

## **Progress in Language Planning**

*Contributions to the Sociology of Language*

31

*Editor*

Joshua A. Fishman

# Progress in Language Planning

*International Perspectives*

*Edited by*

Juan Cobarrubias

Joshua A. Fishman

MOUTON PUBLISHERS · BERLIN · NEW YORK · AMSTERDAM

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*

Main entry under title:

Progress in language planning.

(Contributions to the sociology of language; 31) Bibliography: p.

1. Language planning -- Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Cobarrubias, Juan, 1936--

II. Fishman, Joshua A. III. Series.

P40.5.L35P76 1983 404 82-22310

ISBN 90-279-3358-8

ISBN 90-279-3388-X (pbk.)

© 1983 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of Mouton Publishers, Division of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin. Typesetting: Asian Research Service, Hong Kong. -- Printing: Druckerei Hildebrand, Berlin. -- Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer Buchgewerbe GmbH, Berlin. -- Cover design: K. Lothar Hildebrand, Berlin. Printed in Germany.

# Contents

## INTRODUCTION

Language Planning: The State of the Art <i>Juan Cobarrubias</i>	3
--------------------------------------------------------------------	---

## PART ONE: DECISION MAKING IN LANGUAGE PLANNING 27

Language Planning and Language Change <i>Charles A. Ferguson</i>	29
---------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Ethical Issues in Status Planning <i>Juan Cobarrubias</i>	41
--------------------------------------------------------------	----

Language Status Decisions and the Law in the United States <i>Shirley Brice Heath and Frederick Mandabach</i>	87
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Modeling Rationales in Corpus Planning: Modernity and Tradition in Images of the Good Corpus <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i>	107
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

## PART TWO: CODIFICATION IN LANGUAGE PLANNING 119

Contemporary Models of Standardized New World Spanish: Origin, Development, and Use <i>William G. Milan</i>	121
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Models of New Englishes <i>Braj B. Kachru</i>	145
--------------------------------------------------	-----

<b>PART THREE: LANGUAGE PLANNING IN NORTH AMERICA</b>	<b>171</b>
U.S. Language Status Policy and the Canadian Experience <i>William F. Mackey</i>	173
Corpus and Status Language Planning in Quebec: A Look at Linguistic Education <i>Denise Daoust-Blais</i>	207
The Modernization of Navajo <i>Bernard Spolsky and Lorraine Boomer</i>	235
What Can Language Planners Learn from the Hispanic Experience with Corpus Planning in the United States? <i>Gary D. Keller</i>	253
<b>PART FOUR: IMPLEMENTATION OF LANGUAGE PLANNING</b>	<b>267</b>
The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice <i>Einar Haugen</i>	269
The Implementation of Language Planning in China <i>Dayle Barnes</i>	291
Implementation of Language Planning in the Soviet Union <i>Glyn Lewis</i>	309
<b>PART FIVE: EVALUATION OF LANGUAGE PLANNING</b>	<b>327</b>
Evaluation Status Planning: What Has the Past Decade Accomplished? <i>Joan Rubin</i>	329
Evaluation of Language Planning: What has the Last Decade Accomplished? <i>Bjorn H. Jernudd</i>	345
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>379</b>
Progress in Language Planning: A Few Concluding Sentiments <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i>	381

## Introduction





JUAN COBARRUBIAS

## Language Planning: The State of the Art

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A glance at the titles of the essays contained in this book will reveal to the trained reader the jargon of at least two sources in language planning: Haugen's (1966) language planning model and Kloss's (1969) distinction between language *status planning* and *corpus planning*. The conceptual framework used in the gathering of the essays published here draws on both of these sources, although the authors have naturally used their personal insight.

Haugen's well known fourfold model (1966, 1966 [1972], 1969 [1972]), describes the stages of language planning thus: (1) norm selection, (2) codification, (3) implementation, and (4) elaboration. Haugen (1966 [1972]: 252) initially conceived these stages as four aspects of language development. . . as crucial features in taking the step from "dialect" to "language," from vernacular to standard.

