in the form of the Official Languages Act of 1963, which stipulated that English may continue to be used for all official purposes of the Union and in the Parliament beyond the expiration of the transition period in 1965. However, the use of may instead of shall in the Act continued to bother the non-Hindi states, which feared that pressures from the Hindi lobby would lead the government to reverse its stand. As the deadline for the changeover neared, the Hindi groups intensified their demand for it. The government responded by issuing several orders. For example, one instructed that all routine circulars of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting from January 25, 1965 would be in Hindi; another asked that Hindi should be used for all staff meetings and discussions, as far as possible; and so on (see

Das Gupta 1970:237). Such measures provoked stiff opposition from non-Hindi areas, especially Tamil Nadu. Even erstwhile staunch supporters of Hindi such as C. Rajagopalachari denounced Hindi and led a popular anti-Hindi movement. Under the leadership of an openly chauvinistic regional party, the Dravida Munnetra Kazagam (DMK), the anti-Hindi agitation assumed violent proportions and swept the whole of South India. The non-Hindi speakers demanded a constitutional amendment embodying Nehru's assurance of the indefinite continuation of English. The underestimation of the popular sentiment against the imposition of Hindi and the State and Central Governments' inept handling of the situation caused widespread violence for about two months, leading to the death of over 60 persons. There was talk of Tamil Nadu's secession from the Indian Union on this score (Ram 1968). Ironically, this only resulted in a more concerted mobilization of the supporters of Hindi, who pressured the government not to yield to the non-Hindi sentiment. On the eve of the implementation of a language policy aimed at bringing about national integration, the union stood on the brink of dissolution.

The war with Pakistan led to a temporary suspension of the agitation, but with the realignment of forces brought about by the general elections of 1967 (the ruling Congress Party lost its majority in a number of Hindi-speaking states), the pressure on the government intensified. In 1967, an Official Language (Amendment) Act was passed, stipulating, among other things, that knowledge of either Hindi or English was adequate for Central Government employment. This act institutionalized the southern states' veto power on the replacement of English with Hindi for an indefinite period. In retrospect, it is clear that the Hindi lobby's attitude--their zealotry for their language, their refusal to accommodate the sentiments of the speakers of other languages--in effect, their inability to accept the pluralistic character of India, worked to slow the spread of Hindi.

4.2 The three language formula. The second example of the conflict generated by the attitude of the Hindi speakers is the language-in-education policy espoused by the Central Government. The accelerated pace of the adoption of Hindi in the Central administration following the Report of the Official Language Commission and the Central Government's vigorous promotion of Hindi led to widespread complaints

about the inequality of the language burden borne by the Hindi and non-Hindi speakers. The non-Hindi speakers argued that they had to learn Hindi, English, and their mother tongue, while Hindi speakers could get away with only Hindi and English. To address this problem, the Central Government arrived at a 'Three-Language Formula' at the meeting of the Chief Ministers of the States and Central Ministers held in 1961. According to the formula,² each child was required to learn: (a) the regional language and the mother tongue when the latter is different from the regional language; (b) Hindi or, in Hindi-speaking areas, another Indian language; (c) English, or any other modern European language.

Note that Hindi mother tongue students are required to learn another Indian language. It was argued that by making all children learn three languages, the disadvantage of non-Hindi speakers would be remedied. Moreover, it was expected that Hindi speakers would learn a South Indian language, thus reciprocating the latter's learning of Hindi and fostering national integration. However, this turned out to be only a fond hope. Hindi speakers could find no use for a South Indian language. Instead, they opted for Urdu or Sanskrit--which are easier to learn, being cognate languages--thus circumventing the spirit of the formula. The non-Hindi states, naturally, felt that the Hindi states were not making a good faith effort to promote national integration and therefore felt less enthusiastic about their own implementation of the policy. The formula was also found to be unfair to linguistic minorities (about a quarter of the country's population): in practice, they would have to learn their mother tongue and the regional language (though a later (1966) version of the formula makes only one of these mandatory), as well as Hindi and English (see K. Sridhar in press). The discriminatory nature of the formula led the government of Tamil Nadu to repudiate it formally and proclaim a two-language formula (Tamil and English) in that state. Tamil Nadu also demanded that all the major regional languages of India should be declared official languages of the country. The Central Government stood helplessly by as its language policy was defied and discarded--there was little it could do, since education is a 'state' subject under the Indian Constitution. At the present time, there is a vast degree of variation in the way the provisions of the formula are implemented by various states. In general, non-Hindi

speaking students are learning Hindi at school, while Hindi-speaking students rarely learn a South Indian language.

The two examples I have given--the Report of the Official Language Commission calling for increased use of Hindi without reference to the problems of the non-Hindi states and its aftermath, and the flawed conception and implementation of the Three-Language Formula--illustrate the attitudinal problems that have slowed the spread of Hindi.

5. The regional languages, English, and the spread of Hindi.

I will now briefly discuss the extent and mechanisms of the spread of Hindi and the dynamics of 'language equilibrium,' as it were, in India. Although the spread of Hindi has been retarded by the problems raised by the controversy about the variety and the overenthusiastic attitude of its sponsors, there is no doubt that the language is spreading, slowly but surely. In the absence of empirical data, the following discussion is inevitably impressionistic.

It is clear that Hindi is spreading primarily and overwhelmingly through nonformal means, rather than through schooling or governmental incentives for and pressures upon its employees. It is true that many times more students are learning Hindi in schools than there used to be, mainly because it is a compulsory language in most states. But the quality of competence acquired at school is inadequate, though this is due to pedagogical reasons. The results are much better in nonformal learning situations, such as the certificate courses conducted by the Central Hindi Directorate and the classes conducted by the Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachara Sabha (Society for Propagation of Hindi in South India). It is fascinating to note that the highest enrollment in the former consists of middle class persons from Tamil Nadu, the state most vehemently opposed to institutionalized adoption of Hindi (E. Annamalai, personal communication). Clearly, Hindi is rejected as a necessary means of national integration, but accepted for its instrumental value in securing government positions and advancement in government service.

The most effective and pervasive tool for the spread of Hindi has been the entertainment media, primarily the Hindi movies, and more recently, television. The movies, because of their glamor content, are immensely popular and command tremendous fan loyalty. Less popular, but widely watched (because of a lack of alternative) is the state-controlled

television, whose use to promote Hindi irritates non-Hindi speakers and draws strong criticism in the regional language newspapers. The most popular features are the Hindi film-song program, Chitrahār, the reruns of Hindi films, and the 'serial' sitcoms in Hindi. These, together with the Hindi programs sandwiched it between, seem to be succeeding in promoting a passive knowledge of Hindi. The enormous economic clout of the movie industry in Hindi is rightly perceived as a threat by the advocates of the regional languages, who call for--and often succeed in obtaining--protectionist legislation in the states (for example, laws mandating the showing of regional language movies at all theaters for a certain number of weeks every year). Nonetheless, the current TV, audio and video cassette revolution sweeping the country is most likely to bolster the gains established for Hindi by the movies, and be far more effective in spreading Hindi than governmental promotion in education and administration.

The government's promotion of Hindi in the administration has not been very effective. (For a discussion of the dismal record in this area, see Dwivedi 1981). Although many glossaries of administrative, technical, scientific, and other terms have been produced, and large numbers of employees have undergone training in the use of Hindi, the fact remains that only a small part of the administrative work, especially at the higher levels, is carried on in Hindi. At the central ministries, Hindi is often used in oral discussions, less in writing. The bureaucrats, trained in and used to functioning in English, feel inhibited by their lack of knowledge of precise terms in Hindi. Code-mixing with English would have been a pragmatic solution, but puritanical attitudes have blocked the way. Also, due to the prestige differential, Hindi is de facto the link language with the less educated interlocutors, while English is used with the more educated (see K. Sridhar 1982).

It is interesting to note that the spread of Hindi has not resulted in any appreciable replacement of English, as had been anticipated by the nationalist leaders, nor of the regional languages, as the advocates of the latter fear. In fact, all three are 'spreading' at the same time, in apparent defiance of the laws of physics.

English has strengthened its position due to the exponential increases in the number of persons receiving education. English continues to command prestige and to

symbolize education, power, and modernity. Its international currency and association with the great developments in science and technology give it certain advantages that Hindi cannot match. Forty years of independence have not diminished the role of English; if anything, its importance in the life of the nation has grown substantially. Rhetoric aside, upwardly mobile parents, including the most vociferous proponents of Indian languages, make enormous sacrifices to send their children to 'English (medium) schools' even when government schools offer instruction in the regional languages at a fraction of the cost. Promoters of regional languages have called for--and obtained--protectionist measures against English as well. (For example, there is currently a ban on beginning new English medium schools in the southern state of Karnataka; however, the state government is reported to be under tremendous pressure to lift it.) This is precisely the situation that the proponents of Hindi had feared, and that is why, in part, they wanted a quick and clean switchover, even if the process was certain to be painful. There are many who feel that now it is too late to dislodge English from its privileged position.

The real challenge to Hindi comes, in my opinion, from the regional languages, rather than English. During the first two decades of independence, the regional languages did not receive the attention due to them. Part of the reason for this neglect was that there was no constitutional pressure on the Central or State governments to undertake time-bound measures to promote them comparable to that regarding Hindi. In fact, the Constitution refers to the use of regional languages in permissive rather than mandatory terms. The other reason was that the speakers of the regional languages were scattered among various political/administrative units until the reorganization of the states on linguistic lines in 1956. The leadership of the regional language groups woke up to political realities only during the agitation following the publication of the report of the Official Language Commission, when they realized that numbers do matter in a democracy and that the switchover to Hindi was not just an idealistic slogan made in the passion of a nationalistic movement but a real and present event that was going to take place in the not too distant future. Once awakened, they did assert themselves. Almost all the states have declared the major language of the region as the state official language and there is now a considerable pressure to

implement the use of the regional language in state administration at all levels. The regional languages are increasingly being used as media of instruction at the university level (see K. Sridhar in press for a recent statement of the question). The states are competing with one another to demonstrate their commitment to their respective language and hence to democratic principles. All this is of a piece with the trend toward replacing the old-fashioned nationalist politics with regionalist politics.

In short, the regional languages are fiercely on the ascendant. They are extending their functional range--in (state level) administration, in belles lettres, in the mass media and the like, and look to English, not Hindi, for their modernization. Some of the more established regional languages--those with long traditions of literature or higher intensity of language loyalty on the part of their speakers--have come to regard Hindi as just another regional language, only a rather dangerous one because of the number of speakers and their potential political clout. The fact that Hindi is not in a diglossic, 'High' language relationship with other major Indian languages, the way Sanskrit or English had been, has been a handicap. Hindi lost the goodwill of the non-Hindi speakers due to the narrow-mindedness and short-sightedness of its enthusiasts and the 'attributive values' of the language are not sufficient to take the place of that good will. It is, therefore, spreading as a third language, competing with the regional languages and English, dependent on its entertainment value, governmental patronage, and vaguely perceived instrumental value. However, the rise of one of the world's largest (numerically) middle classes in India, the expansion of educational opportunities, the not inconsiderable potential effect of governmental incentives, and last but not least, the intangible appeal of a national language to symbolize national pride, are all potential factors that might spur the spread of Hindi. Given the many pulls of a culturally and linguistically diverse democracy, and a political structure in which protectionist measures are often invoked to temper the operation of the linguistic free market, the question of how the spoils will be divided is certainly an intriguing one.

I shall close by noting the lessons that the case of Hindi seems to offer to language spread in general, and to the most widely spreading language of the world today, English: too much of an eagerness on the part of the native speakers

to promote the language, and prescriptivism in the choice of the variety that spreads may be dangerous to the health of language spread. In this, as in many other matters, it is best to let the product, rather than a shrill salesperson, do the talking.

Notes

It is a pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professors E. Annamalai, D. Jaware Gowda, Braj Kachru, and Yamuna Kachru, with whom I had extended discussions of the contents of this paper. They are, of course, not responsible for my point of view and interpretations. This paper is based in part on research I conducted at the Central Institute of Indian Languages (CIIL), Mysore, as a Senior Research Fellow of the American Institute of Indian Studies (AIIS) in 1983-84, and again while on sabbatical leave in 1986-87. I am grateful to the AIIS and my home institution for making this research possible, and to Dr. Mehendiratta, Director, AIIS, for his unfailing help on numerous occasions. I also wish to thank the faculty and staff of the CIIL for their valuable assistance.

1. Rai (1984) and others have pointed out that the Sanskritization of Hindi was actually a reaction to the attempt on the part of the Muslims to mold Hindi-Urdu as a symbol of Muslim identity. The need for such a symbol was felt keenly in the wake of the demise of the last of the Muslim Kingdoms in India and the later attempts to revive the Hindu values.

2. There are many versions of and hence much confusion about what exactly the Three Language Formula entails. I have cited what I believe is the most widely held version. Annamalai (in preparation) details the historical background and the various versions of the Formula, and implications of each of them.

References

- Ahmed, Z.A., ed. 1941. National language for India: A symposium. Allahabad: Kitabistan.
 Annamalai, E. (in preparation) Three Language Formula.

- Cooper, Robert L., ed. 1982. *Language spread: Studies in diffusion and social change*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Das Gupta, Jyotirindra. 1970. *Language conflict and national development*.
- Dwivedi, S. 1981. *Hindi on trial*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Gandhi, K.L. 1984. *The problem of official language in India*. Delhi: Arya Book Depot.
- Gandhi, Mohandas K. 1956. *Thoughts on national language*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan.
- Gopal, Ram. 1966. *Linguistic affairs of India*. Delhi: Asia.
- Handa, R.L. 1983. *Missing links in link language*. Delhi: Sterling.
- Kachru, Yamuna. 1987. Hindi. In: *The world's major languages*. Edited by Bernard Comrie. Beckenham, Kent: Croom Helm.
- Kumaramangalam, Mohan. 1965. *India's language crisis*. Madras: New Century Book House.
- Majumdar, A.K. 1965. *The problem of Hindi*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Misra, Bal Govind. 1982. *Language spread in a multilingual setting: The spread of Hindi as a case study*. In: Cooper, ed. (1982).
- Nehru, Jawaharlal. 1941. *Untitled article in Ahmed (1941:45-74)*.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal. 1964. *Jawaharlal Nehru's speeches*. Delhi: Publications Division, Government of India.
- Pattanayak, D.P. 1973. *Distribution of languages in Indian states and Union territories*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages. (Revised and updated)
- Prakash, Karat. 1973. *Language and nationality politics in India*. Bombay: Oriental Longman.
- Raghuvira. 1965. *India's national language*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Ram, Mohan. 1968. *Hindi against India: The meaning of DMK*. New Delhi: Rachna Prakashan.
- Sridhar, Kamal K. 1982. *English in a South Indian Urban context*. In: *The other tongue*. Edited by Braj B. Kachru. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 141-53.
- Sridhar, Kamal K. (in press) *Language policy for education in multilingual India: Issues and implementation*. *International Educational Journal*.
- Sridhar, S.N. 1987. *Language modernization*. Paper presented at the Second World Basque Congress, San Sebastian,

Donostia. (To appear in a volume of selected papers from the Congress.)

Sundara, Reddi, G. 1973. The language problem in India. Delhi: National.

LANGUAGE TEACHING CONTRIBUTES TO AND IS INFLUENCED BY THE SPREAD OF LANGUAGES

Peter Strevens

The Bell Educational Trust

0. Introduction. This paper is concerned with the relations between the spread of languages and the development of language teaching. Starting from a consideration of the enormous increase in the number of users of English that has taken place within a short period of time, the paper argues that the reasons for this spread are more complex than has commonly been assumed, and that they include an element of supply/demand economics as well as a response to improved accessibility and enhanced effectiveness of language learning and teaching opportunities. The paper poses the question: who are the new English users? And it notes that some of the categories of new users of English have parallels in respect of many other languages. The 'spread of English', it will be suggested, is part of a wider trend, that of a global increase in multilingualism, within which English is but one language among a great many. It will be suggested that the drive to teach and learn languages has led to the provision of massive resources, financial and human, for the development of improved language learning and teaching facilities and techniques; and that the existence of these improved facilities has contributed strongly to the willingness of great numbers of people to embark with confidence of success on the task of learning a foreign language. Finally, the paper will point to the emergence of definable characteristics of high-grade teaching and learning and will suggest that where this 'informed language teaching' occurs, a suitable climate is produced for the successful learning of a foreign language.

1. The spread of English. The commonly held estimates of the number of speakers of English have recently been

challenged (Crystal 1985). His argument that the statistics should include English users not confined to those who read books or newspapers in English is hard to resist: widening the statistical base would undoubtedly increase the total number of English users, especially among those for whom English is not the mother tongue (or 'primary language'): Crystal proposes a total of between one billion and two billion (1,000 million to 2,000 million). In the nature of language statistics there can be no single 'true' figure. My personal inclination is to take as a working figure the midpoint between Crystal's upper and lower limits, and therefore to suggest that there are a total of some 1.5 billion English users, of whom about 350 million are native (L1) speakers of English and 1150 million are nonnative (L2) speakers. In this view, the nonnative speakers--the foreign learners--of English outnumber by more than three to one those for whom it is the mother tongue.

In the context of this paper it is not the total numbers that are important, but equally the remarkable surge in numbers that has taken place within a short space of time, particularly among the L2 users of English. Basing one's judgment upon the extension of radio, television, film, and journalism communication in English worldwide; upon the switch to English in many countries in place of other languages (French or Russian, for example) as the chief foreign language in the public education system; and upon the massive occupational demand for English in science and technology, in computing, in air and sea transportation, in educational aid and administration, etc.--given these and other pressures, it seems reasonable to estimate that an additional 500 million English users have emerged in the past ten years.

2. Reasons for a surge in the number of English users. A number of reasons are conventionally proposed to account for the general increase in the numbers of English users, including among others: (1) the historical legacy of the colonial era, which created many populations of English users; (2) geopolitical developments, alliances, and groupings for economic and military collaboration, especially since the Second World War; (3) the consequences of political independence in multicultural and multilingual societies, which creates a need for an internally usable lingua franca; (4) the proliferation of English-language broadcasting.

However, one may suggest that these reasons, while they undoubtedly contribute to the spread of English, are insufficient to account totally for the recent rapid increase. What other possible reasons might be advanced? Two in particular seem to be of special importance: (1) the operation of economic principles of supply and demand; and (2) the growth of positive attitudes towards success in learning English as a foreign or second language.

2.1 Principles of supply and demand. A practical but instrumental grasp of English--i.e., the ability to use English for some particular purpose--has recently come to have great monetary and social value for large and growing numbers of individuals, groups, institutions, even nations. For them, success and progress has become linked with being able to use English as a tool for occupational or administrative or academic purposes. Consequently, a demand for English tuition has built up from would-be learners or their parents, sponsors, employers, etc. And this demand is backed by a willingness to pay for such tuition. The very large funds thus made available through payment of tuition fees (or in some countries the equivalent allocation of funds to the public education system in order to meet national needs) has created a supply of English tuition. In so doing, it has funded a massive effort of intellectual and practical research and development in the learning and teaching not only of English in particular, but of foreign languages in general. One element on this 'supply' side has been a corresponding growth in the provision of specialist professional training for teachers of English as a foreign or second language (EFL/ESL). This growth of teacher preparation has taken place in many countries, perhaps especially in the 'resource countries' for EFL/ESL: Britain and North America. Taking an example from Britain, and even confining the observation to projects outside the university system, the four-week intensive teacher training courses pioneered by John Haycraft, founder of International House, and the Royal Society of Arts courses closely modelled on those of International House, are estimated to have been taken by some 20,000 teachers in the past 15 years (Haycraft 1978 and personal communication). A further comment on the principles of supply and demand is that demand-led tuition means that teachers are teaching volunteers, and that in the case of English the majority of those who have been learning

the language not only sense a reason for doing so but have laid out money for the privilege. Under these conditions there exists a greater than normal 'intention to learn' (Strevens 1984, 1987) and a relatively high rate of success in learning. People who want to learn English tend to succeed in doing so. (There is, of course, the contrary example, of young school learners in many countries who do not perceive any reason for being required to learn English--or French in Britain, etc.--and who therefore, not being demand-led volunteers, have no enhanced intention to learn and little or no improved rate of success.)