Norm selection involves choosing a language or variety for specific purposes frequently associated with official status or national roles. Norm selection is, in an important sense, making official policy. In Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria, for instance, prior to independence, French dominated the educational system, while Arabic was relegated to a secondary position. After independence, the question of what language was to be chosen as the official language and what language was to be used as the language of education became questions of fundamental importance. Two trends emerged, one led by those who favored an immediate and total Arabization, the other led by those who recognized the importance of Arabization but considered more immediately urgent the maintenance of an efficient educational system with basic education in French. The first trend prevailed and the Ministry of Education's plan for 1956-1957 determined that the first grade was to be completely Arabized. The resulting lowering in the quality of education and shortage of qualified teachers motivated other policy changes later (Altoma 1970 [1974]). The officialization of Quechua in Peru and the regulations providing for bilingual education in the U.S.A., Canada, or Finland, with due differences, offer examples of norm selection and language policy. Although

in many instances norm selection involves choice among competing languages or varieties, they need not be competing in every instance.

Codification is related to the stabilization of the norm selected. Codification presupposes norm selection and is related to standardization processes. Standardization has involved at least two distinct language strategies, one requiring the elaboration and adoption of one variety among others, the other consisting in the creation of a new variety composed of some main dialects. The situation of Pilipino in the Philippines illustrates the first. Aasen's strategy for achieving a national language using the dialects as a raw material for a new Norwegian illustrates the second. The standardization process involves, among other things, the production of dictionaries, grammars, spellers, style manuals, punctuation and pronunciation guides, specialized glossaries, etc., and it is carried out in many instances by language academies or individuals who do the work of academies, like Aasen or Samuel Johnson.

Implementation or, as Haugen also calls it at times, acceptance, involves the activities of governmental agencies, institutions, and writers in adopting and using the selected and codified norm. Activities such as the production of newspapers, textbooks, books, and other publications, as well as the use of a language for mass-media communication, are part of the implementation process.

Elaboration involves the expansion of language functions and the assignment of new codes, such as scientific and technological. Language modernization is one of the most common activities requiring elaboration. Examples can be found in the modernization of Arabic (Altoma 1970 [1974]), Hebrew (Fellman 1974), Pilipino (Sibayan 1971 [1974]). Production and dissemination of new terms is one of the most typical activities of language modernization and elaboration.

Neustupny suggested (1970 [1974]) a model that differs from Haugen's in emphasizing language cultivation as a separate stage or process. Cultivation involves functional differentiation of one variety from another within a given code through identification of registers that will determine 'appropriateness,' 'coorrectness,' or acceptable 'style.' Fishman, in a lucid comparison of both models (1973 [1974]: 80), finds the differences between Haugen and Neustupny reconcilable. Thus, the latter's emphasis on cultivation fits in Haugen's model, whereas the former's emphasis on implementation fits in Neustupny's model. Whether or not such reconciliation eliminates differences between the two models depends, in the ultimate analysis, upon our understanding of concepts still in need of further clarification.

Haugen's model has been the focus of attention of an important part of the literature on language planning. Others have added new dimensions to the model, such as evaluation (Rubin 1971), but in general the model has been widely accepted. Only in the essay included in this volume has Haugen

attempted to revise the original model and offered, as he calls it, his own harmonization, although the basic structure of the model is still similar to the original. Interestingly enough, Haugen attempts to show that his new version harmonizes also with Kloss's distinction between status planning and corpus planning. Although some associations between Kloss's distinction and Haugen's model are fairly straightforward, such harmonization may be a matter of controversy for those who see status vs. corpus as a blurred distinction (see the summary of Rubin's paper in this volume).

The distinction, however, has heuristic value, and although Kloss's first presentation of it needs refinement, it seems illuminating. Discussions of language rights, language policy, language allocation, language legislation, for example, become more enlightened when seen through the distinction. The distinction also permits us to see where the attention of planning research has been concentrated. Several authors (Ferguson, this volume; Rubin, this volume) have observed that most of the research on language planning has been concerned with corpus planning. The problems related to status planning are not so clearly defined and seem to entail a greater degree of complexity. But it seems clear that we need to know more and do more in the area of status planning. A semantical analysis of the concept of language status can be found in the first part of my paper in this volume. One of the interesting aspects of this collection of essays is that, in addition to a number of papers focusing upon language-corpus issues, it includes a number of others focusing on language status.

It is important to note that neither Kloss's distinction nor Haugen's model, nor a combination of the two, is going to do the job of sound language-planning theory. Haugen himself recognizes that even the revised version of the original model he presents here does not 'amount to a theory of language planning'. He also points out that 'our discipline remains largely descriptive and has not reached a stage of "explanatory adequacy"'. This is an important realization shared by a number of other language planners and socially minded linguists. In order for language planning to provide adequate explanations, a paradigm shift is required, a gestalt switch on the language planning processes. Part of this gestalt switch is incipient in the realization that the task of language planning so far has been largely descriptive rather than explanatory. But in order to provide explanations we need well-confirmed hypotheses. A theory of language planning will consist, like any other theory, of a set of such hypotheses. A new paradigm will regard explanatory power as one of the fundamental goals of language planning, and the search for confirmable, sound hypotheses will be an essential part of theoretical development in language planning. A substantial amount of sociolinguistic information is already available, although it seems that the formulation of explanatory hypotheses will require a much more extensive gathering of data

than we yet have. The task of hypothesis formation has barely begun. We are in a pretheoretical stage, in a 'sociological paradigm', 'a locus of professional commitment, prior to the various concepts, laws, theories' (Kuhn 1970 [1962]: 11). 'That commitment and the apparent consensus it produces are prerequisites for formal science'. Although the word 'paradigm' is an accordion word that by expansion and contraction generates too much philosophical music, Kuhn distinguishes the concept of 'sociological paradigm' from paradigm as 'a concrete scientific achievement' containing a problem-solving set of confirmed hypotheses (for a discussion of the intricacies surrounding the concept of paradigm, see Masterman 1970). A paradigm in the latter sense would be an 'artifact paradigm' or 'construct paradigm'. A theory of language planning would involve such an artifact paradigm, i.e. would supply the tools to provide reliable explanations.

Haugen thinks that a theory of language planning 'would surely have to be one that takes a stand on value judgements' (last paragraph of part one of his paper). It is understandable that language-planning issues relate to value judgements. However, a theory of language planning does not necessarily, *qua* theory, have to take a stand on value judgement. Explanations resulting from economic theory, for instance, may entail quite diverse value judgements, but these are not the direct result of the theory itself. Although theories may show different forms of theoretical and methodological commitment, no theory to my knowledge takes, as part of its own task, a stand on value judgements. Thus, Haugen raises the question: 'Where norms conflict, shall we plan for unity or for diversity, for "transitional" bilingualism or for maintenance?' His concern is quite legitimate. But I do not think that we should conceive of a language-planning theory committed to transitional bilingualism and another language-planning theory committed to maintenance. The theory should include hypotheses that explain and describe the regular consequences of both possible language strategies, but the theory as such should be a unified body of knowledge. It is because we may anticipate with the help of the theory desirable consequences that we may want to affect given conditions to bring about expected results or try to prevent certain events from happening. The epistemic value of the theory does not rest upon the results that we or other groups favor. Haugen's concern is quite legitimate since language-status decisions are affected by ideological considerations of powerful groups and counteracting forces. However, we should not saddle the theory with ideological considerations. I have attempted to show in my paper in this volume that language-status issues are entangled in ideological matters, and I submit now that the future theoretical foundation of language planning depends upon our greater understanding of status and policy issues so that we may separate objective knowledge, stated in well-confirmed hypotheses, from partisan inclinations and ideological sympathies.