2.2 Language teaching seen as accessible and effective. As a result of the demand-led application of resources to EFL/ESL, more people learn more readily, and the wide perception of this relative success stimulates further demand. A climate of expectations of success is created, and many more people feel encouraged to become language learners than might otherwise have been the case.

3. Who are the new English users? At least four categories can be identified among the many millions of new English users.

3.1 Population migrations. The spread of English is essentially an example of language contact: one of the principal mechanisms that produce language contact is the migration of populations. In modern times (i.e., in the past 100 years) there have occurred massive migrations into basically 'English-speaking' countries, principally the United States and Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and to a much lesser extent Great Britain. Such migrations continue to this day whenever economic hardship, political or ethnic despotism, or the desolation of war drive large populations of people to make their homes either in chiefly English-speaking countries or in countries where they, the migrants, will need to use English in order to integrate into the community.

3.2 Populations subject to national language planning policies. Educational and political decisions can create or reduce these statistics. Thus, in Pakistan the number of English users has declined since independence, as the place of English in the schools and in administration has been reduced. By contrast, in Singapore English has dramatically

increased since the political/educational aim was adopted, for every Singaporean citizen to become bilingual in English, and in either Chinese, Malay, or Tamil. In some countries, notably the People's Republic of China, a decision to make English the first foreign language in the educational system, rather than Russian, has already added great numbers of English users to the total.

3.3 Nonethnocentred English users. It is useful to distinguish those uses and users of English who are ethnocentred (i.e., concerned with the uses and needs of a community or nation) from those which are nonethnocentred. Ethnocentred uses and users include those referred to above as population migrations and populations subject to national language planning policies. Nonethnocentred uses and users embrace all those millions of people who need and use English for their work or for study: e.g., those who work in air traffic control and maritime communications, in tourism, in the international aid and administration agencies, in pop music, in the radio and TV news media, in space technology, in computing and artificial intelligence, etc. It is not that all activities in all these fields are always conducted in English, but rather that English tends to predominate and that those who take part in them require English for such activities, even though the activities themselves are not 'ethnocentred'. In short, while a Canadian or a Singaporean will need English because he/she is a Canadian or Singaporean, a space scientist or air traffic controller needs it because of his/her work, regardless of nationality.

3.4 Those attracted by prospects of success in language learning. Compared with, say, 40 years ago and more, the public view of the likelihood of achieving worthwhile success in learning English has been transformed. Previously, there were relatively few opportunities to learn English; where opportunities existed, they often provided a learning experience that was slow and ineffective; frequently, English tuition was available only as a 'package deal' with literature and not at all for aspiring scientists; in short, it was often very limited. As a result, the task of learning English was rather low-valued (even if the end result itself was already prized), and the numbers of English learners was depressed accordingly. It should be noted that this poor reputation applied not only to English but to the learning of all foreign

languages. Indeed, it was in large part the restriction of facilities for learning languages to élite secondary schools and the relatively poor general standards achieved by them that led to the vogue for invented, 'simplified' international auxiliary languages such as Ido, Anglic, Volapük, Esperanto, and others in the last century. Today the circumstances are very different. English is widely accessible and effectively learned/taught, so that the public's view of the possibility of learning a useful amount of English is now an optimistic one, by and large. And not only English: what can be done in learning English is increasingly seen as potentially available in learning other languages too.

4. 'Informed language teaching' and improved learning success. The changes in the access to and the effectiveness of language teaching and learning are not confined to English, but to a large extent they have been led by and through English. This has perhaps been inevitable, given the demand for English and the consequent disproportionate allocation to English of resources for intellectual and practical developments. The nature of the resulting changes may be summarized under three heads: professionalism; methodology; principles and theories.

4.1 Professionalism in language teaching. It is now commonly accepted in EFL/ESL that learning is improved by good teaching; that teaching is improved by the deliberate training or preparation of the teacher; that the conscious maintenance and improvement of standards is incumbent on those who teach; that standards are disseminated through teachers' associations; that EFL/ESL teaching, being part of education, requires an element of social responsibility of those who engage in it;--in short, that EFL/ESL has the characteristics of a profession.

4.2 Methodology in language teaching. There has been a vast increase in the quantity, variety, and interest of teaching techniques and materials prepared for teaching English. Not only have authors been prolific and publishers willing to market their work, but it has gradually become a mark of the good teacher that he/she expects to contribute new ideas on teaching techniques, for the benefit of others. Perhaps only the teaching of medicine has such an array of methods and materials.

4.3 Principles and theories in language teaching. It is now 40 years since some specialists in EFL/ESL (following the earlier lead of, e.g., Victor, Sweet, Passy, Jespersen, Palmer, Hornby, and others) observed that while improvements in classroom methodology are certainly important, there is an essential requirement also for intellectual understanding of the learning and teaching processes. Increasingly, in recent years, professionalism in the preparation of teachers has included imparting an ever greater understanding, by the teaching of principles and theories relevant to his/her task.

If the lead in these and related developments has been taken in the teaching of English, in consequence of the greater resources available for the purpose, the teaching and learning of other languages are also developing apace. The teaching of French is becoming a focus of effort and achievement; the teaching of German, Italian, and Russian is receiving a great deal of attention; other languages, too, are being promoted in many ways.

As a result, it is now increasingly common to observe examples of excellence in language learning and teaching, where the cooccurrence of a number of features in the teaching seems to be associated with exceptional levels of achievement in learning. I have termed 'Informed Teaching' the kinds of high-standard professional activity commonly associated with exceptional learning.

The principal characteristics of Informed Teaching are typically these:

- (1) The teachers have received specialized professional training as teachers of EFL/ESL, or other languages.
- (2) The methods and materials employed are varied, interesting, and relevant.
- (3) Good personal relations exist between the teachers and the learners.
- (4) The learners sustain a high level of intention to learn.
- (5) There is a language-rich environment for learning, with much opportunity for language use and practice.
- (6) Often the learning/teaching are conducted at a high rate of intensity (in hours per week).

Under these conditions of Informed Teaching, the learning is typically very effective. In the context of the present paper the argument being advanced is that Informed Teaching is becoming increasingly frequent, that it has its origins in

the demand-led ferment of activity in EFL/ESL, that it is becoming visible in relation to other languages than English, and that it has contributed to the change in public perceptions about their likelihood of success in learning a foreign language.

5. A fresh view of 'the spread of English'. Ever since the publication of Fishman's (1977) book The Spread of English, it has been conventional to concentrate attention on English, noting that it is English more than any other language which occupies a dominant position among the statistics of language use. But it is not only English that is being spread, and learned. Looked at in global terms the picture is, rather, one of the spread of multilingualism. No doubt it is English that is being learned more than any other language, but very many languages other than English are also being learned by large numbers of people.

Thus, Trim (in Quirk and Widdowson 1985) outlines 'the constant guiding principles according to which the Council of Europe has promoted language learning'. These are, briefly: permanent education; learner-centredness; life-relatedness; participatory democracy; a communicative approach; learning by doing. These principles are being realized in relation to the learning and teaching of all the languages of North-West Europe.

Not only in Europe but throughout the world there is a growing surge of language teaching as a facet of cultural diplomacy, notably in respect of French, German, Italian, and Japanese.

In the Jewish diaspora, Hebrew is being taught with renewed vigour (Spolsky, private communication); in a similar way, tuition in the Armenian language is being offered more pressingly to Armenians scattered around the world.

Bilingual education, too, introduces very large numbers of people in many countries to the existence of other languages and cultures, and also to the discovery that learning another language is by no means impossible or extraordinary.

6. Conclusion: The global rise of multilingualism. Throughout the world it is becoming normal and unremarkable for people to expect to gain some degree of practical command of at least one foreign language--throughout the world with the exception, that is, of the large populations of

monolingual speakers of English. For them, a paradox now starts to build up.

Speakers of English as the mother tongue--the British, the Americans, the non-Francophone Canadians, the Australians and New Zealanders--have for three centuries been able to say 'We don't need to learn foreign languages; foreigners can learn English.' (For many, the first proposition has been darkened to 'We can't learn foreign languages...' with the foreigners' ability to learn English being regarded almost as an unwelcome foreign trait.)

In the colonial/imperial era, the cachet of the dominant Anglophone society sheltered us from the disadvantages of being monolingual. Today, by contrast, the disadvantages are coming home to roost. With colonialism discredited, and with the former colonial powers being the last monolinguals, suddenly the merits of multilingualism are apparent, while the monolingual Anglophone is seen to be at a real and growing disadvantage in the present multilingual world.

It can be argued, then, that the spread of English has been strengthened and made more accessible and effective as a consequence of the funds generated by its demand-led status; that the accessibility and effectiveness of English tuition has encouraged around the world a more positive public attitude towards learning foreign languages in general, as well as feeding the improvement of methods and materials in other languages; that the spread of English is in fact only one aspect--albeit the most obvious--of a global surge in multilingualism; that in consequence the monolingual English speakers, already heavily outnumbered by English users for whom English is a foreign language, and no longer able to enjoy the spurious cachet of colonial domination, find their lack of linguistic expertise a positive disadvantage. Monolingual Anglophones everywhere must come to terms with the absolute necessity of learning foreign languages.

References

- Bailey, Richard, and M. Görlach, eds. 1982. *English as a world language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Crystal, David. 1985. How many millions? The statistics of English today. *English Today* No. 1, January.
- Ferguson, Charles A., and Shirley Brice Heath. 1981.

- Language in the U.S.A. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, Joshua A., ed. 1968. Language problems in developing nations. New York: Newbury House.
- Fishman, Joshua A., R. L. Cooper, and A. W. Conrad. 1977. The spread of English: The sociology of English as an additional language. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Greenbaum, Sidney, ed. 1985. The English language today. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.
- Haycraft, John. 1978. Teacher training as a practical need. In: Strevens (1978).
- Kachru, Braj B. 1980. The pragmatics of non-native varieties of English. In: Smith (1981).
- Kachru, Braj B., ed. 1982. The other tongue: English across cultures. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1986. The alchemy of English: The spread, models and functions of non-native Englishes. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Michaels, L., and C. Ricks, eds. 1980. The state of the language. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longmans.
- Quirk, Randolph, and H. G. Widdowson, eds. 1985. English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Larry E., ed. 1981. English for cross-cultural communication. London: Macmillan.
- Smith, Larry E., ed. 1983. Readings in English as an international language. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Strevens, Peter, ed. 1978. In honour of A.S. Hornby. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strevens, Peter. 1980. Teaching English as an international language. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Strevens, Peter. 1982. World English and the world's Englishes; or, whose language is it, anyway? London: Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, Vol. CXX, No. 5311:418-31.
- Strevens, Peter. 1984. Elements in the language teaching/learning process: 'Did he learn or was he taught?' Quebec: TESL Canada Journal 2.1.
- Strevens, Peter. 1987. Language learning and language teaching: Towards an integrated model. In: Tannen (1987).

- Tannen, Deborah, ed. 1987. *Linguistics in context connecting observation and understanding: Lectures from the 1985 LSA/TESOL and NEH Institutes*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Todd, Loreto. 1984. *Modern Englishes, pidgins, and creoles*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell; London: André Deutsch.
- Trim, John L. 1985. Commentary on C. Edelhoff, 'A view from teacher in-service education and training'. In: Quirk and Widdowson (1985).

EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE PHILIPPINES: A CASE STUDY

G. Richard Tucker

Center for Applied Linguistics

The Republic of the Philippines comprises a chain of approximately 7,000 islands stretching from Taiwan in the north to Borneo in the south. The official languages, according to the Constitution ratified on February 2, 1987, are English and Pilipino, which is based on Tagalog. Spanish and Arabic are to be 'promoted on a voluntary and optional basis'. Nine major regional vernaculars (Ilokano, Kapampangan, Bikol, Waray, Cebuano, Hiligaynon, Pangasinan, Maranao-Maguindanao, and Tausug) are to serve as 'auxiliary official languages' in their regions. One or more of the ten major languages--including Tagalog--are spoken by approximately 90% of the population, which is now thought to number 65 million.

The Philippines offers a unique opportunity for those wishing to examine the full range of activities subsumed under the rubric of language planning/language policy--namely, policy discussion, implementation, evaluation, formative feedback, and possibly policy modification (cf. Gonzalez 1984). A number of major events have occurred over the past two decades which relate directly to language (education) policy in the Philippines. In 1968-1969, with financial assistance from the Ford Foundation and the Asia Foundation, staff from the Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal College planned and implemented a nationwide language policy survey (Gonzalez 1985; Gonzalez and Bautista 1986; Sibayan 1978). The results of this survey--described by Sibayan at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978--served to document the uses of and attitudes toward diverse vernacular and official languages in the Philippines. The resulting picture was one of societal multilinguality; of parents--particularly

in non-Tagalog areas--ambivalent about extending the use of Pilipino as a medium of instruction; and of limited availability of teaching materials, particularly outside of the large urban centers.

Senior staff from the Language Study Center (most notably Bonifacio P. Sibayan and Fe T. Otones) continued the analysis of the data from that survey and their observations, reports, and recommendations contributed in large measure to the reasonably full debate which led to the formulation of the Philippine bilingual education policy (BEP) of 1974 (Department Order No. 25--Implementing Guidelines for the Policy on Bilingual Education). One particularly salutary occurrence was the extent to which Filipino language educators were involved in the discussions leading toward implementation of a new policy.

With the promulgation of this department order, the language education policy of the Philippines became a bilingual one--that is, some academic subjects (science and mathematics) were to be taught in English while others (e.g., history and geography) were to be taught via Pilipino throughout elementary and secondary school--our grades 1 through 10. In addition, a portion of the day was to be devoted to instruction in Pilipino Communication Arts and some to English Communications Arts. The educational objective was to develop a citizenry bilingual in English and in Pilipino. For many prospective students, Pilipino was not their mother tongue, but rather served as a linking national language. The policy was to be implemented throughout the country, with the possibility of using local or vernacular languages for initial instruction during some portions of grade 1 and 2, if necessary, for transitional purposes.

For many years (from 1898 until 1957), English was the sole medium of formal education, although Pilipino has been taught as a subject since 1940. The BEP constituted a rather dramatic departure from the educational scheme in effect since 1957 in which the vernacular had been used for instruction in primary 1 and 2, with a switch to English as the major medium of instruction for all subjects (except Pilipino Communications Arts) at primary 3 (Gonzalez 1982; Luzares 1982; Ramos, Aguillar and Sibayan 1967). After Department Order No. 25 was issued, during the period from 1974 through 1985, the new policy was presumably implemented in various ways in different areas of the country. A range of teacher preparation plans were proposed

(many current teachers had never taught via Pilipino and were neither native nor proficient second language speakers of Pilipino), and a Pilipino materials development project--for the elementary level--was undertaken at the Language Study Center. Anecdotal reports indicated that policy implementation was uneven, and that the preparation and distribution of materials, particularly for teaching subjects in Pilipino, left much to be desired.

A retrospective evaluation. Within this context, representatives of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines prepared a proposal in 1984 to evaluate the results of the BEP ten years after its implementation. This proposal was submitted to the Philippine Ministry of Education, Culture, and Sports (MECS), the Asia Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the United States Agency for International Development--all of which acted positively and collaboratively to fund a four-part project which was begun in the spring of 1985. The evaluation plan comprised four parts:

1. The major study was a quantitative evaluation of language proficiency and academic achievement. Two groups--students and teachers--were selected, using purposive stratified sampling from within geographical areas represented by each of 17 major ethnolinguistic groups. Within the geographical area of each group, the regional director of the MECS was asked to select the most 'excellent' public and the most 'excellent' private school as well as the 'poorest' public and the 'poorest' private school in that division. Within each of these nominated schools, 40 students were tested at each of grades 4, 6, and 10 in each of five subjects (Pilipino Communication Arts, English Communication Arts, Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics). These grades were chosen because they represent important transition points in Philippine education. The students were tested using reliable and valid instruments which had been developed by the center for Educational Measurement or by MECS. In addition, teachers were also tested in English, Pilipino, Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics. (This is the only major country-wide evaluation of which I am aware in which teachers have been systematically tested.) Altogether, 136 schools were selected, which resulted in a total test sample of 568 teachers and 2,251 grade 4

students, 2,328 grade 6 students, and 2,592 grade 10 students.

The data analyses examined: (1) students' language proficiency and achievement as a function of factors such as ethnolinguistic background, length of participation in the program, congruence between mother tongue and language of instruction; and (2) teachers' proficiency and achievement of a function of numerous predictor variables.

2. A second qualitative study was conducted to examine the level of awareness of BEP among representatives of selected government and nongovernment organizations and among a large randomly chosen sample of parents. This study examined the level of awareness, patterns of language use, perceptions, and attitudes toward BEP via questionnaire and structured interviews. A sample of parents and the heads of 33 government and nongovernment organizations were questioned.

3. A third study examined the contributions of scholarly societies to the implementation of BEP. Officers of 48 scholarly societies--ten of which were language societies and 38 of which were nonlanguage societies--were interviewed regarding the contributions of their respective organizations to the development of Pilipino and the strengthening or maintenance of English.

4. Lastly, a survey study was carried out to obtain data on the implementation of the BEP at the tertiary level which was based upon Department Order No. 50 of 1975. For this study, 94 of the 1,168 tertiary institutions in the country were selected by proportionate random sampling, with attention being paid to ethnolinguistic region and public versus private institution. Administrators, faculty members, and students were interviewed, using a prepared questionnaire to collect information about policy implementation as well as general patterns of language use.

Results of the evaluation. Under the dynamic leadership of officers and other key members from the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, the evaluation was conducted during 1985. Data were analyzed and a series of reports (Linguistic Society... 1986) were prepared and distributed. It is beyond the scope of the present paper to present the findings of these four studies in detail, but it may be useful for me to share highlights with you. With respect to the first or quantitative study, the following highlights emerge:

1. The BEP had been implemented in approximately 98% of the schools that were sampled. This indicates a reasonably widespread--at least superficially--implementation of policy throughout the country at the elementary and secondary levels. At the tertiary level, however, approximately 65% of the responding institutions had not implemented the policy.

2. With respect to student performance, the first interesting finding was that different ethnolinguistic groups performed more or less equally on a nonverbal general intelligence test.

3. Results indicated a very depressing 'cross-sectional over-all down trend in achievement'. This indicates a pattern of deterioration by the grade 10 level for students who have been in the bilingual program over a period of time. That is, students were actually performing relatively more poorly at higher grade levels than at lower. The results indicated that with respect to certain subject matter, non-Tagalog mother tongue speakers were particularly disadvantaged.

4. With regard to subject-matter proficiency, teachers in general scored poorly on all of the tests. The inference was drawn by the reports' authors that teachers, for the most part, do not know the content that they are called upon to teach. Furthermore, and particularly with regard to the teaching of social studies (which should, according to BEP, occur in Pilipino), many teachers reported that they are not themselves fluent in Pilipino, are uncomfortable teaching via Pilipino, or simply do not teach via Pilipino.

5. At the elementary and secondary levels, more than 80% of the teachers reported they believed it possible to be a 'genuine' Filipino without using Pilipino as a medium of instruction for formal education. This theme recurred in several of the studies and seemed to represent a widely held belief.

What general implications can be drawn? One sees an overriding pattern of poor teacher language proficiency--particularly in Pilipino--and poor teacher subject matter mastery. The survey revealed a widespread lack of materials for teaching at the secondary level, and especially a lack of materials for teaching social studies via Pilipino. Noteworthy

was the absence of specialized resource or reference materials necessary to permit the carrying out of individual projects or original research in Pilipino by either students or teachers. This lack of ancillary materials, together with teachers' limited language proficiency, makes it virtually impossible to teach rigorous, cognitively demanding material in Pilipino at the secondary level. The reports' authors have concluded that Pilipino must be cultivated as a language for higher cognitive activities; that additional rich and extensive materials must be developed for the secondary level; and that teacher training programs must prepare teachers in Pilipino if the language is to be used successfully as a language of higher intellectual endeavor. (The authors refer to this general process as the 'intellectualization' of Pilipino.)