The formulation of language-planning hypotheses seems to depend more heavily upon clarification of status than of corpus matters. Also, in this sense, the distinction status vs. corpus seems illuminating.

#### STATUS-RELATED PAPERS

Without attempting to do justice to the contributions assembled here and their authors, it seems worth noting some similarities and differences that give us an overall idea of the state of the art.

Language change as an independent topic of study has attracted the attention of socially minded linguists for a long time, and the references on diachronic studies of language evolution and language change are too numerous to be listed here. However, most of the existing research has approached language change as a natural or spontaneous phenomenon. The first essay that approached language change from the perspective of language planning, to my knowledge, was Rubin's (1977). Ferguson takes up the same approach and shows, with several examples, how non-'natural' language change relates to language planning. He observes that 'efforts devoted to language planning and studies of language-planning processes have generally been well separated from systematic studies of language change'.

And, on the other hand, the strong tradition of the study of language change in 19th and 20th century linguistics has typically distrusted language planning or assured that language-planning efforts were irrelevant to the fundamental processes of change.

Ferguson believes that a theory of language change will be incomplete if it does not take into consideration the influence of language planning. In order to make his point, Ferguson considers two perspectives: one, change and planning within a speech community; the other, change and planning in the structure of the language itself. There are changes in the functions of different varieties in the speech community and changes in the language structure. Again the distinction status vs. corpus reappears.

Heath and Mandabach study the way in which language-status decisions have been reached in the Anglophone-mother-tongue world. They find significant similarities between the achievement of the status of English in England and in the U.S.A., at least until the nineteenth century, i.e. 'without official declaration and without the help of an official academy.' The status of English in England does not come about through statute, but through cultural and societal forces. The United States inherited the reluctance to mandate language choice.

Heath and Mandaback sketch the history of the status of English in

England and show how after the Norman Conquest, 1066, Norman French became the language of the Parliament, the courts, and the upper class. Latin was the language of universities, scholarship, and legal writings. English was the popular tongue of the people. English and French were competing languages in regard to specific language functions from the Norman Conquest, 1066, at least until 1362, i.e. about 300 years. For at least a century and a half after the Conquest it was doubtful which of the two languages, French or English, would ultimately triumph. The two languages kept sullenly apart all those years, in a diglossic situation, refusing to intermingle. The Norman Conquest established in England a court and an aristocracy, and French, in its Norman dialect, became the only polite medium of intercourse. English was despised at first as the language of a subject race, used by boors and serfs. A study of the changes in the functional distribution of the two languages and the intervening forces should illuminate our understanding of diglossic situations.

Heath and Mandabach assign only a meager importance to Henry III's Proclamation of 1258, in improving the status of English. This milestone in the race of the two languages for linguistic supremacy may, however, be open to different interpretations. It is true that it is not the only event that may account for the triumph of English over French. The latter is marked, in fact, by a series of events, such as the loss of Normandy in 1204, that separated England from France and broke the connection between French aristocracy and Anglo-Norman aristocracy, allowing the possibility for a new English aristocracy to emerge. It was a combination of English and Norman barons that forced King John in 1215 to sign the Magna Charta. And it was in 1258 that English was used officially, for the first time since the Conquest, in the proclamation in the name of Henry III for summoning a parliament of barons from all parts of England. This, in my view, clearly shows that French had ceased to be the only language spoken and read by the Anglo-Norman nobles. But the race between English and French continued. In 1349, three years after the victory of Crecy, it was ruled that the teaching of Latin should no longer be conducted in French, as had been the practice until then, but in English. French continued to be used as the language of the courts until 1362, when it was ruled that all pleadings in the law courts should be conducted in English. The reason as stated in the preamble to the Act was 'that French has become much unknown in the realm'. The use of French by 1400 was considerably reduced, and a vast English literature had sprung in the interim and became popular not only among noblemen but also among knights and burgesses. Heath and Mandabach emphasize the literary use of English in achieving higher status and maintain that 'status promotion through increased use came about as poets, preachers, and some officials of the law quietly used English in their writings'. However, one

may have the impression that the situation of English was linguistically more homogeneous than it was. It is not that the status of English per se was promoted through increased use by poets, writers, etc., but in fact it was a specific variety of English that was more strongly promoted than others, the Midland dialect, not the Northern or the Southern dialects, although each of them had had their own period of glory. These dialects also stood in a somewhat competitive relation. It is important to understand the emergence of Modern English from a number of language changes associated with language-planning processes. We recognize three periods in the evolution of Modern English: Old English (450-1200), Middle English (1200-1500), and Modern English (1500 to the present). But Old English consisted of at least three different dialects: the Northumbrian (Northern), the Mercian (Midland), and the Wessex (Southern). The latter is now better known as 'Anglo-Saxon', a name given by sixteenth-century scholars who wished to revive the language of Alfred the Great, whose subjects were known as 'West Saxons' or Wessex men. Curiously enough, the Northumbrian and the Mercian literatures prior to the Norman Conquest are fragmentary, while the Anglo-Saxon is, in contradistinction, significant and stretches from 700 to 1200. The 200 years from 700 to 900 are the years of the language of Alfred the Great, born in 849, who superintended the translation from Latin into the Wessex dialect of the *History of the World* by Orosius, *Church History* by Bede, *Consolations of Philosophy* by Boethius, and the *Pastorales* by St. Gregory. He was also responsible for the compilation of early portions of the *Old English Chronicle*. The period 900-1100 is the period of the language of Elfric, who wrote a collection of *Homilies* and other works; and the period 1100-1200 is that of the language of Layamont, who wrote *Brut*, a poem on the kings of England. This poem, written during a transition period in which English and French were competing languages and completed a century and a half after the Norman Conquest, shows how little influence French held over English at the time. *Brut* contains about 56,000 lines and has scarcely 150 French words in it, and about 200 Latin words. It was not until at least 1362 that French words began to be incorporated into English in substantial numbers, and, by this time, the status of English was secure, while French was more and more passing out of daily use.

The rivalry among the three dialects lasted practically until 1400. The supremacy of the Midland dialect can be explained by a number of reasons: it was the dialect in which the *Old English Chronicle* was completed up to the year 1154 (the *Chronicle* was written in the Wessex dialect up to the time of the Norman Conquest). It was the dialect used by Henry III in his 1258 proclamation for summoning a parliament from all the counties of England. It was the dialect used by Wycliff, the first translator of the Bible into popular language, and Chaucer, a Londoner, who raised the literary

quality of the dialect in an unparalleled way. The Midland dialect was the only one patronized by Caxton when he introduced printing into England, in 1477. The decadence of the Southern dialect was sudden; it practically ceased to be used for literary purposes after 1400. The Northern dialect, however, includes a distinguished line of poets at least until 1555, including James I of Scotland, Henryson, Dunbar, Gavin Douglas, and Lyndsay. Burns is perhaps the last great poet who used this dialect. The diachronic description of the status of English should ideally include not only the competitive relation with French but also the rivalries existing among varieties of English. I recognize that this may indeed be the topic for a separate paper in itself, and that the increased use of English by poets and writers in status promotion is well taken.

The status of English in England seems well established at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and there will be little surprise that no academy had assisted in the process since the first academy we are aware of, the *Accademia della Crusca*, was established in 1582, the French Academy in 1635, the Spanish in 1713, the Swedish in 1739. It is at this time, as Heath and Mandabach note, that an academy for the English language in England was proposed. The difference is that such a proposal found no support in England. Thus the effort toward language codification of preparing a dictionary was undertaken by an individual.