With respect to the implementation of the BEP at the tertiary level, only 35% of the sample of 1,168 institutions reported that they were implementing the policy. Those who had not implemented the policy--and even those who had--reported a lack of materials, a lack of teacher language proficiency, and a lack of terminology to deal with cognitively complex, academically demanding material as reasons. They did not feel prepared, nor did they feel that they had the resources, to undertake original scholarship in Pilipino. Substantially more than 50% of the respondents reported that Pilipino is not as effective or efficient a medium for advanced scholarly inquiry as is English.

With respect to the level of awareness of the BEP among government organizations (GOs) and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), fully 76% of the GO respondents claimed that they had never heard of the policy, while 58% of the NGOs reported that they had not heard of the policy. All reported that English was important for an individual's career, that the majority of all official documents and correspondence were now and would likely continue to be in English, that proficiency in English (but not in Pilipino) was a consideration--indeed a prerequisite--in hiring and promotion decisions. They also reported a belief that the quality of English has deteriorated in the country over the last decade. None of the GOs reported any policies for promoting the use or spread of Pilipino except for the Ministry of Education.

With respect to the contribution of scholarly societies, the general summary was that little original research, little cultivation, or little scholarly communication occurs in the

country in Pilipino. Nor did respondents report that this state was likely to change in the near future.

Modification to bilingual education policy. A series of reports presenting the findings from the evaluation were prepared and distributed. Officers of the LSP wanted to find the best possible means of informing concerned parents, educators, and policy makers about the results of the evaluation and of taking steps to develop recommendations for proposed modifications to the BEP. In November 1986, the team which had completed the evaluation held a briefing for the Minister, Deputy Minister, and Director of Elementary Education to explain the research findings and to present a set of tentative recommendations. They suggested a framework for facilitating information dissemination, program review, and planning for possible policy modification.

They proposed that a conference be organized by the MECS to announce officially the major findings of the study. The audience would be representatives from the public and the private sector, and hopefully from the press as well. Second, they proposed to convene an executive group of approximately 15 individuals to examine the findings, to suggest tentative policy changes, to prepare draft recommendations, and in short to discuss all aspects of language education policy for the country. The Ford Foundation agreed to provide funding for these 'implementation' activities based upon a model for similar activities in Jordan (see Harrison, Prator, and Tucker 1975).

The first phase--'A conference to present the findings of the BEP evaluation project: Their implications for language policy under the new constitution'--was held on December 13, 1986. This activity occurred during MECS' Education Week program and was attended and widely reported. The second activity--a working seminar involving an executive group--occurred January 12-14, 1987. Fifteen individuals (decision makers from the Ministry, representatives from the Institute of National Language, key Filipino language educators, and myself) participated in this working seminar. The purpose of the seminar was to discuss fully all aspects of the evaluation and implications for current policy, and to develop proposed policy modifications in a setting removed from Manila and thus removed from the demands of daily business schedules. Two and one-half days were devoted to a thorough discussion of all aspects of Philippine language education policy. As a

result of these deliberations, drafts of a 'Revised policy on bilingual education' and 'Implementing guidelines for the revised policy on bilingual education' were developed by the group for presentation to the Minister of Education.

Proposed recommendations. At the seminar the working group reiterated the desirability of students' developing competence in both Pilipino and English at a national level. The group reaffirmed the desirability of using both Pilipino and English as media of instruction at elementary and secondary levels, with their use allocated to specific subjects in the curriculum.

The group reemphasized and strongly recommended that the major vernaculars should be used for purposes of initial literacy training among non-Tagalogs--a practice which had fallen into disuse during the preceding 11 years. The group stressed the desirability of broadening the base for teaching Pilipino where 'faculty are ready and where teaching materials have been developed', but agreed that the 'maintenance of English as a medium of instruction [is] one of the specific goals of the Bilingual Education Policy.'

The group commented on the necessity to cultivate Pilipino as a language of scholarly discourse--'that is to say, its intellectualization, is the responsibility of tertiary-level institutions.' The group proposed that incentives be set by the Ministry to encourage research and development in areas such as translation, the compiling of original reference works, and the writing of textbooks. They agreed that the Institute (to be called a Commission) of National Language must take more rapid steps toward the lexical enrichment and elaboration of Pilipino.

More specifically, in the 'Implementing guidelines', the group reiterated the necessity of developing literacy materials and disseminating these materials in the vernacular languages--particularly those used in non-Tagalog areas. The group called for the development of suitable teaching materials, the training of special teachers, the offering of additional classes, and the establishment of incentives for Pilipino teachers so that Pilipino could be taught as a second language more efficiently and effectively in non-Tagalog areas than has been the case. (It is interesting to note that the widespread attention directed toward all aspects of the teaching of English as a Second Language for many years in the Philippines has not been replicated with the teaching of

Pilipino.) The group called for the development of standards for achievement and of competency testing to be implemented at grades 4, 6, and 10, and asked that test results be used as the basis for providing formative feedback to educators. Further, the group suggested that students who have not attained minimum language skills set for the various grade levels should not be promoted.

The group also took a reasonably strong position with respect to teacher training and agreed that in the future, admission to preservice training programs should depend upon the demonstration of language proficiency; that specific programs should be developed to train teachers to use Pilipino as a medium of instruction; that certification mechanisms should be developed and implemented; and that inservice training programs should be revised to reflect any changes in bilingual policy. Lastly, the group called for the repetition of a summative evaluation in ten years time (i.e., 1997) so that it would be possible to examine the implications of the suggested fine tuning of policy. These draft policy and guideline statements were presented to the Education Minister on February 20 for her consideration. It is hoped that a second stage of consultation will occur later this spring to involve the review of these draft recommendations by regional directors of education or their key language policy implementers. Hopefully, this second workshop will finalize the drafts in consultation with different sectors at the regional or grass-roots level.

Summary. From my perspective, it is possible to examine the entire spectrum of the language education policy process by studying the Philippine example. The evaluation which formed the basis for deliberations at the Punta Baluarte seminar constitutes an extremely important 'benchmark' which will provide the raw material for potential policy modification and a basis for future comparative assessment. Several highlights emerged from the evaluation and from the deliberations: (1) a refocusing of attention on the importance of the vernacular language in young children's literacy training and early education; (2) attention to the need to provide special training in Pilipino as a second language for those who are not native speakers of the language; (3) the need to develop a more rigorous Pilipino Communication Arts program for native speakers and nonnative speakers alike; (4) the need to develop a more

rigorous program for the maintenance of English language skills, which now are widely perceived to be deteriorating; (5) a call to articulate a set of educational standards, to develop a standardized testing program, and to ensure that data are collected on a regular basis concerning progress in meeting these standards; (6) attention to teacher preservice education as well as inservice education, with a requirement that teachers be proficient in the language(s) in which they will teach as a condition of their certification or employment, and that they also be masters of content material if they are teaching subjects such as social studies, mathematics, or science; (7) attention to the development and distribution of a sufficient body of core and ancillary materials--particularly in the subjects to be taught in Pilipino; (8) attention to the need to mobilize individuals to address the continuing elaboration or cultivation of Pilipino. Without such work, the task of using Pilipino to teach cognitively complex and academically demanding subject matter at the secondary level might well be hopeless. (I personally feel that unless prospective social studies teachers can be trained at teacher training colleges in Pilipino using Pilipino materials, such teachers will not be able effectively to stimulate, challenge, and teach their students.)

Participants at the seminar spent a good deal of time discussing the choice of optimal strategy for providing children with a sufficient knowledge of Pilipino and English so that they could then participate fully in education. We agreed that this language proficiency would constitute a necessary prerequisite for participating in education, but would not in itself be isomorphic with educational attainment. That is, the point was made strongly that creating a program or an environment in which the child could develop bilingual proficiency in Pilipino and English would not in any way necessarily guarantee that the child would master the science concepts, mathematics concepts, or social studies concepts necessary for educational attainment. The results of the BEP evaluation suggested strongly that we must do more than fine tune the choice and sequencing of languages for purposes of instruction, and that the challenge then becomes, at least in part, to ensure that language educators reach out to colleagues in science, mathematics, and social studies education to ensure a concerted effort to improve the quality of education for Filipino children.

Note

The catalytic leadership provided by Andrew B. Gonzalez, Fe T. Otones, and Bonifacio P. Sibayan has been the essential ingredient in the nurturing of language-education discussions in the Philippines during the past 20 years.

References

- Gonzalez, A. 1982. Language policy and language-in-education policy in the Philippines. In: *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 1981*. Edited by R.B. Kaplan. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Gonzalez, A., ed. 1984. *Language planning, implementation and evaluation: Essays in honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his sixty-seventh birthday*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Gonzalez, A. 1985. Language use surveys in the Philippines (1968-1983). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 55:57-77.
- Gonzalez, A., and M. L. Bautista. 1986. *Language surveys in the Philippines 1966-1984*. Manila: De La Salle Press.
- Harrison, W., C. Prator, and G. R. Tucker. 1975. *English-language policy survey of Jordan*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Linguistic Society of the Philippines. 1984. *A project to evaluate ten years of the bilingual education program in the Philippines*. Mimeographed report, De La Salle University, October.
- Linguistics Society of the Philippines. 1986. *Eleven years of bilingual schooling in the Philippines (1974-1985): A summative evaluation*. Mimeographed report, De La Salle University.
- Luzares, C. E. 1982. Language in education in the Philippines. In: *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 1981*. Edited by R. B. Kaplan. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Ramos, M., J. V. Aguillar, and B. P. Sibayan. 1967. *The determination and implementation of language policy*. Quezon City, Philippines: Alemar-Phoenix Press.
- Sibayan, B. P. 1978. Bilingual education in the Philippines: Strategy and structure. In: *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978*. Edited by J. E. Alatis. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press. 302-29.

LANGUAGE SPREAD IN MODES OF USE

H. G. Widdowson

University of London

In this paper I want to consider language spread as a function of changes in customary patterns of use. These patterns, referred to as varieties, dialects, registers, styles are the normal realizations of linguistic resources, sanctioned by convention, confirmed by common custom. They constitute the established order. But changes in the prevailing cultural paradigms, the emergence of new fashions of thought or behaviour, will result in new realizations of these resources, the spread of language out of its conventional confinement in established modes of use into new territory, often creating conflict in the process with the particular mode of use already installed by right of custom. My concern, then, is with language spread as a potentially disruptive influence, for good or ill; language spread as a kind of rhetorical incursion.

Let me begin by giving an example of the aspect of language spread I have in mind, and the reactions it can provoke. There are people of somewhat conservative cast of mind who deplore the spread of demotic dialect into the polite discourse of the bourgeoisie. These are the self-appointed custodians of language correctness. One such is the writer John Simon, author of a book entitled Paradigms Lost in which appears the following: 'Bad grammar is rather like bad manners; someone picking his nose at a party will still be recognized as a minimal human being and not a literal four-footed pig; but there are cases where the minimal is not enough' (quoted in Stalker 1985:68). Now why should Simon be so extreme? What is it that incites such intemperate condemnation? The equation of bad grammar and bad manners makes it clear that the objection has to do with improper social comportment, the intrusion of a way of behaving which is a contravention of standards of propriety.

It is a threat to the established order. There are people no doubt who customarily pick their noses and use bad grammar, and occasions when such habits would pass without comment. But not in polite society and not at a party. Nose-picking and bad grammar are social markers. The spread of such common practices must be prevented in the cause of maintaining a particular mode of behaviour. For the custodians of correctness are not seeking to deny or to eradicate this vulgarity but to keep it from spreading into their own protected domain. The way other people speak in their own social situations is their own affair, so long as there is no encroachment. Minimal human beings are free to behave as they choose so long as they are kept in their place and do not threaten to gatecrash the party. An analogy is provided by Edgar Allen Poe's story The Masque of the Red Death. Here the Prince of a country being ravaged by pestilence assembles a thousand of his courtiers in an abbey and seals it entirely off from the world outside. While the peasants die of plague, the prince (quite literally) has a ball, confident that he is safe from infection. All is in vain, of course, for eventually the pestilence of the Red Death spreads into this preserve of privilege. Attempts to prevent the spread of linguistic infection are likely to be doomed to failure in the same way, and this no doubt partially explains why they take the form of such extreme and exasperated polemic.

But although it is easy to pillory such attempts at protection and prescription when they seek to conserve a traditional social order, it is important to recognise that such attempts to limit language spread are not confined to these so-called 'death-of-language' writers, these vigilantes who see language change in terms of social abuse and the corruption of manners. In the same volume (Greenbaum 1985) in which Simon is quoted and castigated (along with others of his persuasion) we find a chapter on the Plain English Movement. This is described as 'the effort to simplify the language in legal, government, business technical, and academic documents' (Redish 1985:123).¹

It is easy to approve of this effort. But, benevolent though it may be, it too is directed at language limitation, the prescription of appropriate use. There is no implication that the kind of style used in legal or technical documents may not be allowable within its own specialist domains. What is objectionable, and what the Plain Language

Movement seeks to prevent, is the spread of this language into kinds of use which should serve the needs of the general public. The writers who deplore vulgarity and seek to promote standards of correctness and those who deplore obscurity and seek to promote standards of plain speaking, though motivated by very different sociopolitical dispositions, are both in the business of abuse control. Both attempt to intervene in the process of language spread by appeal to notions of what is appropriate and in defence of social values. And both are prone to hyperbole. Redish, for example, in commending plain English, writes as follows:

Plain English means writing that is straightforward, that reads as if it were spoken. It means writing that is unadorned with archaic, multisyllabic words and majestic turns of phrase. Plain English is clear, direct, and simple. (Redish 1985:125)

One notes the loaded terms, 'unadorned', 'majestic turns of phrase'. Like the comments of Simon cited earlier, these by Redish are also charged with partiality. To require of writing that it should read as if it were spoken is to appeal to popular prejudice. It ignores the fact, well documented in the work of such writers as Goody (1977), Ong (1982a, 1982b), Tannen (1982b), that writing and speech are modes of use which typically realise conceptual and communicative functions in different ways. There is no more reason, on the face of it, for proposing that writing should approximate to speech than for proposing the opposite. Everything depends on what function the language is required to serve. There can be no absolute injunction. There are occasions, particularly those calling for interactive sensitivity, when speech will need to be other than plain and straightforward to be effective for its purpose. It just will not do to dismiss all elaboration as 'adornment' and the trafficking in 'majestic turns of phrase', or to associate these features uniquely with written language. The attempts by the Plain Language Movement to regulate language spread, however well intentioned and worthy one may believe them to be, are marked, as are the efforts of Simon and other custodians of correctness, by a certain lack of sociolinguistic awareness. This is not to say that there is no case for the simplification of language for public consumption but only that the case

cannot be logically argued by making a simple equation of speech and writing.

The suspicion that adornment is used to deceive, and the general distrust of eloquence, are apparent also in the writing of Labov. I am thinking in particular of his paper 'The logic of non-standard English', published almost 20 years ago, but still influential. Labov makes a distinction between 'verbality', the efficient use of language to achieve communicative precision, and 'verbosity', the inefficient elaboration of language designed to impress. It is verbosity, he claims, which characterises middle-class as distinct from working-class speech:

Our work in the speech community makes it painfully obvious that in many ways working-class speakers are more effective narrators, reasoners and debaters than many middle-class speakers who temporise, qualify, and lose their argument in a mass of irrelevant detail. Many academic writers try to rid themselves of that part of middle-class style that is empty pretension, and keep that part that is needed for precision. But the average middle-class speaker that we encounter makes no such effort; he is enmeshed in verbiage, the victim of sociolinguistic factors beyond his control. (Labov 1972:192-93)²

Verbosity is to be deplored because it is not, to use the terms of Redish, straightforward, clear, direct, and simple. It is not plain speaking. In both cases, there is a belief in the primacy of precision. But even if one considers language use in essentially transactional rather than interactional terms (cf. Brown and Yule 1983), as Redish and Labov do, precision is, as the work of the ethnomethodologists has amply demonstrated, an extremely elusive quality. It is indeed a communicative variable and is realised through negotiation in relation to purpose. And when features of interaction are taken into account, it is easy to see that there will be occasions when it would be quite inappropriate to be plain, when temporising and qualification are part of acceptable social practice. One cannot simply dismiss such elaboration as pretension and set it up in opposition to precision. To do so is to misrepresent the very nature of language use.

The truth of the matter is that Labov is predisposed to favour features of working-class speech. He has an axe to

grind. The disparagement of verbal elaboration as a middle-class phenomenon is a polemical tactic. He seeks to promote a particular mode of use and to protect it from the incursions of another. So it is that he is especially critical of Charles M, 'an upper-middle-class college educated Negro man', whose way of speaking is unfavourably compared with that of Larry, described as a 'paradigmatic speaker' of Black English Vernacular. Larry is 'quick, ingenious and decisive'; 'he does not wander, or insert meaningless verbiage'. Charles M, on the other hand, does. He has become enmeshed, a sociolinguistic victim:

Charles M is obviously a 'good speaker' who strikes the listener as well-educated, intelligent and sincere. He is a likeable and attractive person--the kind of person that middle-class listeners rate very high on a scale of job-suitability and equally high as a potential friend. His language is more moderate and tempered than Larry's; he makes every effort to qualify his opinions, and seems anxious to avoid any misstatements or over-statements. From these qualities emerge the primary characteristics of this passage--its verbosity. Words multiply, some modifying and qualifying, some repeating or padding the main argument. (Labov 1972:198)

It is just as plausible to evaluate the performance of Charles M positively as an effective use of language in the exploration of ideas and in the adjustment to the interactive requirements of the occasion. But Labov will have none of this. On this account, it is all so much verbiage. Charles M is guilty of allowing middle-class verbosity to spread into his speech and to corrupt the virtues of his native vernacular.

Now we may acknowledge that Labov's argument is devoted to a good cause and wish to be associated with the ideology which informs it. But this should not prevent us from recognising that his promotion of a particular mode of use by referring to some absolute criterion of precision is, like the campaign of the Plain Language Movement, not essentially different from the efforts of Simon and like-minded custodians to promote the mode of use of their preference by referring to some absolute criterion of correctness. In all three cases, what we see are attempts to control language spread in the cause of some concept of social well-being.

This worry about the spread of undesirable modes of use has, of course, a very long history. Sir Thomas Sprat, in his History of the Royal Society, published in 1667, is particularly concerned that the scientific transactions of the society should not be infected with the fanciful language of poets. He associates the advancement of science with 'the improvement of the English language as a medium of prose' and inveighs against eloquence, with the same intemperance of tone that we have already noted with modern protectors of language domains. There is one thing, Sprat tells us,

about which the Society has been most solicitous; that is, the manner of their Discourse; which, unless they had been very watchful to keep in due temper, the whole spirit and vigour of their Design, had been soon eaten out by the luxury and redundancy of speech (quoted in Willey 1934:211).

The discourse which is so threatening is that which indulges in 'ornaments of speech', to which poets are particularly prone. It is against poets, therefore, that Sprat directs the full force of his attack:

who can behold, with Indignation, how many mists and uncertainties, these specious Tropes and Figures have brought on our knowledge?... this vicious abundance of Phrase, this Trick of Metaphors, this volubility of Tongue, which makes so great a noise in the world. (Willey 1934:212)

And so the arraignment rages, couched, we may note, in the very redundancy and luxury of phrase which it condemns. Against the incursion of this verbal extravagance, says Sprat, the Fellows of the Royal Society have adopted a

constant Resolution, to reject all the amplifications, digressions, and swellings of style: to return back to the primitive purity, and shortness, when men deliver'd so many things, almost in an equal number of words. They have exacted from all their members, a close, naked, natural way of speaking; positive expressions, clear senses; a native easiness; bringing all things as near the Mathematical plainness, as they can: and preferring the

language of Artizans, Countrymen, and Merchants, before that, of Wits and Scholars. (Willey 1934:212)

As Olson (1981) has pointed out, what is implied in Sprat's commendation of mathematical plainness (and, we should note, by the same token, in the advocacy of precision by Labov and the Plain Language Movement) is a belief in the relative autonomy of text, the assumption that language can if effectively used somehow signal its own meaning, thereby avoiding the uncertainties of variable pragmatic interpretation and exegesis. And here we make contact again with the issue raised earlier about the relationship between speech and writing. For this assumption of text autonomy, Olson argues (citing McLuhan and Ong in his support), arises from the development of literacy. The spread of language functions from speech to writing encourages a belief in conceptual control exercised through the production of permanent text. Paradoxically, the attempt to make writing approximate more closely to spoken language, as advocated by both Redish and Sprat, is ultimately informed by a literate tradition of reasoning which privileges the function of written language. We can deconstruct the arguments here (in just the same way as Derrida 1976 deconstructs the arguments of Saussure) to show that they represent the primacy of writing even as they proclaim the primacy of speech.