Concerning efforts toward language codification of English, it is also interesting to note that the first English grammar on record seems to be the grammar by William Bulokar published in 1586, that is, almost a century after the Spanish grammar by Nebrija. By 1586 there were grammars in at least 17 languages other than English, including a Tarascan grammar (1558), an Inca grammar (1560), a Nahuatl grammar (1578), and a Zapotec grammar (1578) (Rowe 1974). Perhaps once more the somewhat prescriptivistic nature of most grammars of the time accounts for the reluctance to regulate language choice suggested by Heath and Mandabach.

Efforts to establish a language academy also failed on the other side of the Atlantic, and history repeated itself with the efforts by Webster toward language codification.

Heath and Mandabach find important similarities between the unregulated, decentralized language policies in England and the U.S.A., at least until the nineteenth century, concerning the status of the English language. This is undoubtedly a point of great interest in the history of the status of the English language. The degree of liberalism implied by the authors may nonetheless sound a little too optimistic to some Cherokee speakers, whose ancestors were driven away from their homelands, or to Afro-American speakers and many other language minority groups, whose ancestors suffered unregulated and decentralized linguistic discrimination, although it is also



true that many other language groups enjoyed liberties commensurate to their socio/political power. The fact that the linguistic liberalism that existed prior to the late nineteenth century was greater than the degree of tolerance existing today should not be construed to indicate that prior to the late nineteenth century there were no coercion or restrictions on the allocation of language functions of minority languages. The characterization of the present status of English is quite accurate: '[It] is based not only on the British custom of no legal restrictions on language, but also on an intolerance to linguistic diversity akin to that which has been prevalent throughout British history'.

Mackey advises us not to draw general theories based on Canada's case study on language policy. He attempts to elucidate the concept of language status and finds that there are several aspects of status: demographic, economic, cultural, social, political, and juridical, as the status of a language depends 'on the number of people using it, their relative wealth, the importance of what they produce and its dependence on language, their social cohesiveness, and the acceptance by others of their right to be different'. Mackey makes a number of interesting comparisons between the language-status situation of French in Canada and that of Spanish in the U.S.A. as he develops the aspects of language listed above. Important differences are found, first in the very foundation of the country by two founding peoples: the French, who settled in Quebec, and the English, who settled in Ontario, in nearly the same proportions; second, in the official status of French, now protected by an Official Language Act, whereas no similar act is to be found in the U.S.A., except sporadic local status gains and losses as in Miami, where Spanish reached the status of 'officially promoted language', to use Kloss's terminology, in 1973. In all other cases we actually observe a loss of official status, for example, of Spanish in New Mexico, French in Louisiana.

The role of language in education is clearly perceived by Mackey as the way in which family vernaculars are transformed into vehicles for scientific, cultural, and professional advancement. In the U.S.A., 'English holds the status' in education. The fact that Spanish-speaking students go to college does very little for the advancement of the status of the Spanish language, since most courses are offered in English. The recent efforts in bilingual education at lower educational levels do not seem so significant, particularly in view of the scarcity of qualified teachers. The situation in Quebec is different, as it has always had education in French at all levels.

The section on juridical status reveals contrasting policies in Canada and the U.S.A. One interesting difference is the difference between symbolic bilingualism and functional bilingualism, practically nonexistent in the U.S.A. and significantly widespread in Canada. Symbolic bilingualism implies a qualitative difference in language status. Mackey's account sounds somewhat

less optimistic than Heath and Mandabach's regarding the degree of tolerance toward language diversity. Mackey rightfully points out, for instance, that the evolution of language status of Spanish in the U.S.A. is quite different from the situation of French in Canada, in spite of the fact that Spanish was also 'a colonial language which was official over much of the United States Southwest before that area fell under the jurisdiction of an English-speaking population'. He also refers to the fact that in the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty, Article 9 promises the people all the political rights of U.S. citizens in addition to free government. The article contrasts this with the fact that it took New Mexico 66 years to achieve statehood. The reason, which surfaced in the 1902 Congressional Committee, was clearly reluctance in Congress to create a state in which most citizens were able to function in Spanish only. Statehood was granted only after intense encouragement of English-speaking settlers changed the majority of the population toward English. This does not look like a good example of granting the rights promised in Article 9 of the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty (on this issue see also Kloss 1977).

Mackey raises a crucial question on language status toward the end of his paper.

Just as in Canada French is official from the Atlantic to the Pacific in all matters under federal jurisdiction, is it also conceivable that Spanish or any other language will be so recognized from coast to coast and from the Rio Grande to the Canadian border?

This is a complex question and Mackey decides to answer it in the form of a condition.

If indeed another language should become official in the U.S., it supposes two things: the right of the citizen to use the language of his choice, and the corresponding duty of the government official to use that same language. Should the government official fail to comply, the citizen may take the government to court for violating his rights.

This condition may be viewed by some as too strong, for it may not necessarily be a *duty* of the official to *use the same language*, but rather to provide someone who will assist the citizen in achieving full participation in the system. Whether or not such degree of officialization will ever be achieved for any minority language in the U.S. is a matter open to debate.

The main thrust of Daoust-Blais' paper is to describe the series of legislative decisions that led to the existing *Charter of the French Language*, or Bill 101, issued in 1977. This piece of legislation makes French the official language while restricting some of the language functions of English to

specific activities without official status. Thus Bill 101 shifts a bilingual tradition in Quebec into a monolingual French official status, with specific objectives such as the francization of even business firms, and restrictions on the use of English in schools. This situation, according to Daoust-Blais, bypasses status planning and can be viewed as a type of what Laporte has called 'labor-market planning', in so far as it impacts the potential labor force who will be required to use French.

Now, it is true that restrictions imposed upon English use will have an impact on social planning. But this is the case with most status planning. The fact that such an impact upon social planning is achieved mainly through the reallocation of language functions should not prevent us from seeing that from the language-planning standpoint this is a form of status planning, although the changes that obtain are not exclusively linguistic.

The *Charter of the French Language* contains provisions concerning scientific and technological terminology, and in this sense relates to the corpus of the language. However, the main focus of Daoust-Blais' paper is on status planning, as it deals mostly with legislative decisions that affect the reallocation of language functions.

Chronologically, there are at least three different pieces of legislation that lead to the *Charter*:

1. The *Education Department Act* (Bill 85) (1968).
2. The *Act to Promote the French Language in Quebec* (Bill 63) (1969).
3. The *Official Language Act* (Bill 22) (1974).
4. The *Charter of the French Language* (Bill 101) (1977).

Each one of these pieces of legislation changes the status of French, starting with the support of bilingualism and ending up with the support of French monolingualism.

The *Education Department Act* was basically geared to protecting the right to choose the language of education of linguistic minorities in Quebec. It ensures that English-speaking children and immigrants into Quebec will acquire a working knowledge of French. This Bill never became a law, but it helped to promote other pieces of legislation. The *Act to Promote the French Language* in Quebec reaffirms the rights recognized in Bill 85 and adds the parents' right to choose either French or English as the language of education for their children.

The *Official Language Act* is perhaps the most important piece of legislation in the history of the status planning of French in Quebec. It is this piece of legislation that makes French the official language of Quebec, and declares that the French text of Quebec's statutes will prevail over the English version in controversial situations. Thus, this piece of legislation adopts a very straightforward defining characteristic as to what gives a language its official

status. It allows for bilingualism but includes measures to ensure that professional bodies and public utilities offer their services in French and that all official texts be printed in French.

The *Charter of the French Language* replaces the *Official Language Act*, partially as the result of the triumph of the new *Parti Québécois* in an election held less than a year before the passage of the *Charter* (1977). While the *Official Language Act* allows for bilingualism, the *Charter* does not, stating that only French texts of laws, decrees, and regulations are official. It also decrees that every public utility and business firm is required to obtain a 'francization certificate' that will secure for French the highest status in the company. Public or subsidized instruction at the elementary or secondary school levels should also be in French. Three supervisory boards are established to monitor the implementation of the *Charter*.