Sprat's polemic against the spread of poetic style into the domain of science and in favour of the adoption of the plain speech of artizans and countrymen is echoed, curiously enough, in the pronouncements of Wordsworth more than a century later. This is curious because Wordsworth's attempt at language planning is inspired by a desire to establish what he sees to be the proper discourse of poetry, and to purge it of what he calls, in very Spratlike terms, 'the gaudiness and inane phraseology of many modern writers'. His intention, as outlined in the advertisement of the first edition of Lyrical Ballads in 1798, was to write his poems as experiments:

They were written chiefly with a view to ascertain how far the language of conversation in the middle and lower classes of society is adapted to the purposes of poetic pleasure.

The middle and lower classes of society are of course precisely the artizans, countrymen, and merchants whose

speech Sprat was commending as the proper model for scientific discourse. But, as we have seen, such proposals promote strong opposition: they are seen as disruptions of a desired social order. Wordsworth's public, accustomed as it was to the adornments of eighteenth century poetic diction, did not take kindly to this spread of demotic speech into the domain of literature, seen as the property of the polite world. Wordsworth's lyrical ballads were considered by many as a breach of good manners: the poetic equivalent of nose-picking. And Wordsworth himself, lacking a little in the courage of his convictions, produces revisionist versions of his poems in later editions, acknowledging the impropriety of too much plainness, of too faithful a representation of what he calls 'the real language of men'.

Wordsworth's quest, like that of Sprat before him, was to find a kind of language which would be appropriate to new purposes. In Sprat's case, it was objective scientific enquiry. In Wordsworth's case it was a poetry which would deal with 'the incidents of common life' and in particular with 'low and rustic life' regarded by the fashion of his time as being beneath poetic notice. The language of common speech was in both cases pressed into the service of a new paradigm.

There are two issues arising from this discussion which, it seems to me, have a particular bearing on the theme of this conference. The first has to do with the sociolinguistic implications in the transfer of modes of use from one discourse domain to another. The second is the extent to which a literary realisation of linguistic resources in quest of appropriate expression differs from this transference across socially established patterns of use.

We can approach these issues by way of Wordsworth. Wordsworth chose 'the real language of men' as suited to the topic of his poems, 'the incidents of common life'. It seemed also to be especially suited to their genre, the ballad. Here was a form of poetry which belonged to an oral tradition of folk narrative and which had a particularly close association therefore with common speech. But Wordsworth cannot, of course, recover the conditions of composition and performance which inform the original ballads. His poems are fashioned in writing, fixed in print, and necessarily informed by modes of conception and communication developed over more than three centuries of literacy. They draw on certain features of spoken language but these are shaped into the rhetorical patterns of writing: the 'real

language of men' in a superficial sense, but dissociated from modes of discourse which characterise the oral tradition. The poems are a fusion of different modes: a rhetorical innovation.³

What then of Sprat, also an advocate, it would seem, of the 'real language of men'? The plainness of speech, which he associates with (presumably illiterate) artisans and countrymen, services modes of thought and interaction which may well be quite unsuited to the advancement of science to which the Royal Society is dedicated. Ong, for example, has claimed that 'Philosophical and scientific analysis are entirely dependent on the interiorization effected by writing'. And he makes the further point that:

... most literates are totally unaware that their most characteristic kinds of thinking... are unavailable to oral peoples, are not 'natural' at all in the sense that they cannot be carried on by a mind unaffected, directly or indirectly, by writing. (Ong 1982b:19-20/21)

It is just this lack of awareness that would seem to compromise the Sprat proposal. The kind of thinking which is characteristic of oral modes of use does not naturally accommodate the philosophical and scientific analysis which it is the purpose of the Royal Society to pursue. There is a disparity here. Is there a similar disparity in the poetic enterprise of Wordsworth?

I will return to this question presently. Meanwhile, let me prepare the ground by reformulating a more general point. It would seem that one cannot simply use language as a neutral resource, shaping it like raw materials to conceptual and communicative requirements on demand. Language is marked by its mode of use, and when it is brought into service in a different domain it necessarily carries its rhetorical associations with it. The consequence is, as we have seen, that conflicts arise with the conventions in residence.

And this raises quite fundamental social and educational questions. It may be accepted, for example, that, as Labov has demonstrated, nonstandard English has its own integrity and its own logic, but it does not follow that it should be preferred above all others, or that it is the mode of use which should be adopted for the kinds of enquiry conventionally associated with formal education.

Observations made by Johnson-Laird are relevant here. He has pointed out (1983) that what counts as satisfactory reasoning in everyday thinking ('practical reasoning', in ethnomethodological terms) very commonly does not satisfy the requirements of formal logic, but is based on reference to what he calls a mental model. This can be defined as a schematic construct of how the world works derived from subjective contextualised experience rather than from the exercise of objective conceptual analysis. The logic based on mental models is essentially, it would seem, a sort of informed guesswork, the intuitive inference from evidence, which Peirce referred to as abduction. (See Eco 1984:39-43) This mode of reasoning (developed into a fine art, incidentally, by Sherlock Holmes (Eco and Sebeok 1983) may characterise the mode of language use which constitutes the ethnologic of everyday life.⁴ But to adopt it as the basis for education would be to alter radically the definition of the curriculum and require a fundamental revision of what constitutes the principles of systematic enquiry. Now it may be that such radical reappraisal is necessary, as the thinking of scholars like Illich, Freire, and Feyerabend might dispose us to believe. My point is simply that both the prevention and the promotion of language spread in respect of modes of use have implications of this social and educational kind which we cannot ignore.

This question of the appropriateness of transfer of one mode of language use into the discourse domain conventionally the preserve of another has an obvious bearing also on the role of a second or foreign language in education. In the teaching of English to speakers of other languages, for example, it seems quite commonly to be supposed that English can be freely transferred and exploited as a resource. But particularly when it is the communicative function of language which is emphasised, there is always a rhetorical marking, an association with modes of use, and these will be in potential conflict with vernacular discourse patterns. Learning English as a means of conceptualisation and communication is bound to involve the initiation into those conventions of thought and its conveyance which define standard practice. Learning English means an acculturation into its customary modes of use. But then how do these modes affect the current local pattern of language use? How do the two cultures resolve their differences? This is not only a matter of reconciling the general

oppositions between oral and literate traditions of the kind discussed earlier. Work on contrastive rhetoric (e.g. Kaplan 1983, Connor and Kaplan 1987) has indicated that there are quite fundamental differences in conventionalised patterns of written use across cultures. Thus, when English is learnt for the specific purpose of pursuing academic study, the difficulty arises that students will be required to conform to rhetorical conventions which are different from those acquired through first language literacy.

But what if the students do not conform? They create a new mode of expression by the process of a kind of rhetorical creolisation whereby they adapt the resource of English to patterns of use associated with their own language. This may be inconvenient if one is seeking to develop a discourse of international currency based on the established patterns of English use where the emphasis is on convergence in the interests of communicative efficiency. But it can provide for the emergence of quite new forms of expression which challenge the rhetorical constraints that generally accompany the borrowing of linguistic resources. We come here to the second issue I mentioned: namely, the extent to which literary uses of language are subject to the same conditions and consequences of transfer as are those uses which are institutionalised by social convention. I have argued elsewhere (Widdowson 1975, 1984) that literacy discourse is of its nature nonconformist. It does not refer to a socially sanctioned reality but represents a conceptualisation of the world which is not accountable to the conventional conditions of truth and relevance but is required only to carry conviction.⁵ The direction of fit, to borrow a formulation from Searle (Searle 1976) is world-to-words and not words-to-world. And the world which the word creates is one of perpetual possibility never realized, a conceivable alternative version to the actual and factual world which is organised and recognised as a function of institutionalised social life. It follows that the exploitation of linguistic resources in literary discourse does not have the disruptive consequences of the kind I have already discussed because there is no intrusion into established modes of conventionalised social behaviour. Literary discourse never encroaches on the actual world: it is always apart and parallel. To be sure, it has its own conventions of composition (as Wordsworth found to his cost) but these are conventions of representation and not of reference, preferred

ways of contriving a fictive reality, variations of artifice. They may be influenced by, and may themselves influence, changes in the patterning of the socially sanctioned world, but the influence is not by direct causation but by indirect association. It works by the mediation of a kind of imitative magic.⁶

And herein, I suggest, lies the difference between Wordsworth and Sir Thomas Sprat. Sprat is looking to apply the language of common speech to referential and institutional purposes which set a high premium on rational analysis in conformity with the conventions of philosophical logic. The question must arise, as I have indicated, about the basic appropriateness of this oral mode for a discourse which would seem to realise modes of thinking particularly dependent on writing. But Wordsworth is looking to use the 'real language of men' for quite different representational purposes. The ideas and experiences which he expresses do not have to conform to established patterns of logical argument. Such patterns have no authority in the represented world. Wordsworth is not using language to explain anything but to express experience which cannot of its nature be explained but only expressed. And since this experience is of a reality other than that which is given official social recognition, it clearly cannot be expressed by conforming to established encoding conventions. There is bound to be incongruity, ambivalence, ambiguity: these are essential features of the discourse.

The difference between the world that poetry represents and the world which is referred to by institutionalised systems of thinking is made clear by Susanne Langer in the following way:

... all poetry is a creation of illusory events, even when it looks like a statement of opinions philosophical or political or aesthetic... Poetic reflections, therefore, are not essentially trains of logical reasoning, though they may incorporate fragments, at least, of discursive argument. Essentially they create the semblance of reasoning; of the seriousness, strain and progress, the sense of growing knowledge, growing clearness, conviction and acceptance--the whole experience of philosophical thinking. (Susanne Langer quoted in Davie 1955:22)

Poetry, in other words, represents the experience of thinking itself, the very process of cognitive exploration. And it is this, I believe, which characterises all literature: this probing into conceivable possibilities not confined by accepted conventions of reasoning, this reformulation of the familiar, this discovery of alternative ways of conceptualising and expressing experience.

We would expect to find in literature, therefore, a mixing of modes, an exploitation of linguistic resources dissociated from their conventional patterns of use and the conflicts that this would otherwise cause are reconciled by the very principles of literary composition. What would otherwise be disparity is fashioned into coherence of a different order. The spread of language through particular patterns of use can threaten social stability because these patterns may conflict with those which are in place and which define customary ways of life and thought. My argument is that the spread of language in literature does not have this effect because the alternative reality which is expressed exists on a distinct ontological plane, always apart and in parallel. It is an alternative representation of what *is*, not an alternative model of what might be. There is no claim that it might offer a more practical, effective, reasonable way of ordering the world. In this respect, the spread of English through literacy activity is less problematic than its spread through its use in education and other kinds of social institution. It allows for the exercise of bilingual creativity beyond the confinement of accepted convention.

Bilingual creativity is the term which Kachru uses in reference to what he calls 'contact literatures in English'. He comments:

Such literatures exhibit stylistic and discoursal characteristics that differ markedly from the traditional canons of English literature. One reason for such divergence is the 'transfer' of cohesive devices, rhetorical strategies, and underlying thought-patterns and conventions of coherence from the writers' other languages. As a result, 'un-English' linguistic, aesthetic, social, and cultural norms develop, giving to each contact literature a unique linguistic and cultural identity of its own. (Kachru 1986:27)

One might question whether the writers of such contact literature are using language in any essentially different way

from that which characterises literary innovation in general. It has always been the case that when a particular literary mode becomes conventionalised by social fashion and so is drawn into the very world of reference that it seeks to counter, then writers will look for other ways of providing for representation. This is after all what Wordsworth was doing in the Lyrical Ballads. These poems too 'exhibit stylistic and discorsal characteristics which differ markedly' from the poetry which constituted the accepted canon of his day. And, again, these characteristics are the consequence of transfer from other modes of use, the rhetorical strategies, the underlying thought patterns of what he conceived to be the 'real language of men'. The result is a rhetorical hybrid which corresponds to no other use of language and is in this respect 'un-English' and unique in its linguistic and cultural identity.

Chinua Achebe, a distinguished exponent of the contact literature that Kachru refers to, has been much concerned with the matter of transfer. He remarks:

I feel that the English language will be able to carry the weight of my African experience... But it will have to be a new English, still in communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings. (quoted in Pride 1982)

Achebe expresses here, I think, the general condition of literary creativity. All writers of literature seek to mould the material of language into forms which represent their experience, freeing it from customary rhetorical associations, to fashion a new idiom. Of course, the writers of contact literatures in English may well feel the need for such freedom with particular urgency. The literature of the ancestral home may represent too remote and too restricted a vision and one too bounded by antipathetic values. New social and conceptual surroundings in Africa, in India, in the Caribbean, and elsewhere extend the possible scope of representation associated with them. But the way linguistic resources are drawn upon to realise this representation is the same for Achebe as it is for Wordsworth, or for Lawrence, or Joyce, or Virginia Woolf.

Language spreads as people find new uses for it. It spreads as an incursion into established and orthodox patterns of thought and verbal behaviour, with the danger of

disruptive consequences for the cultures that these define. There are conflicts then which have to be reconciled. But language spreads also by literary exploitation which frees it for the representation of realities which are not bounded by the orthodoxies of social convention. Both cases, it seems to me, raise issues of a fundamental kind about language and human values. How is language used both to delimit and to extend perceptions of significance? How can it serve both the homing instinct which seeks the security of a stable social order and the questing instinct which explores the possibilities for change? What, after all, is the relative validity of modes of thinking cast in the cultural paradigms of different societies or different disciplines of enquiry? These are the kinds of questions which this paper has tried to provoke. And if it seems that I have myself been too enmeshed in verbiage, a victim of verbosity, I can only defend myself by saying that the complexity of the issues and the partiality of my own understanding are such as to elude the limits of precision and plain language.

Notes

1. In Britain, a similar campaign for plain language was launched by Sir Ernest Gowers in 1954. His book The Complete Plain Words has recently been published in a new edition revised by Sidney Greenbaum and Janet Whitcut (Gowers 1986). Evidently, the prevention of the spread of unsuitable language is still a matter of moment.

2. Labov's paper was originally published in Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1969. The quotations cited here are from excerpts published in Giglioli 1972. It is of interest to note that Labov's characterisation of the middle-class speaker as a 'victim of sociolinguistic factors beyond his control' commits him, paradoxically, to the very language deficit position that his paper is dedicated to oppose. For if the middle-class speaker cannot indeed control the factors which determine the way he speaks, then he is condemned to a style which by Labov's account is of its very nature communicatively deficient. What Labov in effect does in his desire to champion working-class modes of use is to shift the notion of deficit from restricted to elaborated styles of speech.

3. Ong makes the same point in reference to the epic genre. He points out that Milton's Paradise Lost is essentially literate in its linear and creative mode of composition (and intended, we should add, for a literate public) and so different from the oral narrative of the epics of Homer which is based on episodic remembering:

... even though he (Milton) was now blind and composing by dictating, he was doing essentially the same sort of thing he did when he learned to compose in writing. Milton could have his dictated lines read back to him and revise them, as an oral narrator can never revise a line spoken or sung: Milton was creating not remembering. Though he of course used some memory in his writing, it was not the communal memory of themes and formulas that Homer dwelt in. (Ong 1982a:19)

4. Geis, in pursuing some implications of Johnson-Laird's mental models, has argued that an adequate theory of pragmatics should be based on such an ethnologic rather than on the analytic techniques of logicians. He expresses the view that

a genuinely empirical theory of language understanding must be based on experimentally sound data gathered from theoretically (including logically) naive speakers. It will not do to use ourselves as informants: we know too much about logic and too little about human behaviour. (Geis 1984:80)

Since the understanding of naive speakers will be informed by different mental models, such a view presumably would have to acknowledge a good deal of ethnological variation, each valid in its own terms. Note that Labov, in the paper discussed earlier, commends nonstandard modes of use not by arguing the validity of such ethnological mental models but by invoking the principles of analytic formal logic.

5. The distinction between reference and representation corresponds to the two ways of thinking that Bruner has distinguished, what he calls the paradigmatic and narrative modes:

There are two modes of cognitive functioning, two modes of thought, each providing distinctive ways of ordering experience, of constructing reality... one mode, the paradigmatic or logico-scientific one, attempts to fulfill the ideal of a formal, mathematical system of description and explanation... the narrative mode leads... to good stories, gripping drama, believable (though not necessarily "true")

historical accounts. It deals in human or human-like intention and action and the vicissitudes and consequences that mark their course. It strives to put its timeless miracles into the particulars of experience, and to locate the experience in time and place. (Bruner 1986:11-13)

6. There is an invocation here of Sir James Frazer. In his celebrated (if somewhat discredited) work The Golden Bough (Frazer 1922), he makes a distinction between homeopathic or imitative magic, which operates on a principle of similarity, and contagious magic, which operates on a principle of contiguity. This distinction clearly corresponds to that in linguistics between paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, to Jakobson's characterisation of metaphor and metonym (Jakobson and Halle 1956) and to Bruner's two modes of thinking just referred to. It seems reasonable to suppose that we have here some sort of universal principle of human cognition. One can argue with some plausibility, I think, that contagious magic develops into formal logic in the service of scientific analysis, whereby contiguity is interpreted as causation explained in referential terms, whereas imitative magic develops into art, the representation of similar worlds influential by association.

References

- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. 1983. Discourse analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1986. Actual minds, possible worlds. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Connor, U., and Robert B. Kaplan, eds. 1987. Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley.
- Coulmas, Florian, ed. 1981. A Festschrift for native speaker. The Hague: Mouton.
- Davie, Donald. 1955. Articulate energy. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1976. Of grammatology. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1984. Semiotics and the philosophy of language. London: Macmillan.
- Eco, Umberto, and Thomas A. Sebeok, eds. 1983. The sign of three. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Frazer, Sir James. 1922. *The golden bough*. London: Macmillan.
- Freedman, A., I. Pringle, and J. Yalden, eds. 1983. *Learning to write: First language/second language*. London and New York: Longmans.
- Geis, Michael L. 1984. On semantic and pragmatic competence. In: Schiffrin, ed. (1984:71-84).
- Giglioli, P.P., ed. 1972. *Language and social context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Goody, Jack. 1977. *The domestication of the savage mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gowers, Sir Ernest. 1986. *The complete plain words* (new edition). London: HMSO.
- Greenbaum, Sidney, ed. 1985. *The English language today*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Jakobson, R., and M. Halle, eds. 1956. *Fundamentals of language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Johnson-Laird, P.N. 1983. *Mental models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, Braj. 1986. Bilingual creativity. In: *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 6, 1985.
- Kaplan, R.B. 1983. Contrastive rhetorics: Some implications for the writing process. In: Freedman et al. (1983).
- Labov, W. 1972. The logic of nonstandard English. In: *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1969*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 1-43. (Excerpts in Giglioli 1972).
- Olson, David R. 1981. The literate natural speaker: Some intellectual consequences of the language of schooling. In: Coulmas (1981).
- Ong, Walter J. 1982a. *Orality and literacy*. London and New York: Methuen.
- Ong, Walter J. 1982b. Oral remembering and narrative structures. In: Tannen, ed. (1982a:12-24).
- Pride, John, ed. 1982. *New Englishes*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Redish, Janice C. 1985. The Plain English Movement. In: Greenbaum (1985).
- Schiffrin, Deborah, ed. 1984. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1984*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Searle, J.R. 1976. The classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5.1:1-25.

360 / Georgetown University Round Table: 1987

- Stalker, James C. 1985. Language as symbol in the death-of-language books. In: Greenbaum (1985).
- Tannen, Deborah, ed. 1982a. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1981. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah, ed. 1982b. Spoken and written language. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1975. Stylistics and the teaching of literature. London: Longmans.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1984. Explorations in applied linguistics 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willey, Basil. 1934. The seventeenth century background. London: Chatto and Windus.

THE LITERARY DIMENSION OF THE SPREAD OF ENGLISH: CREATIVITY IN A SECOND TONGUE

Edwin Thumboo

National University of Singapore

My approach to the topic may initially seem unduly removed from essentials. The reason derives from the general thrust marking discussions of the literatures which developed upon the spread of English. They have tended to short-circuit the critical process by applying without reconsideration the theories, assumptions, and practices formed within and for mother-tongue bases, as if new literatures were fully part of the same literary continuum. There are grounds--presently adduced--to question seriously the appropriateness of this first, undisclosed assumption. And the manifold grounds will be apparent (at least the chief ones) as frame and context are sketched.

But first a caveat. A majority of current terms are rendered unsatisfactory by the rapid, extensive, complicated--and still continuing--spread of English which outstripped the perspectives, concepts, and terminology that sought to describe and assess it. A substantive question concerns orientation. While positions differ and theories/hypotheses compete, the body of scholarly work on language is now steadily augmented by research findings about and from 'nonnative' varieties and bases. Similar developments are occurring in the study of the literatures. Criticism still assumes a one-language one-literature equation, that varieties of a language lead to varieties of a literature. That is not necessarily so, and definitely not the case with English. There is obvious concession in the label 'new literatures in English', a label predictably interim. When did American literature emerge as such? We have Australian literature--and a dictionary of Australian English--and New Zealand literature defined by criticism, fueled chiefly from within, alert to elements--linguistic, attitudinal, and such--that

nourish an ethos. Moreover, 'new literatures' itself seems a misnomer when applied to India, where the creativity predates Macaulay's Minute of 1835. Nor is 'second tongue' accurate as a majority of the writers wield English as their first language, with literary aplomb. Nor is 'contact literature' a firmly suitable alternative to 'new literatures'. In the area of contact, the literature in English is but another literature. It only starts as contact literature because after it acquires body, momentum, contemporary preoccupation, and so forth, its 'contact' character becomes historical, part of origins. Nonetheless, such terms continue to be useful. To attempt replacing them calls for acts of definition and elaborate exception-making not for this occasion, whose purpose is general in scope and intention.

The English language and its literature moved towards multiplicity in three broad sweeps to: (1) Scotland, Wales, and Ireland; (2) Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa; (3) Asia, Africa, the West Indies, the Pacific, and other geographical pockets throughout the globe. Important for my present purpose, in this rough chronology of some 500 years, are the generalised factors distinguishing each movement. In the first, the language spread through the force of arms, politics, and culture, as part of an assimilative process, through rearranged fiefs, principalities, and kingdoms, of Anglo-Saxon-Norman hegemonies over Celts. There were problems but the language made its way. The Irish, for instance, have hardly had difficulty with the English language--only with the English. And lest we forget, at the going down of the sun, the greatest English wits have been Irish. Moreover, the differences were part of a symbiotic relationship arising from contiguities generating a large measure of shared culture, if not shared politics.

In the second movement, language and culture spread as the people spread: the English--and Welsh, Scots, and Irish--took both with them. Major institutions of identities were transferred, at times replicated, and grew. Strong, constant contact with England, at times paradoxical, maintained bonds which survived such varied and chronologically separate happenings as Oliver Cromwell in Ireland, Easter 1916 in Dublin, the American War of Independence, the Boer War, the reaction in Australia and New Zealand when Britain joined the EEC, and South Africa's expulsion from the Commonwealth. I do not propose for even a moment that the historical and contemporary relationships among these

nations are simple. On the contrary, their very complexity and subtlety is perhaps why they are firm. They constitute a basically Anglo-cultural combine, the areas of which are held together by common institutions, inheritances, common in essentials yet different in secondary ways. Despite increasing distinctiveness, these English mother-tongue bases are varieties of each other as cultures. It would be an interesting exercise to relocate John Steed, Rambo, and Crocodile Dundee or to have them in forum at a Georgetown University Round Table. They reflect three unique masculine discourses beneath whose gesture and dress lie complex psychosociolinguistic variables and distillations; they are interesting, but in no way threatening to the deep structures held in common by the Anglo-cultural combine.

It is the third movement that provides my subject. British expansion overseas had its origins chiefly in trade--new markets for manufacture and fresh sources of cheap raw material. Responding to internal political, economic, and industrial hungers and to competition among European powers such as Spain, Portugal, France, Holland, Germany, and Italy, trade gradually mutated into a sustained colonialism creating an empire. For a combination of reasons Britain, with the largest muster of dominions and colonies, proved the most successful. That is why English, introduced to facilitate administration and commerce, became transplanted in every colony. Without exception, it remained to flourish variously as national language, official language or auxiliary language for technology, science, regional and international finance, and education. English links communities, ethnic groups, regions within a nation, and nations within regions such as ASEAN (the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), the West Indies, and the Pacific Islands. It is at the heart of programmes to modernise and performs a veritable mixture of roles supported by governments and ambitious parents.

This third movement harbours a second spread: the horizontal and vertical embedding of English within a nation, a point whose importance linguists are generally aware of but one literary scholars and critics often overlook. Some are born into a language; others have it thrust upon them; succeeding generations achieve it; and those succeeding them are then born into it. A cycle starts, gathers momentum and cumulatively affects the shape of English and the other languages involved. For the countries of the third movement have their earlier languages. The case of India apart, such

linguistic multiplicity derived from colonial boundaries drawn under a power principle that ignored the logic of the tribe and subtribes, nations, etc. Unintentionally, they laid the foundations for English as a link language and those problems and vulnerabilities connected with tribal-ethnic rivalry.

The complex background to the new literatures is manifest in the following divisions of the third movement into nations with:

1. long and elaborate written and oral literary traditions, e.g. India, Sri Lanka, Malaysia;
2. powerful, sophisticated oral traditions, e.g. Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Papua New Guinea, Samoa;
3. areas created by colonial needs, such as (a) Singapore, with the population drawn substantially from the surrounding Malay sultanates, South China, South India, Jaffna in Sri Lanka, and Hadramant; (b) the West Indies, mainly Africans with East Indians and a smaller number of Chinese, with the Indians as bilinguals and a variety of English as the sole language for the others.

There is a fourth category--and a fifth if we include Black North America:

4. areas where the Anglo-culture and/or power dominates indigenous peoples, e.g. the Maoris in New Zealand and the Zulus in South Africa.

Consider the separate paradigms required to understand any major question along that spectrum of institutions and cultural content ranging from religious/philosophical systems, through attitudes and values, to the symbolic resources in each nation, some with ethnic groups only recently in contact. We encounter totalities of cultures within them, major literatures. The content, reach, and spirit of a culture can usefully be established by a frame, an outline of essentials. Genetics, as does biology, allows a fairly precise mathematical predictability of explanations for intricate engineering in biotechnology. In matters of culture and environment some predictability is part of their general stability, especially where ensured by sati negeri, satu bangsa, satu ugama.¹ I have taken from the Malay because ugama has an apt comprehensiveness not easily translatable. It also anticipates a point to come: how to put Tamil or Ijo

or Teochew, that is 'bilingual' life, into English. In the singularity of a relatively firm political, cultural unity, resting on shared fundamentals, virtually all aspects of total life of the society are common through slow evolution. Cause and effect lie within narrow parameters; there is resilience. Drastic changes occur but they test rather than exhaust the capacity to understand and to cope with them. I have suggested elsewhere that if the analogy is not pressed too hard, it would be useful to see the cultures of a people as having a genetic structure. The chromosomes are main heads identifying the content and range of culture in terms of religion, ethical-philosophical systems, aesthetics, epics, myths, legends, visual art, drama and theatre, literature, political and social concepts, economic strategies and expectations, symbolic structures and resources, and so on. Each of these heads subdivides as necessary, from chromosomes to genes. Take religion: (1) thematic: doctrine, dogma, apologetics, commandments, heresy, parables, etc.; (2) Christianity: Roman Catholic, Armenian, Free Church, Seventh Day Adventist, Presbyterian, Bethesdan, Methodist, Anglican, Coptic, Greek Orthodox, and groups set up by doctrinal differences; Buddhism: Hinayana, Mahayana, Chinese versions--priestly or popular, with or without Taoist influences; Taoism--high and popular; Confucianism--ancestor worship or ethic or religion?; Hinduism--Vedanta, worshippers of Siva, Vishnu, Ganesha, Subramaniam, Parvathi; Sikhism. Nor are the boundaries between some of them always firm, judging from actual practice. A few Taoists in Singapore carry the kavadi during Thaipusam. Some older converts to Christianity continue to visit Buddhist and Taoist temples. In this analogy, religion is the chromosome and the individual religions the genes.

As main heads, each chromosome and its chain of genes is no less than a semiotic system in place as part of that 'edifice of meaning' which defines both the individual and the social reality, the microcosm and macrocosm. Whether we prefer the genetic or semiotic metaphor--and there are cogent reasons to combine the two--what requires stressing is how in different ways they describe the preservation of cultures, folkways, mores, and the general intellectual environment by conscripting the individual. One must not lust too willingly after strange gods: genuflect, perhaps, but not pray. There is room for initiatives, for shifts from the familiar to the less or unfamiliar, within acceptable limits

usually set by fundamental beliefs and norms. Evolution is preferred to revolution. But revolutions--whatever their scale and in whatever parts of the system--succeed or fail depending on whether they can ultimately be accommodated within the system, the genetic/semiotic structures.

In the already complex instance of monocultures--as broadly defined by one language, one people, and one religion--structures overlap, extend, at times contradict and compete to create specific and general tensions within their accommodating stability. These are multiplied in a curve more exponential than linear in multicultures, of which virtually all the third movement nations are representative. Each of the component cultures has its distinctive genetic/semiotic systems; they occupy the same space-time continuum; each is gripped by the forces of national development; each is exposed to interpenetration through the formal and informal political, economic, social, and educational context which often pushes a policy of bilingualism. Among the chief conduits are the processes of modernisation and the increasing adoption of English and the international culture that directly or indirectly comes with it. Social engineering on this scale makes for rapid change. To link genetic and semiotic models has the advantage of identifying the main heads (assessing whether they are stubborn or amenable to engineering) marking off areas--i.e. language, religion, politics, aesthetics, social values--with room for their necessary subdivision and detailing, so as to lend a manageable cognitive structure without which it would be difficult to see links between, say, religion and a sense of values, language and culture, and language and social status; or to keep track of cause and effect in the changing role of languages in the larger patterns of social, economic, cultural and other expectations.

Language--and literature--have a special place. As Halliday points out (1978:2):

There are two fundamental aspects to the social reality that is encoded in language: to paraphrase Lévi Straus, it is both 'good to think' and 'good to eat'. Language expresses and symbolizes this dual aspect in its semantic system, which is organised around the twin motifs of reflection and action--language as a means of reflecting on things, and language as a means of acting on things. The former is the 'ideational' component of meaning; the latter

is the 'interpersonal'--one can act symbolically only on persons, not on objects.

A social reality (or a 'culture') is itself an edifice of meanings--a semiotic construct. In this perspective, language is one of the semiotic systems that constitute a culture; one that is distinctive in that it also serves as an encoding system for many (though not all) of the others.

This in summary terms is what is intended by the formulation 'language as social semiotic'. It means interpreting language within a sociocultural context, in which the culture itself is interpreted in semiotic terms--as an information system, if that terminology is preferred.

That participants are able to 'predict' with advantage assumes a language in common, extensively embedded in the personal and social realities through its role in 'reflection and action'. A sufficient history of usage is implied, one overlapping other genetic/semiotic systems--and subsystems--such as religion, philosophy, science, the study of language itself, and literature, which is perhaps the most influential, judging from the simple if crude test of which structure/system reveals most about the others. Language is both instrument and repository. All this would ordinarily apply to 'indigenous' languages of third movement nations, each with its time-sanctioned place within the relevant social reality. Adjustments occur through mutual influence arising from sharing a time-space continuum, especially if the space is held in common as distinguished from being held in sectors, regions of that space. Peranakan Malay and Hokkien in Singapore and Malaysia are examples with interesting and instructive adjustments in their respective genetic structures/semiotic systems.

The arrival of English among indigenous languages presents these as well as other challenges. Its conversion from imperial, foreign language to one increasingly 'nativised' is fascinatingly important. So too are questions of what English to teach, the choice of texts and methods and the frame for bilingualism, and research priorities. But the concern here is with literature, the making of which is bracketed by other interests, individual rather than public, reflecting creative options rather than policy, with each option often moving in a different direction. In regard to language, the writer--dramatist and novelist more than poet--has to create a suitable English language semiotic system in

a non-English social reality. Powerful elements of culture, of attitude come with the language. Present as part of the colonial inheritance, they are maintained, even strengthened, by the formal study of English and the international culture of the mass media, especially television. In order to explore and carry a new social reality, it has to be uncluttered, made free of certain habitual associations, develop a new verbal playfulness, new rhythms, additions to its metaphorical and symbolic reach to explain and amplify feelings and ideas about literature and life and cater to the claims of the imagination. The depicting of characters in fiction and drama, of great and ordinary persons, of complex and simple states of mind, of their psychology, strengths and flaws, reason and obsession, their very memory, all require registers for dialogue and description to give us access to them. In drama, this includes situations where characters describe each other. Great and small lives speak of and for sectors of society.

A great deal of the literary practice of the English language semiotic system is retained in the creation of one that is visible in a third movement setting. It is connected to a great, vital, subtle literature in a language whose flexibility makes it adaptable. It has been retuned and reorchestrated and augmented with strategies and concepts from the indigenous languages and literatures. The innovations can be as broad, declared, and sustained as Gabriel Okara's The Voice (see Thumboo 1985 for a discussion) or as subtle as Raja Rao's short story The Cow of the Barricades or Okot p'Bitek's Song of Lawino. The necessity to innovate is inevitable because it is connected to bending, reorientating the language to express the imaginative energies of a set of perceptions, a vision faithful to the collective but varied experience and aspirations of a people.

Similar complexities, confronting in other ways, are to be discovered under other heads such as law and literature. Displaying the pattern of chromosomes and constituent genes is a first step in revealing the larger structure of a society. Comprehending the dynamics at work, especially how they shape and prime the individual, how attributes are transmitted from one generation to another, is an exercise that takes us beneath the generalisations into the details, the byways of a culture. How is education achieved, formally and informally? Do particular colours have special

significance? Is the week four-day or seven-day? Is pregnancy before marriage a social and/or religious disaster or necessary proof of fertility? There are large and small questions. We cannot trace their import to the nth degree, but the more we attempt, the better our recognition of significances, flexibilities. Keeping to the example of religion, Catholics and Muslims are least likely to be converted. Whether a chromosome or gene is strong has significance for various societal processes, such as reactions to giving more time to technical studies and less to religious education. That is but one instance of modernisation provoking controversy.

It should be clear that paradigms--reflecting traditional cultures and subcultures and the tension of those forces that order or disrupt societies--appropriate to each of the countries in the areas listed above are marked by a uniqueness not easily accessible. As colonies and ex-colonies, much of their recent and contemporary experience overlap. An example is the basic reaction to colonialism itself, though even here the final push towards independence ranged from the relatively quiet Sri Lankan experience to the Mau Mau blood-sacrifice which forms a major theme in Ngugi wa Thiong'o's fiction and essays. Generally, the experience of colonialism, centrally administered as it was, was disruptive in ways to be noted shortly. The disruptions interrupted essential continuities. It therefore follows that the paradigms should have three parts: the first for precolonial settings where appropriate, the second covering the period of colonial occupation, and the third the postindependent phase. The three function as benchmarks for comparison and contrast of stages in the biography of nation and individual.

Certain facets of colonialism are worth reemphasising briefly. Though the force of colonial occupation varied enormously, generally it was a deeply traumatic experience. Even where it appeared to sit lightest, it had strong impact on the content and rhythm of life. The encounter between cultures, between polities of unequal power, with the more powerful dominating for unilateral purposes, produced immediate and long-term distortions. The understanding of, say, broad political and social culture originating in world views embodying contrasting images of man and of the cosmos and the relationships binding them, at times lay beyond the comprehension of the European Enlightenment. The concepts and modes of analysis--especially that capacity

to test and revise themselves, to take into account, if not incorporate the point of view implicit in the material being studied--which, in anthropology and sociology especially, have revealed a great deal about cross-cultural contact, are twentieth-century formulations. The study of subject races was part of colonial contact; the results had little effect on the sense of equity. Colonial contact was governed by economic, strategic, religious, and other considerations.

The new literatures in the second tongue are by and large associated with nations hard in search of a commonality. They did not exist in their present politico-geographical incarnations, having been put together--at times hastily--not with the logic of the geopolitics of a region but the geopolitics of colonial powers anxious for territory. Consequently, with few exceptions, they brought together diverse groups, in some instances formed by tribes sharing a great deal, in others by ethnic groups originally sharing little. But whatever the mix, in almost every instance they lacked the opportunity for gradually paced evolution into a single people. This achieving of a single identity was linked to the compulsion to modernise, to achieve integrated social, political, and economic infrastructures that made the nation viable. Needed first was political stability as a base for the second requisite, economic development, followed by education and physical well-being. These primary requirements were imposed by the historical moment, by the state of society. And culture was and is a major essential instrument in this growth of a people, culture as a pan-national concept to bring the individual ethnic groups together within a frame allowing the fulfilment and satisfaction of their own aspirations. Writers have a role. As Chinweizu (1983:21) and others have pointed out:

They are acutely aware of literature's capacity to prepare for life, and even on occasion to move them to action. After all, the nationalist novels of Rizal had sparked the Filipino revolution against Spanish colonialism in 1896; and Al-Hakim's The Return of the Soul had moved Nasser to the role he played in Egyptian and Arab history. Most of these writers recognise that it is not given to many works to intervene so directly in history. Like Achebe, they would agree with Garcia Marquez that 'literature is a long-term weapon'. They therefore concentrate on examining, through literature, fundamental questions of national

history, national identity, national purpose, and national morality and outlook.

Seen against this background, the challenge to individual creativity is broadly twofold. First, the writer must grasp and then make sense of that complicated milieu--compounded of past, present, future--which he inhabits and from which derives a vision to feed the imagination and the choice of themes. Second, the writer must handle language and genre. Both challenges are different aspects of the single, embracing experience of the writer at work, a finely poised undertaking in which the force of the experience validates language and form, which in turn, authenticate the experience.

The more we contemplate the three movements associated with the spread of English and the three stages in the paradigms for each of the nations in the third movement, the more we realise that there are unusual features which distinguish their literatures in English from the Anglo-literatures in the mother-tongue bases represented by Britain, America, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

More so than is the case with the writer inhabiting one language, one culture, and one literary tradition, the writer's situation in the new literatures, including the making of himself, is open to compulsions of an order revealed by the array of forces at work in a multilingual, multicultural, multiliterary society in circumstances of rapid societal change. These make for radical differences, beginning with conceptions regarding the function of the writer. As implied earlier, where the language goes, the criticism and its key assumptions tend to follow. Richard Hoggart (1982), for instance, in a chapter on 'Culture and its ministers', does not approve of 'culture as state-formation' (195) and has reservations about the 'idea of culture as national identity' (189). He believes in 'the notion of an artist as both inside and outside his society at the time' (188). According to Hoggart, 'the authentic marks of literature' require a combination of 'radicalism and honesty' (192). His analysis of his topic is comprehensive and sensitive. But he cannot break free from his basic ideological position, which means his analysis tends to be prescriptive, to impute positions not always sustained by the realities predicating the third movement. In referring to new nations, Hoggart claims that:

The spreading of culture is less a matter of individual self-fulfilment as an immersion in, a dyeing in the vat of one's traditional culture. There is no suggestion of a movement towards an independent culture and independent critical self-awareness (or towards the free play of informed opinion which the existence of such individuals can set off). It is rather as though people were expected, separately or--preferably--in known groups (family, village, sub-tribe, etc.), to become linked umbilically to the one great mother. (183)

The notion of 'traditional culture' was created chiefly by colonialism, cultural confrontation, and the impulse to modernise: the Thais, Chinese, and Japanese are not prone to see their culture as either traditional or modern. In any case, Hoggart's central assumptions are that traditional cultures are not sufficiently independent to support 'independent critical self-awareness'. This is patently odd. Traditional cultures whose members see them as continuities that maintain a sense of self, of orientation in the flux of contemporary cultural fashion, are elaborate. They were not magically received whole. That they are commonly conservative should not blind us to the fact that they evolved, absorbing and discarding elements, occasionally reorientated radically in one sector, with gradual ramifications elsewhere. Examples would include the entry of Islam into India; of Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam into Southeast Asia; of Buddhism into China, Burma, Thailand, and Japan; and of Tang culture into Japan and Korea. Nor was the capacity to invent absent. Sufism is but one of many instances. Moreover, 'individual self-fulfilment' and 'critical self-awareness' are notions or ideals whose degrees of realisation are largely themselves supported by a culture, whether 'traditional' or 'modern'. However much we like to think so, they are hardly absolutes in a cultural context. Questions of degree are involved and they are being missed. More than a billion people are consequently swept into and dyed by confident generalisations. The confidence and the stance--and margins of actions they generate--all rest on a history of Britain's continual internal and external achievement whose progress was occasionally stayed but never fundamentally disturbed after 1745 and before the First World War. Napoleon did much for the British sense of themselves. It paid off a hundred years later in the

Kitchener recruitment poster. The accumulating political, social, intellectual, scientific, and economic capital from the late eighteenth century made for a powerful Englishness whose depth and comprehensiveness, even today, comprise an unspoken constant. It ensures a set of useful reflexes, a sense of oneness which--I would like to stress--many envy, because they wish for the same.

Society... needs artists to translate the people's feelings, the aspirations, the beliefs, the values into art forms, into dances, dramas, music, paintings, literature, etc., so that these experiences can be accumulated and portrayed effectively and transmitted continuously for the benefit of the present and future generations. The subsequent generations of people will then be able to understand their roots better, will then know what binds them together as a people and as a nation.

Of course, not all artistic works are inspiring and effective in reflecting the past and present. The key is in excellence. An artistic work can only evoke a response from the viewer or reader if he can relate to it; and if the work is executed to a high degree of artistry (Wong 1987:2).

These are 'official' sentiments. They are shared by many writers; they are implicit in much contact literature, especially in the early phases of growth. They are inevitable in a multiracial society in which sectional interests become less aggressive and more inclined towards a national ethos based on an enlarging cultural, political, and social consensus.

The most cursory acquaintance with the growth of nations from tribe to complex social, political, and economic entity reveals how constructive energies were much preoccupied with correlations between political and cultural boundaries. There is an unrelenting attempt to preserve, and then engender and extend homogeneity in a spirit most sharply manifest in the clan, which is the largest unit within which the individual finds himself fully at home, reflecting a neat linkage between macrocosm and microcosm. In conditions of geographical and cultural stability, the dynamics of the group are marked by a constant sharing through maximum integration. Over a period of time, emblems of order are taken as there, as natural. The ambience of national history, of common destiny, are reinforced by myth, legend and

religions and much else; a collective imagination emerges and in turn nourishes and is nourished.

Within such a stability, language plays a binding function. Words acquire denotative and connotative power. The ways of speech, of declamation, the voice in poetry help to mark a sharing that leads to cohesions of various kinds. It gives the group an identity. Language is society. Muhammad Haji Salleh (1977:127) is able to assert that 'Language is law, music and myths'.

If inclined, students of English language and literature should have little difficulty recalling that within the earlier history of England--before she became Great Britain--the same national spirit, the same sense of formation marked the literary imagination. Chaucer's Canterbury Tales describes emergent types: Prioress, Franklin, Knight, and so forth. Consider Shakespeare. While his poetry, his psychology build up to powerful images of the universal in man, in society, this should not blind us to the fact that he was perhaps the most political and historically aware writer of his age. Sharp analyses of history mark his work. His grasp of politics combines surely with a knowledge of human nature, both the noble and the flawed.

It was noted earlier that as a semiotic system language has a special place through its dual role 'organised around the twin motifs of reflection and action'. Literature has its special place through straddling the system associated with language and the very range of materials it incorporates, materials ranging from striking individual obsessions to reworkings of earlier works such as Anouilh's Antigone from Sophocles (Oedipus the King, Oedipus at Colonus, and Antigone) and Aeschylus (Seven against Thebes) or Jean Rhys's The Wide Sargasso Sea of Jane Eyre, or Michel Tournier's Friday, a retelling of Robinson Crusoe's story, or J.M. Coetzee's Foe, which purports to be the tale of Susan Barton, linked to, extended and built upon the world of Robinson Crusoe.

A writer living in a country seeking to consolidate and to unify, to defuse ethnic tensions--often complicated by class conflict--in exchange for a sense of national identity, would naturally respond to issues and nuances associated with nation building. It marks the literature of almost every Third World country. He writes in order to rewrite and expand upon the originality of the indigenous, uncovering and giving perspective. Life that was peripheral, an

anthropological footnote under a colonial dispensation, is given a centre. This process occurs not merely in the Third World countries using English, but also at an appropriate point in history in the new literatures in Spanish and Portuguese. And that sense of nationalism--and its practical side--can also be found in a number of European literatures: in the Hungarian, in the Czech, in the Polish, again at appropriate times in their history.

Unless we identify and connect these and other preoccupations, it would be difficult to see in perspective the impulses behind the emergence of the new literatures in English. First are the reasons for writing. These include explaining society to itself, reconstructing the past, exploring the binding of diverse peoples and cultures with the idea of commonality, and giving imaginative expression to the array of forces fashioning society. Obviously, there are other reasons and their attendant themes, such as the effect of political and moral corruption--catastrophies played out in the lives of ordinary men and women--or the ambiguous changes wrought by modernisation brought into focus by instances of conflict between tradition and innovation. These comprise a brace of themes which are so compelling that, in a very real sense, themes have chosen writers, a phenomenon neatly summed up by Nadine Gordimer (1973:11):

Black writers choose their plots, characters and literary styles; their themes choose them. By this I mean that themes are statements or questions arising from the nature of the society in which the writer finds himself immersed, and the quality of the life around him. In this sense the writer is the voice of the people beyond any glib political connotations of the phrase.

Almost every writer who has talked about his or her situation has declared or implied as much. The basic framework of challenge is substantially similar; the ingredients, the response, the stance (the political and economic and social ideology creating the sufferance) may vary. Gordimer's remarks pertain to South Africa, where apartheid perpetuates the worst features of a colonial regime hardened by the fact that the colonisers are themselves white natives. The blacks there live in the grip of formal white power under an unremitting oppression so extensive that black poets cannot help but feel the tragic intensity of black

and white, as revealed in Stanley Motjuwadi's White Lies (Royston 1973:12). Motjuwadi's passion, in less intense form, can be found in the earlier phase of most new literatures, in variations of themes from those touching on racism, political suppression, and economic exploitation to those about snobbery and intellectual inequality. In these literatures, there is an attempt to restore dignity, to reestablishment of the self, and to compensate for deprivation, depersonalisation, and so forth. Colin Johnson, the Australian aboriginal novelist and poet, says:

... creative writers like myself... can re-decipher and re-interpret mythology, legends and stories, to a certain extent modernise it or give it relevance and have that tradition going from the 'dreaming' of the beginning to 1983 and onwards. That is where we will link up again with what has been lost somewhat by relying on alien forms of literature (Breitinger and Sander 1985:2).

Such nexi between writer and society, almost compelled by a reading of contemporary events, is often sanctioned by tradition. It is not unusual for the artist to see himself as a medium, as a shaping conduit. Kofi Awoonor, whose poem-novel This Earth My Brother remains amongst the most profound explorations of individual psyche and society, describes a role which Hoggart and others, bred by a different intellectual, aesthetic climate, would possibly find strange. The artist lives in a society where

Forms and motifs already exist in an assimilated time and world construct, and so he serves only as the instrument of transforming these into an artistic whole based on his own imaginative and cognitive world, a world which exists and has meaning only within the larger world... He is not a visionary artist per se, like the European artist who projects into space and time structures which simply were not there before. There is no otherness locked in the private psyche of his vision. (166)

Although the artist, his function especially, was not always this tightly circumscribed, there generally existed firm conventions governing choice and treatment of subjects. Nonetheless, it provides for a sharp contrast to Hoggart's writer--partly of and partly out of society, and of a culture

not 'formally organised'. In third movement paradigms, fully within a society and a culture responding to recent history, the writer is moved by a sense of the contemporary that converts into powerful injunctions.

Nor is the dissimilarity confined to conceptions of the artist's role. Perceptions of the world as physical construct, for instance, likewise differ. While making it clear that she is generalising, Kamala Markandaya (1973:22) states that for the West 'the earth was created for man: an assumption that seems to be used, consciously or unconsciously, to justify almost any kind of assault upon the animal kingdom and upon the systems of the earth itself.' I have had occasion to suggest that prior to the mid-nineteenth century--later, if we exclude Japan--there was a broad contrast between European and Asian attitudes to scientific discoveries. Asia did not fully exploit their practical value, while Europe did, mainly because Asia went more fully into metaphysics while Europe delved predominantly into physics, as each kept up an inquiry into physics and metaphysics, respectively. I find it intriguing to speculate on whether the fact that Europe was dominated for so long by one religion which, despite schisms, allowed a fairly stable view of man and his universe, of man and God, of the separation of the sacred from the secular, encouraged a concomitant scientific spirit and method. Did such earlier centers of scientific enquiry as Egypt and Greece lose the capacity because new religions, new world views that were fundamentally disruptive, broke their continuities and left them divided?

Physics and metaphysics: Markandaya's own background urges that 'everything exists in its own right' (22). She goes on to say that while she does not import that perception directly into her work, nonetheless it seeps in. The sacredness of the earth--in a Blakean sense, interestingly enough--the conviction that it is the source of life, is to be found in almost all her novels. The conviction generates a kind of fortitude embodied, for instance, in Rukmini in A Nectar in a Sieve, as well as in The Cofferdam, where the Europeans find 'tropical' nature discomfiting and the 'natives' are fully at home. Nature, and nature methodised. It should be patent that unless there were an understanding of the vision behind notions of the luminous, the cosmic, the nature of man and his place in the universe, our perceptions would be impoverished to a degree.

The genetics of culture, the reference to semiotic systems I sketched all too briefly, and the three-stage paradigm proposed, are necessary preludes to a grasp of the precolonial and colonial past and their impact on present-day events and expectations. The nature of colonial occupation varied enormously but, as noted earlier, even where it sat lightest, it had strong impact on the content, capacities and rhythms of life. I do not want to dwell overmuch on this, but it seems worthwhile to realize how extensive and deep that deracination went. Albert Wendt (203-4), whose views are invariably temperate, had this to say: 'Over the last two centuries or so, that most fearful chill, institutionalised in colonialism, was our perpetual cross in Oceania.' He sees that chill continuing with the raising of national flags, the first hurrahs on the stroke of midnight. There are the tasks of deconstruction, reconstruction, and construction. There are journeys to make. For the global system still projects looming inequalities between the First and the Third Worlds, inequalities exerting powerful influence on cultures and fledgling economies.

Deracination, distortion, and gradual dismantling of indigenous cultural institutions and practices undermined the quality of life, made for a defensive sense of self and sense of community. For instance, traditional performing arts--including dance drama that implied magic such as the mahyong, which uniquely fulfilled spiritual needs through an aesthetic event--were either neglected or suppressed as superstitious, pagan, barbaric. In Southeast Asia and elsewhere, similar architectonic disturbances were and are still felt. Although no longer colonies, colonial importations remain and many new conduits open. Muhammad Haji Salleh (1977:vi) sees that the 'Malay-Indonesian civilisation is in the state of drift, after a forcible uprooting of its culture by the Dutch and British colonialists, and the bombardment of popular culture originating in the west.'

The sense of cumulative loss, assessed in some instances as beyond restoration, was exacerbated by distorted images of indigenous people. Such images stood in the way of any possible genuine mutual understanding. They hardened into clichés and stereotypes which supported a mental wall far more stubborn than anything actual. The effect is devastating in fact, in fiction, in memoirs, in traveller's tales. Examples occur in the colonizers' utterances concerning behavior towards Indians in E. M. Forster's A

Passage to India. Hardly based on real contact, what is said of interracial contact often derives from and in turn nourishes racist myths which constituted so potent a part of the mythology about colony and colonised, from Darkest Africa to the virtues of whisky and soda at sunset. Clichés substitute for insight.

Such assessments of native peoples can be documented for almost every part of the former empires. There are counter mythologies about the white man, some equally cruel and misguided. But these had no influence on policy governing schools, hospitals, sports, social intercourse, the maintaining of law and order, clubs, tertiary education, jobs, leave regulations, etc. The mechanisms were often subtle. A native 'put in his place' at times felt he was guilty of a misdemeanor. I do not want to give the impression that before colonialism, life was perfect. It was not. One index in Southeast Asia was the heavy migration, from India and China principally. Life was hard in their southern regions, in China especially, where warlords and Kuomintang-Communist rivalries were miseries for the peasants. But as Nkosi (1983:31) points out in reference to South Africa:

The adjustment made by Africans defeated by other Africans produced minimum psychological damage. On the other hand European colonialism represented something wholly different: its transforming power was enormous; its challenge to African values total and inexorable; its exclusiveness was the final blow to even that need which the conquered feel to identify with the victorious.

For many of the writers, the establishment of a refurbished, complete self and society, with history and a sense of recovered dignity, was a primary function. Elechi Amadi's The Concubines, Ngugi's The River Between, and Achebe's Things Fall Apart, have for theme the imaginative reconstruction of life in traditional society either before or at the time the force of the white man was felt. The Concubines and Things Fall Apart are essential to a sense of continuity through the values embodied in the past and for images of that complex humanity marking traditional life before the coming of the white man. As Albert Wendt (123) put it:

The imagination must explore with love, honesty, wisdom, compassion; writers must write with aroha / aloha / alofa / loloma, respecting the people they are writing about, people who may view the void differently and who, like all other human beings, live through the pores of their flesh and mind and bone, who suffer, laugh, cry, copulate and die.

The writer has interests, a set of values, a vision of life, constructed out of satisfactions and dissatisfactions with his immediate situation and its larger milieu. The milieu--whose possible complexity is only limited by the permutations and combinations within the matrix constituted by semiotic systems referred to earlier as defining the total content of society--provides an inheritance which is simultaneously constraint and challenge. On the one hand are the forces of conformity, which are powerfully conservative; on the other are the impulses of an international culture, strongly 'western' and riding upon the global jet-stream of American English. Between them are generated the dynamics of change. To maintain tradition and to modernise are seen either as a dilemma or a challenge whose dialectics impinge upon and revise the notions of life and its contexts. Out of this tension and accommodation, and the very processes they imply, emerge the themes which have dominated the new literatures. Balancing an old past and new present is never easy. It implies a massive psychological, social, political, and linguistic engineering in circumstances of constant change, in which virtually every event has an effect. It is an interregnum, a segment of time between two worlds, one not quite dead and the other not quite born. It may seem a moment in the flux of history, which takes the long term. But for those living through it, it is the only life, the only reality they have. That interregnum is crucial for a host of reasons. Reorientations and retrievals apart, modernisation means, among other things, the creation of new intellectual reflexes, the enlargement of freedoms, the creation of space, a new order for the betterment of both individual and society. The emergence from colonisation involves at least four freedoms. The political is in some ways the most clear-cut, though the routes to it have been various. Brunei was granted independence without a fuss; Kenya had to fight a bloody war. Next comes economic freedom, a difficult task, but one to be accomplished in some measure if a nation is to

have stability. It requires the right kind of planning, sustained effort, and noncorrupt governments, all of which are not always in sufficient evidence. The third freedom requires internal all-round strength--political, economic, social, and cultural--to maintain a degree of independence internationally, to be able to withstand the more ambiguous of the pressures exerted by power blocks. Finally, there is psychological independence, which is perhaps the hardest to achieve.

Given the forces at work in his situation, the writer's interests, his expectations, his response to the riddles and enigmas of his society translate into essential notions about life and contacts. Questions about self and societal identity, the directions self and society are taking, and so forth prove virtually inevitable themes. As Gordimer noted, the writer's themes have chosen them. These themes are connected with what I have elsewhere described (1984:24) as a series of grammars the chief of which comprise 'interests' and 'motives'.

Every individual has sets of interests which accumulate, develop, and interlink to form intellectual, spiritual and emotional reflexes that support inner needs and which concurrently define and influence relationships ranging from the private and intimate to the public and formal. Moreover, these interests shape, inter-alia, a sense of the sacred and the profane, and conceptions of politics, sociology, economics and culture. The sum of their working is no less than a Bildungsroman, a gestalt, distinctive yet reflecting its basic constructing milieu and ethos. We are in fact referring to the totality of being, one that is, paradoxically, sufficient unto itself at any given time, but nonetheless continuously restless and anxious to enlarge through stages, each again complete yet possessing further potential. The sets of interest which accrue constitute what may be described as a grammar for living, one governing action, thought, the way we view events and experience.

Like anyone else, the writer is subject to the same process but with two notable differences. The first is that the grammar of his interests nourishes a deeper, more personalised grammar of motives--to borrow Kenneth Burke's phrase--generated by and connected to the demands of his vocation. This grammar links life and art and is

partly inherited, partly made, augmented and modified by him. When we identify cardinal influences, primal vision, key themes or structural, metaphorical and imagistic traits or sources of iconography and the assemblage of their elements that give singularity to a writer's work, we are in fact mapping this narrower, specialised grammar. These features have to do with technique and substance. Technique derives from and returns to sources in his basic or adopted literary tradition or traditions. The second concerns contacts between the writer as individual and the total environment of which he is a part. But as both individual and environment alter, so does the grammar whose pattern is forged, after all, by the organic interplay between self and society.

These grammars should be seen suggestively against the complexities I have sought to sketch in general terms. I cannot stress this point too much, as I consider them essential to an appropriate orientation for the study of new literatures in English. For it is precisely the absence of such orientation and not a lack of intelligence that leads to confident but misleading criticism and discussion. The grammars alter, in response to changes in society and in the individual, in writer and reader. In times of rapid change, the writer's dilemma is whether to maintain a consistency or to respond and run the risk of apparent contradictions. Faint hearts do not found literatures or new varieties of languages.

Nor is such grammar formation new to English. As alluded to earlier, we have American, Australian, and New Zealand literature. The difference is that these share a great deal with English literature and with each other. They are linked by deep-rooted religions and by philosophical, scientific, intellectual, and other traditions. The new literatures are seldom, if ever, linked anywhere to the same extent. They share the language, the major genres, certain creative strategies--such as those deriving from oral narrative--and, where appropriate, critical practices. Their literary ecology, if inclusive, is shaped by the literary traditions of their other languages. The literature in English in India, in Nigeria, in Singapore, is part of Indian, Nigerian, and Singaporean literature. For multilingual societies are multiliterary. In any case, the writer himself is formed by two worlds, at times belonging to richly complicated

multiliterary ecosystems (see Thumboo 1983). He has twin perspectives, one established by English, the language of his creativity, the other by his mother tongue and its associated literature or literatures. It is worth remembering that the literary system of Europe which T. S. Eliot outlined in Tradition and the Individual Talent--especially the specific links, the general lines of influence and descent from Homer, through Virgil, Dante, down to the national literatures--has counterparts in other literary ecosystems. In India, for instance, there is the body of Sanskrit texts and the great epics.

Moreover, there are historical parallels in the writer's reshaping of English and his material, subject, and themes. There is the case of Anglo-Irish literature, one of whose dominant figures, W. B. Yeats, I see as a Third World poet of a special kind. The point is that parallels are at hand if we look; they are illuminating. For example, attempts to define an American ethos through a semiotics constructed from religious, political, and social environments and the sense of expanding frontiers at the turn of the eighteenth century, prefigure the dialectics of many new literatures. Some familiarity with the growth of American English and American literature or with specific topics such as sociopolitical themes in, say, recent Arabic and Israeli literature or the frame of nationalism in French-Canadian fiction, would certainly create a fuller sense of the issues taken up in the new literatures. It means looking at them from within, on their terms, through a paradigm that is flexible yet structured enough to power reorientations, to see the limits, to which there is a new shaping spirit, that give the more achieved work an innovative force.

It is into similar contexts that English has entered and gotten adopted to emerge inevitably as a creative language. The language itself, capacious and adaptable, has proven more than equal to the task. But despite flexibility, it carries the codes and reflexes of a history. Each language harbours its own logic, its own system of latent and manifest content. English is no exception. Its very robust life and great body of literature have seen to that. It is that rich English which has remained, which has created bilingual, multilingual situations. Its prestige originally made it attractive to the indigenous ruling/upper class who studied it within the limits set down. They were the first bilinguals who knew a foreign language and with an increase in their numbers, a class

emerged. Siblings benefited through an earlier start and the higher status enjoyed by their families. English became a second language and, in some cases, a first language. Here is Lewis Nkosi's experience (quoted in Alvarez-Pereyre 1984:5-6):

I was reading an incredible amount, reading always badly without discipline; reading sometimes for the sheer beauty of the language... I walked about the streets of the bustling noisy city with new English words clicking like coins in the pockets of my mind; I tried them out on each passing scene, relishing their power to describe and apprehend experience.

One feels the excitement caused in discovering the ability to name things and experiences, and, observing, to apply words to give some order, some management, thus setting up a personal version of its semiotic system. That modifying ability engages what Markandaya has called the cortex; that part of the mind, mysterious and not fully known, which enables the person to become a writer, is broadly similar to that capacity which Coleridge described as the primary imagination. While she sees culture, ethos, and roots as being powerful, fundamental, and self sustaining, what really matters is the 'extraordinary cortex that exists in all of us, a cortex that, as it were, governs morality and the sensibility of creation, and like anything else can be cultivated or neglected'. She goes on to say that the cortex has something to do with the brain but a great deal more with the mind, no less than that 'roving and imaginative entity that reaches into and extracts the truth of such universals whether experienced or not' (1973:15-16).

Such a cortex, revealed through the power of its metaphors and images, is essential to both the writer's development and the reshaping of English in new environments. It is there behind the creation of *idelect*. It is there to help the writer negotiate between the demands of two traditions, one inherited, the other brought by English and its great literature. Its new users feel impelled to adapt, to orchestrate a thrust reflecting everyday realities as well as the nuances of its new home. Yet that undertaking is not always something that can be embarked upon easily. There are those who, like Parthasarathy, feel comfortable in English and--in his case--less so in Tamil, a fact that set up 'painful

but nevertheless fruitful tension with regard to poetry' (1973:27).

This dilemma/challenge confronts almost every bi- or multilingual writer. His bilingualism is one of three broad types--proficient, powerful, or limited--whose boundaries are obviously not clear-cut. Nor is his position in this cline static because quite often one language gains dominance to gradually edge out the others. A bilingual person has at least two language universes, within which each language works with its own linguistic circuits, its accumulation of social, psychological, and other experiences in terms of images, metaphors, and emblems. How the two languages and their semiotic systems, their literary ecosystems, associate, depends on whether the languages as neighbours inhabiting the same space and time are able to move into each other and bend one to serve creative purposes.

Some of the earlier references regarding the connection between language and society, between language and the shape of the individual in terms of his intellectual and social identity, would suggest that language in a sense determines not only consciousness but also one's perception of reality. This suggests a kind of linguistic determinism close to that proposed by Whorf's Mirror of Language, from which it follows that the speakers or users of different languages possess different patterns of thought. The Whorfian hypothesis has taken hard or soft forms. The soft form is useful especially in its suggestions that there is a tendency for the individual to think along avenues that have been defined by the whole of language. There is scope for initiative and for variation so that the proficient bilingual can bring into his creative language, in this case English, some of the strategies and other resources of his native language and its literature. It also provides for the possibility that the proficient bilingual, by the possession of two languages, has a sharper sense of reality, of perception because he is bifocal.

Be that as it may, the search for idiom and idelect is ongoing. What F. W. Bateson (1934, quoted in Wellek and Warren 1955:177) said about the changing language of poetry would apply to the language of literature as a whole:

... the age's imprint in a poem is not to be traced to the poet but to the language. The real history of poetry is, I believe, the history of the changes in the kind of language

in which successive poems have been written. And it is these changes of language only that are due to the pressures of social and intellectual tendencies.

There is one notable difference between these changes in a monolingual situation and in a bilingual or multilingual situation. When we talk about the spread of English, we usually have in mind its spread to countries. What is more important at the micro level is its spread within so-called second-language areas. The learning of English is at a premium, both as a foreign language and as a second language. In Singapore, for instance, it is the medium of instruction throughout the educational system. The model adopted seeks to reflect an international standard English, close to British English. But the writer's innovations in order to create an idiolect quite often do not follow the general drift of the language promoted educationally. This generalisation has to be modified to take into account the genre in which the writer works. As a rule, the genre of poetry is acrolectal although there are instances where basolect is used. In drama the characters speak or ruminate in the lect appropriate to their intellectual and social background. In the case of fiction there is a larger number of registers. Even with the first person narrative we can make the assumption that if the narrator is an acrolectal speaker, it would be possible for him to narrate across the lectal range of the world depicted in the fiction. Therefore it is not so much an evolution because there is a certain simultaneity in the sense that many writers are concurrently attempting to evolve their own idiolect; and the writers, in some circumstances, draw from quite different language backgrounds, as in Singapore, Malaysia, India, and Africa.

Within a basically monolingual situation, such as that which obtains in England, we can see this evolution over the years. In the case of poetry, we have the Metaphysical period, during which the use of conceits dominated; then we have the eighteenth century, with its fiction and theory of kinds; and lastly we have the Romantic period, where there is a loosening, as it were, of the idiom and therefore a greater variation in styles.

The second-language situation is quite different. And the writer is faced by unusual possibilities and therefore unusual challenges. The work of Kamala Das is exemplary. English is not Das's mother tongue. Yet the poetry she writes in it

is powerful at its best. On the other hand, her short stories are in Malayalam. What is striking here is the confident and powerful claim to two languages.

The case for the use of English has been argued back and forth in almost all the new literatures. An early and in some ways still telling statement regarding the problem is provided by Raja Rao in his foreword to his novel Kanthapura. Here the tensions, auguries of opportunity, are delicately defined: a language that is not one's own balanced against a spirit that is one's own. English is said to be 'alien', yet it is recognised as not being really alien. It serves intellectual, not emotional purposes. There is the interesting claim that we are all instinctively bilingual; there is the contention that you cannot write like the English nor is it possible to write only as Indians. There is the conviction that the use of English in India will prove to be as distinctive as that which has emerged in Ireland and America. What Raja Rao has said here has behind its delicacy a very strong sense of the philosophical reach that can be behind the writer's aims and intentions. His stress on the necessity to reorientate, to adjust, and to adapt the language is something that others in India have recognised.

Irrespective of the role they see for themselves and the function they might see their work as having, the ambition is one which poet, novelist, and dramatist share. Whatever their stance, their choice of genre, their choice of material, they portray individuals and the warp and woof of society. At times their writing consists chiefly of their own reactions to and seekings about life around them in a language that is simultaneously a private and public possession. Language is the chief medium of consciousness, the instrument through which the external world is received, analysed, and internalized; it is the instrument of creativity, of that reaching out. It mediates upon the flow between the writer and his social reality. Creativity pushes him beyond mere description--meaning as it is--to assemble new meanings to capture the temper, the quintessential flavour, of the times, linking generations and roving among decades. He takes his substance from the unique, the perennial, and the temporary, the buoyant and the ordinary--which may prove unexpectedly unique to others. He examines the surface and deep structures of his material and themes, exploring in a single moment the vocabulary of understanding and expression, inventing in order to extend the depth and power of both.

English for the writer is a language to give and a language to take, a language that gives and a language that receives.

The study of language is conducted through three main, related branches: historical linguistics, descriptive linguistics, and comparative linguistics. These rest in varying degrees (depending on purpose, availability of data, and similar factors) on the study of phonetics and phonology, grammar (morphology and syntax), the lexicon and semantics, and the many subcategories that each of these subsumes. There are cogent reasons for this reminder of the obvious. The upsurge of linguistics in third movement situations, especially as a science, as an important area to be taught and researched, has tended to concentrate on English. The other languages in situ, whether indigenous or brought through immigration, have yet to receive the proportionate attention which would imply an intrinsic interest in them, distinguishable from that confined to and limited by specific issues, such as mother-tongue or second-language problems. Such pragmatics apart, the other reasons for the spare attention include a shortage of linguists with the required background; the limitations of conceptions and terminologies; and insufficient coordination to pull together previous and current work. But the most crucial factor is the fact that English is the language in common. Scholarship on the language depends a great deal on how it is used by writers in Asia, Africa, the Pacific, and elsewhere. Linguists tap and add to the study of the language and literature of the mother-tongue bases. The scale is international and backed by a certain historical depth. On the other hand, the influence of, say, Ijaw, Yoruba, Ibo, Iwe, Gikuyu, Acholi, Illocano, and Jamaican Creole, or of Mandarin, Tamil, Hindi, Urdu, and Malay, is local or regional in context and import. These languages attract local or at best regional attention, which is often, moreover, subject to political, economic, and social restraints.

And yet the work has to be done if we are to increase understanding of the back-, middle- and foreground to the new literatures in English. While they write in English, virtually all writers of these literatures are bilingual, bicultural, and, for those in multicultural societies, touched by more than two genetic/semiotic meaning systems. The result of that search for an ideolect in terms of a personal voice and a voice for his characters and masks is a verbal edifice that is under constant enlargement and modification,

responding to shifts in the grammars of motives and interests. The edifice has two main doors--and their network of lesser entrances and exits: one to the world of English, dominated by its linguistic and literary semiotic systems; the other to the systems (linguistic, literary, social, philosophical, etc.) of the social reality or realities which the writer inhabits.

There are connections between and similarities in each set, coexisting, coalescing, readjusting through an arithmetic formed by life and contacts. The English language and its literature are used for creating a literature whose impulse and inspiration derive from a social reality distinct from that on which the language and literature rested. In these circumstances, the critical culture, especially the traditional assumptions about the function of the artist and the legitimate concerns of literature, cannot apply in toto because a series of reorientations bring about a new literary reality. Such orientations which help the writer to identify in his works with his social reality cannot be achieved by the nature of his material, his themes alone, which are too superficial, unreflective, untuned to the shape and deeper significances of experience and context whose uniqueness requires some adapting of English for fuller expression. English is writing into a new experience, requiring fresh gesture, a different reach. Part of the strength and capacity of English to absorb modifications and extensions lies in the wealth of synonyms, alluring shades of meaning to be controlled, giving generous room for that movement from the denotative to connotative, from the latent to the manifest. But the new flow of meaning is in some sense and in some instances, a personal creation. As noted earlier, raids into language for a new articulateness can bring into existence metaphor and phrase outside the growing body of common usage. Part of the newly invented, if powerful and made accessible through context, can work its way into general usage. As we can expect, the more radical the innovation the less likely its adoption. Okara's The Voice or Tutuola's The Palmwine Drinkard are extreme examples, the former based on a concerted attempt to impose Ijaw structures upon English, the latter a consistent but personal variety of English. Each establishes its own semiotic system which conditions and directs our understanding. They succeed to a degree through the links each has with the larger system of English as an international language and the varieties of

native-based and new literatures. They constitute a network in various permutations and combinations for both writer and reader, a network offering a basis for entry into the systems despite the fact that some of their linguistic and literary elements, strategies, concepts, and assumptions differ, at times starkly.

Questions about language dominate part of the social reality. The place of English, especially as bridge between ethnic groups, as modernising, as creative instrument, forms a set of concerns inevitably reflected in the new literatures. Some of these concerns are broad, such as the choice of or continued use of English for communication or creativity--a choice facing both the writer and the masks and characters he develops. Others are narrow and specific. There are colonial and postcolonial politics; ethnic rivalries and suspicions; the implications of caste and class, of being 'educated' and 'less educated'; English as an intralanguage and the consequent fall in the standard of usage; linguistic awareness reflected in translation of proverbs and rhetorical manipulation; mother-tongue patronising of new users; interpenetration of languages, either orchestrated or reflecting usage. They make for a virtually infinite variety in life and relationships in the social reality which writer, critic, and general reader inhabit and between that reality and the other social realities of the writer's compatriots, not forgetting the one which comes with English. Life is always firmly behind language and literature. Each character, whether partially or fully developed, is a pool of consciousness, of understanding and ignorance, of darkness and light, of enlightenment and prejudice. The difficulty is not merely one of an appropriate lect. It extends to forming a lectal range that can reflect a multilingual or bilingual situation. The following passage from Achebe's Arrow of God is exemplary. The Igbo Unachukwa uses fractured English when speaking to an Englishman. Yet when he speaks to a fellow Igbo, the English has to pick up as we are to assume that his Igbo is at least good.

'Dat man wan axe master qeshon.'

'No questions.'

'Yassah.' He turned to Nweke. 'The white man says he did not leave his house this morning to come and answer your questions.'

In order to sustain the impression of the shift from English to Igbo, queshton becomes question.

While we are concerned here with creativity in English, it should be noted that the problems are equally there for those who use 'indigenous' languages such as Tagalog, Bengali, and Malay, or other migrant languages, of which Tamil and Mandarin in Singapore and Malaysia would be instances. Each writer makes sense of life in the round as a prelude to its imaginative recreation in and across genetic/semiotic systems, at least to the limits of sensibility, verbal resources, interests--his grammars--powers of analysis and synthesis. The challenge is enormously complex. The human situation is complicated by bi- and trilingual, polydialectal factors, not so much for the individual participants as for those who wish to grasp the whole. The writer is concerned to articulate his interest, his vision, and the themes which ensue therefrom. When he reads contemporaries and predecessors, whether in the original or in translation, his motives are different from those of a critic. It is part instruction, part nourishment, apart from keeping him in touch with the literary scene. Like his contemporaries, he has his own niche and individuality. If he assays criticism, the practice is informed by the insights of the writer. The frame of reference for the critic is significantly broader, for while he may be engaged with a particular text or writer, his very role implies a concern with a literature or literatures. He is concerned, in varying degrees, with periods, with movements, with judging writers, preferring one to another and providing grounds for his preferences. His view covers the literature produced, combining a sense of the contemporary and a sense of the past, the writer with the production of the literature. The writer reduces, installs his vision in his work; the critic has to consider this vision as well as that of other writers. In the context of African literatures in English, it means no less than finding a frame for discussing and evaluating the works of, say, Kofi Awoonor, Chinua Achebe, Gabriel Okara, Elechi Amadi, Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, Oko p'Bitek. Extend the list to include the Anglophone writers in Heinemann's African Writers Series, then Indian, West Indian, Southeast Asian, and South Pacific literatures in English, not to mention their links with 'indigenous' literary traditions, and you have a fair conception of the critical tasks. For each writer, there is perception and performance, active and passive stance ranging from a feel for the larger political, social, and other

currents in the social reality, to the specifics of innermost individual thought and feeling.

Criticism is simultaneously a generalising and a specifying activity. Within a single literary genetic/semiotic system that is part of an integrated social reality, there is the tempting assumption that a work is to some degree characteristic, that its distinctiveness can be accounted for within the prevailing semiotic systems. Moreover, a work that demonstrably cuts against the grain, however powerfully disturbing (Joyce's *Ulysses* is an obvious example), can be accommodated; it does not bring in the context of another linguistic-literary semiotic system. The literature and its language continue to change through revolution and evolution. Donne, Dryden, Fielding, Wordsworth, Eliot, Joyce, and Yeats were innovators whose works were variously revolutionary. They are major figures who open up new possibilities of language and structure which influence their less talented contemporaries. Thus the revolution settles down to an evolution, establishing a mode, a period. It makes for a degree of acceptable generalisation in which the discussion of text or issue has force beyond the specific occasion. Instances are the metaphysical conceit or the theory and practice of Augustan poetic diction. Continuities of literary history encourage the emergence of a critical tradition vigilant of the literature in the language.

The position is radically dissimilar within the new literatures. They have a variety best understood in terms of origins, antecedents, and contemporaneity, attempting to retain much that is traditional in various spheres of life and yet wishing to incorporate desirable change. For the writer, every attempt is a new beginning whose relevance is best judged retrospectively as the means for that judgement are themselves being formed. The innovations are not calculated to alter or refurbish a creative tradition. The tradition, in some instances barely discernible, is emerging *in situ*. Robust as well as lesser talents are equally in search of creative means, of shaping vision, self-definition, and destiny.

A number of linguistic and literary vigilances have been suggested in broad terms to focus attention on the new literatures in their contexts or on the elements--genetic/semiotic systems--that form the contexts. The work they demand is primarily literary and linguistic, concentrating on what the writer inherits and what he does with it, including acts of identification, description, and linkages

between languages, literatures, and their semiotic systems. The tasks are enormous and interrelated and I have merely indicated some of the problems and lacunae, and what responses to make. The overall frame within which specific as well as more general studies can profitably proceed will incorporate a number of foci to sharpen our response.

The first focus is for linguistic and literary studies to link up wherever possible and so avoid what Quirk (1977:65), referring to the study of Old, Middle, and contemporary English literature, described as 'a dichotomy between the relatively modern writings that can be "appreciated" (these are called "literature") and the relatively early writings that cannot be (and these are called "language").' The danger would arise from the divergence in the varieties of English that have resulted from the adoption of English formally and informally within a polity where writers can have quite different mother-tongues, to the greater divergence between the clines of English in, say, the West Indies, the Philippines, and India. Literature draws upon the full stretch of language. While the standard, educated varieties are mutually intelligible in a substantial way, the pidgins and creoles have a local habitation and a name.

The two most recent models for the spread of English are those proposed by Kachru and Quirk in this volume. They raise important issues whose full implication for nations in the third movement will emerge increasingly from theoretical and applied research into the role and state of their languages, given the genetic/semiotic systems which comprise their social reality. But comprehensive, sustained language surveys require substantial funds and specialists. Language is power.² Given limited resources and unlimited needs, governments of third movement nations are forced into a pragmatism, a formula of priorities. The concentration on language in education stresses its practical value, which is quite rightly paramount. Fortunately, scholarly enterprise, however modest in isolation, has cumulative reach. The study of language and the application of linguistic concepts and methods have contributed to the greater definition of our understanding. An increasing number of texts have attracted stylistic/linguistic analysis. Emmanuel Njara, for instance, has done very useful work on a selection of African novels. When as sensitive, discriminating, and precise as Lehmann's treatment of Raja Rao's short story The Cow of the Barricades, such analyses both enrich and structure our

understanding and, moreover, link the linguistic and literary interests. Lehmann's

... presentation proposes within a model of communication three strata; a phonological, a grammatical, and a semiological. Assuming these strata, a text linguist interprets the linguistic material relating the physical phenomena or articulatory and auditory mechanisms using sound waves with the communication situation, including the referential realm, the culture, the language, the social setting and the participation of communicator and audience. These distinctions already make up a rich area for analysis by the text linguist and literary critic. But the three strata provide grounds for added richness. In each of these linguistic strata there are sub-strata with their own elements; the elements are interrelated by means of the formulae known in linguistic study as rules. For illustration I list the seven sub-strata in the grammatical stratum. Beginning with the largest entity these sub-strata are: discourse, paragraph, sentence, clause, phrase, word, and the smallest segment of grammatical form, the morpheme. Exploring the treatment of these sub-strata and of their characteristic elements by a poet might well occupy any literary critic. Phrased differently, the exploration of such well-identified arrays corresponds to the literary critic's task: making explicit the characteristics of their critical procedures in 'der Kunst des Lesens--the art of reading' (n.d.:20-21).

Such analysis via strata and sub-strata will, as Lehmann suggests, make 'explicit the characteristics of... critical procedures'. The other point apposite to the general thrust of what I have been saying is that while the procedures have been applied to native-based English literatures, they have yet to be systematically part of the study of new literatures. Starts have been made but they do not always take into account 'the referential realm, the culture, the language, the social setting and the participation of communicator and audience', i.e. the social reality and the constituting genetic/semiotic systems. And where they do, there remain the problems of balance between the emphases each realm receives.

The network of issues connected with criticism and creation as relating to the new literatures is endless. It

metamorphoses as life and language move. But there are two further suggestions which provide a useful concluding note. The first concerns the formation of an idelect, the second critical approaches. Quarrying into English--or any language--to secure an inwardness sufficient to manage irony, pun, paradox, specific rhythms, striking metaphor, or intricate patterns of images, and with the shades of meaning derived is never easy. Moreover, the process of formulation is not always conscious. The writer as his own critic judges, but what he judges is both consciously and unconsciously formulated. The mind has its secret thesaurus in which words long unused emerge aptly. The general process includes using language to explore and define an idea, a feeling. The contrary state is an idea, a feeling in search of words. For the writer in the third movement the challenge is complicated by his bilingual, bicultural inheritance. Concepts, the link between custom, behaviour, the cosmos even, and language as posited by the mother-tongue often cannot move across into English. Achebe did not see this as representing a serious problem. Others have. Perhaps it depends on one's experience with English, with the conception of what creativity in a polydialectal situation demands, with the idelect thought necessary, with the chosen genre, for instance. Writers as geographically dispersed as Edith Tiempo (Philippines), Derek Walcott (Jamaica), and Okara (Nigeria) have thought it necessary to bend English to achieve satisfactory statement (see Thumboo 1986:253-54). Acts of translation/transcreation mark the creativity, though in this case critical judgments do not have an original text as benchmark. Nonetheless, the methods of translation, especially those used in English and indigenous languages and covering work in both directions, are useful, if we keep in mind the essential spirit of freedom noted as far back as John Dryden's introduction to Ovid's Epistles (1680):

All translation, I suppose, may be reduced to these three heads. First, that of metaphrase, or turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another... The second way is that of paraphrase, or translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered... The third way is that of imitation, where the translator (if now he has

not lost that name) assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the ground-work, as he pleases.

That new literatures are at least bicultural formations--in which English and its literary inheritance are common--has not been sufficiently realised except by those who belong to the social reality or one that is comparable. This has led, among other things, to the feeling in certain quarters that criticism from the outside, the mother-tongue bases especially, remains metropolitan-centred and, at times, imperial. The sense of distance, of minimal sympathy was never a widespread sentiment in the Anglo-diaspora. The coming of age of their literatures was not traumatic: their social realities were offshoots, grafts. The new literatures, which belong to ex-colonies, are a different case altogether.

Nor have critics belonging to the third movement been innocent of misinterpreting works resting on their own or other social realities. But greater difficulties are faced by those from outside these realities, difficulties they can overcome by working their way in through the study of the social, cultural, linguistic, political, and economic background. Some have done so. Their work shows that unless there is that grasp, inappropriate assumptions, questionable points of departure, thesis-proving, inability or unwillingness to see the crucial force of contexts, or the infusions of other linguistic or literary traditions, will misdirect attention. There are more than seven deadly sins. But the most potent is the tacit assumption that as they use English, or a variety of it, the new literatures are an extension of English literature. Consequently, its critical practice, honed over a rich 400 years of creativity, self-confident and supported by academic energies, ought to cope with these fledglings comfortably. This is hardly the case when put to the test. Where the criticism has been illuminating, we find reorientations that take into account the contexts of the work.

Given the fundamental and at times extensive differences between the genetic/semiotic systems constituting the social reality of new literatures, we ought to treat the literatures as separate in certain essential aspects despite their sharing of English. Moreover, while we see them as new literatures in English, they are--with the exception of West Indian writing--but one of two, three, or more literatures within the

social reality. The focus of attention on English should be balanced by the realisation that the literature in it is part of a national literary genetic/semiotic system upon which its survival and growth depend. Such are the complexities to be unravelled that I am convinced that the methods of Comparative Literature are to be adopted with profit. The justification strengthens as we move into each of the literatures and discover their distinctiveness. They are unique parts of a possible whole. Provided the comparative spirit is sensitively attentive, self-testing, tentative, exploratory before turning firm, its methods will take us further towards understanding and judging specific new literatures, the literatures as a group, how they relate to each other and to mother-tongue based literatures, and whether we can ultimately attempt an overview of all literatures in English.

Comparative Literature as a discipline reflects Euro-American interests, while practitioners constantly review its scope and function. The implication of recent developments for the study of new literatures are considered in Thumboo 1987. The basic comparative frame is set by taking literatures in two or more languages, the general assumption being 'one language, one literature'. A relatively recent development (see Grimm 1986) is the study of the literature in one language, in this case German, written by minorities and in different geographical localities. Grimm discusses whether these literatures are extensions or 'second literatures' and makes the point that a more 'differentiated terminology and approach' will have to be adopted. Because the writers he refers to share, in addition to language, a relatively homogeneous culture, the phenomenon of spread is akin to the spread in the first and second movements I outlined. In coping with the new literatures, the comparative approach would be dealing with enormously more varied social realities and therefore would require the working out of appropriate concepts, terminologies, and approaches. The challenge ought to prove fruitful in the meeting. Comparative Literature works by way of disciplined inquisitiveness, considers background, looks at the literatures in the context of cultural and other manifestations. It considers literatures in translation, either on the page or in the mind of the bilingual reader, and is more likely to consider creative adjustments to English in response to new social realities. While it generalises about the strengths and

resources of particular languages for this or that purpose, and ranks texts from them, it is not inclined to rank languages. Moreover, its approaches include those by way of genre and theme, both unfashionable as major foci in the criticism of English literature, but useful in discussing the new literatures. These potential advantages apart, it is less likely to have a hidden agenda.

I have sought to suggest what historical and contemporary forces lie behind the emergence and shaping of the new literatures in English, and possible ways of looking at them, ways consonant with aspirations and purpose. The preoccupation with theme, with linguistic and literary resources within and in response to main and subordinate social realities, is by no means exhaustive. Constraints of time have left generalisations bare of supporting evidence, without which broad statements can appear to be contradictory. What this paper amounts to is a plea for constructive understanding, as a prelude to literary judgment. There are no conclusions, only beginnings. The urging of a more sharply focussed and informed criticism of the individual literatures must resist irredentist impulses. Collectively, they should form part of a common enterprise which, over the long term and especially if it combines literary and linguistic studies, will bring about a clear, richer sense of how English has not only spread but has brought forth new literatures upon which the sun will never set.

Notes

1. When translated from the original Malay into English, this slogan becomes 'One land, one people, one religion' [ed.].
2. See World Englishes 5.2/3, 1986, which is devoted to papers given at a 1986 conference on 'The power of English: Cross-cultural dimensions in literature and media,' East-West Center, Honolulu.

References

- Achebe, Chinua. 1964. *Arrow of God*. London: Heinemann.
- Achebe, Chinua. 1969. *A man of the people*. London: Heinemann.

- Alvarez-Pereyre, Jacques. 1984. *The poetry of commitment in South Africa*. London: Heinemann.
- Amirthanayagam, Guy, ed. 1982. *Writers in East-West encounter: New cultural bearings*. London: Macmillan.
- Awoonor, Kofi. 1976. *Tradition and continuity in African literature*. In: Smith (1976:166-72).
- Bateson, F.W. 1961. *English poetry and the English language*. 2nd ed. New York: Russell. (3rd ed., Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.)
- Breitinger, Eckhard, and Reinhard Sander, eds. 1985. *Studies in Commonwealth literature*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Chinweizu, 1983. *Decolonising the mind*. South, January:19-21.
- Das, Kamala. 1973. *The old playhouse and other poems*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Dembo, L.S., ed. 1968. *Criticism: Speculative and analytical essays*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ee Tiang Hong. 1976. *Myths for a wilderness*. Singapore: Heinemann.
- Egejuru, Phaniel Akubueze. 1978. *Black writers/white audience: A critical approach to African literature*. New York: Exposition Press.
- Ezekiel, Nissim. 1976. *Hymns in darkness*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Feinberg, Barry, ed. 1974. *Poets to the people*. London: Allen. (2nd ed., London: Heinemann, 1980)
- Forster, E.M. 1924. *A passage to India*. Abinger edition. London: Arnold, 1978.
- Gordimer, Nadine. 1973. *The black interpreters: Notes on African writing*. Johannesburg: SPROCAS/RAVAN.
- Grimm, Reinhold. 1986. *Identity and difference: On comparative studies within a single language*. In: *Profession* 1986. New York: Modern Language Association of America. 28-29.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Arnold.
- Hoggart, Richard. 1982. *An English temper: Essays on education, culture and communication*. London: Chatto.
- Huxley, Elspeth. 1968. *White man's country*. 2 vols. London: Chatto.
- Huxley, Elspeth. 1957. *The red rock wilderness*. London: Chatto.
- Huxley, Elspeth. 1962. *On the edge of the Rift*. New York: Morrow.

- Johnson, Colin. 1985. Interview with Colin Johnson. In: Breitinger and Sander (1985:11-14).
- Kachru, Braj. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In: Quirk and Widdowson (1985:11-30).
- Kavanagh, Robert Mshengu. 1985. Theatre and cultural struggle in South Africa. London: Zed Books.
- Lehmann, Winfred. Literature and linguistics: Text linguistics. In: Narasimhaiah and Srinath (n.d.:18-29).
- Markandaya, Kamala. 1973. One pair of eyes: Some random reflections. *The Literary Criterion* 11.1:14-25.
- Narasimhaiah, C.D., and C.N. Srinath, eds. n.d. English, its complementary role in India. Mysore: Dhvanyaloka.
- Njara, Emmanuel. 1982. Stylistic criticism and the African novel. London: Heinemann.
- Nkosi, Lewis. 1981. Tasks and masks: Themes and styles of African literature. Harlow: Longman.
- Nkosi, Lewis. 1983. Home and exile and other selections. Harlow: Longman.
- Parthasarathy, R. 1973. The Indian writer's problems: Poet in search of a language. *The Literary Criterion* 11.1:126-29.
- Parthasarathy, R. 1977. Rough passage. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, Randolph. 1974. The linguist and the English language. London: Arnold.
- Quirk, Randolph, and H.G. Widdowson, eds. 1985. English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures. The British Council. Cambridge: Cambridge: University Press.
- Rao, Raja. 1971. Kanthapura. Delhi: Orient Paperbacks.
- Royston, Robert, ed. 1973. Black poets in South Africa. London: Heinemann.
- Salleh, Muhammad Haji. 1977. Tradition and change in contemporary Malay-Indonesian poetry. Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Smith, Rowland, ed. 1976. Exile and tradition: Studies in African and Caribbean literature. Dalhousie: Dalhousie University Press.
- Soyinka, Wole. 1965. The interpreters. London: Deutsch.
- Thumboo, Edwin. 1984. The writer and society: Some Third World reminders. *Solidarity* 99:24-32.
- Thumboo, Edwin. 1985. Twin perspectives and multi-ecosystems: Tradition for a Commonwealth writer. *World Englishes* 4.2:213-21.

- Thumboo, Edwin. 1986. Language as power: Gabriel Okara's The Voice as a paradigm. *World Englishes* 5.2/3:249-64.
- Thumboo, Edwin. 1987. New literatures in English: Imperative for a comparative approach. Paper delivered at Conference on Literature in English: New Perspectives, Graz, Austria, April 21-24.
- Wellek, Rene, and Austin Warren. 1955. *Theory of literature*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Wendt, Albert. 1982. Towards a New Oceania. In: Amirthanayagam (1982:202-215).
- Wong Kan Seng. Minister of Community development, Republic of Singapore. Speech, Annual Cultural Awards Presentation. Singapore: Typescript, Feb. 10, 1987.

CLOSING REMARKS FOR GURT '87

James E. Alatis, Dean
School of Languages and Linguistics
Georgetown University

It is a great pleasure for me as Dean of the Georgetown University School of Languages and Linguistics to have this opportunity to address the concluding session of GURT '87. I would like to say a few words about an issue which is of particular concern for the language teaching profession and which was mentioned several times during this morning's session.

As you all know, this year's preconference session included a colloquium on 'English as the Official Language? Language Policy in the United States,' at which a panel of prominent linguists, educators, and government officials discussed the issues underlying the current movement to make English the sole official language of the United States. Among the participants was Mrs. Gerda Bikales, the Executive Director of the U.S. English Organization. When the panel was over, I had the impression that the audience expected a response from me to Mrs. Gerda Bikales' comments on the English Language Amendment. Indeed, I even received a note asking for a resolution from the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1987 opposing the movement to make English the sole official language of the United States.

As your host at Georgetown University, I found it inappropriate at that time to make any comment on the issue of the English-Only Amendment. My concern was to treat Mrs. Bikales with every civility and courtesy even though she was advocating a view with which many of us disagree. Our loyalty to egalitarian ideals and practice requires that we act in the scholarly and democratic way that is representative not only of this university but of good academic procedure everywhere: namely, encourage open discussion and accept everyone's right to speak.

However, I have been asked by a colleague, whom I respect, to make some remarks before this conference ends on the subject of English as the sole official language of the United States. So I am taking this opportunity to state briefly my concerns.

To begin with, you are aware that the ideal of multilingualism and multiculturalism dates back much further than the passage of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. Dr. Einar Haugen, who was in the audience at the preconference meeting on Thursday, has traced it back as far as the Tower of Babel story. The reference to the Tower of Babel story is particularly relevant because the speaker on Thursday suggested that the failure of the English-Only Amendment would lead us to the kind of confusion that resulted in the Tower of Babel story.

I would like to argue that such a judgment is based on a piecemeal and unrealistic approach to the complex problem of language planning in the United States. As Haugen (1974:33) explained, although there may be some who consider linguistic diversity a curse laid upon men for their sinful pride,

Those of us who love languages and devote our lives to learning and teaching them and who find language a source of novel delights and subtle experience, find it hard to put ourselves in the right frame of mind to understand the conception of language diversity as a curse.

Haugen argues that bilingualism offers the most humane way to bridge the communications gap and 'mitigate the curse of Babel' (Haugen 1974:ibid.). He proposes two humanistic solutions to the curse of Babel for all men of good will:

- (1) deliberately to inculcate and to promote by means of education a spirit in the general population of interest and understanding of minority peoples, and
- (2) to make sure that people who speak differently understand and are understood, ... by making them bilingual.

He concludes (Haugen 1975:35) that the Tower of Babel is a profound symbol for man's ultimate unity and for his common descent as a talking animal.

Proponents of the English Language Amendment are trying to convince the American people that the maintenance of

minority languages in our nation has begun to threaten the primacy of the English language in the United States. Eminent language scholars have repeatedly emphasized that no minority language in our country can aspire to threaten the position of English as our principal language. Charles Ferguson, for example, at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1977 on 'Language and American Life,' in a speech he made in this very room regarding 'Language and Global Interdependence,' said:

...no matter how much we insist on the language diversity in America or the great value of foreign languages, we must not forget the great national advantage we have in the dominance of English. There is no place in Europe and not many places in the world where there is such a great expanse of so many people speaking the same language in a relatively uniform manner. (Ferguson 1977:27)

Thus it is on the basis of an accumulated knowledge and experience that I suggest we dismiss the proposed English-Only Amendment as a meaningless legislative move. Indeed, nothing could be further from our egalitarian practices and from the realities of language. As I explained elsewhere:

The most obvious fact about the language situation in the United States is the primacy of the English language. No legal effort is needed to codify this primacy. Not only would such an attempt be expensive, wasteful, counter-productive, and ultimately futile, but it would also be an affront to what Americans and leaders of the democratic world value most. In a free and egalitarian society, such factors as ethnic origin must not be allowed to deprive children of the equal opportunity to realize their full potential as individual human beings. Language policy, like any other United States policy, must be a reflection of efforts to measure up to the requirements of a democratic society. A language policy of the United States must acknowledge, respect, and enrich the cultural values of our linguistic minority groups. The first step toward the promotion of such a policy is to reveal the disastrous implications of the English-Only Amendment. (Alatis 1986:199-200)

It is important to know that these lines were quoted from the special focus issue of Joshua Fishman's International Journal of the Sociology of Language, which was dedicated exclusively to the question of the English-Only Amendment. The focus article, entitled 'The Question of an Official Language: Language Rights and the English Language Amendment,' is by Professor David Marshall, whose detailed analysis of the situation provides revealing conclusions with regard to the problem of language choice in American life. Marshall recommends that:

...we need to organize our efforts as scholars so that the resurgent nativism that forms a strand in U.S. history does not undermine what this nation stands for, the opportunity to choose democratically how we live, and that includes what language we choose to speak and where we may speak it. It is that freedom that is at stake, that could be blocked by the ELA, and its loss could portend an erosion of liberty. (Marshall 1986:211)

However, despite our many efforts to improve the public's awareness of the realities of language in the United States, Mrs. Bikales announced on Thursday that 73.2 percent of the electorate of the State of California have voted in favor of the English-Only Amendment. This is a threat of the most serious kind not only to the language teaching profession but to American society as a whole. The statistics given by Mrs. Bikales indicate that we have failed to inform and persuade the American people of our point of view. There is something seriously wrong with our means of communication and with our efforts to make the public informed and aware. We have engaged in omphaloskepsis. We have been talking to one another in close professional circles without getting the word out to the general public.

It is no longer sufficient for us to talk to one another in professional circles without facing up to the practical and political realities of what Mrs. Bikales said to us. We must resolve to extend our efforts to inform the public and to engage in that type of legislative monitoring which is legal and also appropriate to the exercise of our First Amendment rights in order to inform and persuade the American people to assume more intelligent views about language. Now, more than ever, it is appropriate for professional organizations to encourage their members and their affiliates to respond to

the English-Only Amendment debate by briefing their state legislatures on the futility of such legislative measure.

In this connection you may be interested to know that the TESOL organization has prepared a letter to its U.S. affiliates (TESOL 1987), asking them to take action against the proposed English-Only Amendment. In this letter TESOL has outlined the principal elements of its position. The letter insists that:

Measures to declare English as the official language have generated, either intentionally or unintentionally, a negative and narrow view of the position of the United States in the world community. It is to the cultural and economic advantage of the United States that its citizens be proficient in more than one language. For this reason, those in TESOL encourage programs that provide speakers of other languages--the students we serve--the opportunity to learn English, while maintaining their native tongues, as well as programs of foreign language study for native English speakers. Rather than 'English only', we support an 'English plus' position: one in which all citizens have the opportunity to learn and use English in addition to another language.

This letter is the first step in a series of actions TESOL is planning with regard to the English-Only Amendment. The issue of the amendment will be discussed at the TESOL 1987 Convention in Miami Beach, where a resolution opposing such amendments will be introduced and voted upon. The resolution will then be presented to the TESOL membership at the TESOL Legislative Assembly.

It is important to know that other institutions and professional organizations such as the Center for Applied Linguistics, the Linguistic Society of America, the Modern Language Association, and the National Council of Teachers of English have also formulated similar resolutions at their recent meetings and similarly oppose the exclusive use of English as an official language. However, you are all aware that resolutions take time. Further, they are ineffective unless they are widely publicized. To ensure their creative effects, attempts should be made to distribute them to policy makers at all levels, to the members of various professional organizations, to the organizers of the U.S. English-Only movement, and to the American people in general.

To conclude, we, as linguists and language teachers, have gone a long way to unify our professions and to develop them into strong national forces for language education. It is our duty now to use our forces as effectively as we can and exercise our First Amendment right to fight for what we think is necessary for our cultural and national advancement. Ours is not merely an educational battle. It is a battle for the future of the millions of children throughout the nation and the world who look to us for leadership, protection, and love. It is, indeed, a battle for democracy, for social justice, and for world peace. As the Dean of the Georgetown University School of Languages and Linguistics, as the Executive Director of TESOL, and as President of the Joint National Committee for Languages, I would like to emphasize that unless we provide an enlightened choice for the American people at the ballot box concerning the English-Only Amendment, we cannot consider our educational mission fulfilled. Our national leaders should know that such a measure as the amendment of the United States Constitution to make English the only official language is an empty, costly, and worthless exercise. As committed language educators, we should prefer to see this money spent on actually teaching language minorities the English language and spent on teaching foreign languages to Americans as we strive toward what my colleague Richard Tucker has often called 'a language-competent American society.' A major step toward the formation of such a society is to promote efforts to assure the provision of equal educational opportunity for all. Nothing could be further from this egalitarian ideal than an attempt to make English the exclusive official language of the United States.

References

- Alatis, James E. 1986. The question of language policy. In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman. No. 60. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ferguson, Charles. 1977. Language and global interdependence. In: *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1977: Language in American life*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Haugen, Einar, and Morton Bloomfield, eds. 1974. *Language as a human problem*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Marshall, David F. 1986. Rebuttal essay. In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman. No. 60. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- TESOL. 1987. Letter to affiliates giving TESOL position on proposed English Amendment. March 16.