#### CORPUS-RELATED PAPERS

Kachru's paper focuses upon a subject of growing interest, to which existing literature has not paid the attention it deserves: the origin and codification of non-native varieties of English (Kachru, forthcoming). Kachru gives a series of conceptual definitions and offers a number of articulated distinctions that permit analysis of broader problems of language spread and the development of non-native varieties in general. The proliferation of such varieties 'is not unique to English; to a lesser degree Hindi, Persian, French, and Spanish have also developed such transplanted varieties'. Thus, there is more to be learned from this paper than the development and codification of varieties of English as a second language, although the situation of English is complex and interesting in its own right.

A question arises naturally: how do these varieties emerge? However, this is a complex question. First, we must understand that there are a number of different varieties that satisfy different functions. Thus, Kachru suggests that there are mutually nonexclusive ways in which these varieties can be analyzed: we may consider them 'in *acquisitional* terms, in *sociocultural* terms, in *motivational* terms'. Each of these categories can also be analyzed further.

An important addition to the distinction between English as a *second* language and English as a *foreign* language is that second-language varieties are *performance* varieties. This helps us to understand the differential roles that English has in education, public administration, and sociocultural contexts in countries of West Africa and South Asia, where English has been institutionalized as a second-language variety, and countries like Japan and Korea, where English is studied as a foreign language but is not an institutionalized variety.

It is also interesting to understand how specific varieties of English, native or non-native, become a model. This will increase our understanding of how non-native varieties emerge and take shape and will also enable us to understand what varieties should be taught, what should be the role of bidialectalism in education, and how certain varieties become standardized.

Kachru rightly suggests that in the absence of an academy, models of English do not obtain the authority of codification from a body of scholars or from government, and submits that in fact 'the sanctity of models of English stems more from social and attitudinal reasons than from reasons of authority', although he observes that 'these models are more widely violated than followed; they stand more for elitism than for authority'. In regards to the questions of what is a standard (or a model) for English and what model should be accepted, Kachru answers the first question skeptically, borrowing a response by Ward to this problem: 'no one can adequately define it, because such a thing does not exist'. He does not answer the second question. In fact, it is difficult to imagine what the answer to it should be.

In looking at the origin of non-native models (standard varieties) of English, Kachru points out not only that they are institutionalized but also that they possess specific characteristics, such as extended use in the sociolinguistic context, extended register and style range, and others, in spite of the fact that institutionalized varieties start as performance varieties. Non-native models, like any other variety, do not acquire status until they are recognized and accepted. Recognition is manifested in attitudinal terms and in the adaptation of teaching materials to the sociocultural context.

Non-native English varieties may have different functions: as a medium of instruction (instrumental function), as administrative and legal language (regulative function), as a means for intergroup communication (interpersonal function), as a medium of creative writing (imaginative function). These functions vary in *range* (sociocultural scope) and *depth* (degree of linguistic competence at various societal levels). The degree of nativization of a given variety is related to both range and depth.

Two properties can be attributed to non-native models, showing the way in which they differ from native models: they may be either 'deficient' or 'different'. The former refers to 'acquisitional and/or performance deficiency within the context in which English functions as  $L_2$ '. The latter refers to the structural features that distinguish an educated language variety from another educated variety. Kachru concludes that although non-native models of English are 'linguistically identifiable, geographically definable, and functionally valuable, they are still not necessarily attitudinally acceptable'.

The acceptance of a model depends on its users. . . . The users of non-native varieties also seem to pass through linguistic schizophrenia, and cannot make

up their minds whether to accept a mythical non-native model or to recognize the local functional model.

The unique position of English in the international sphere as a language of cross-cultural communication poses demands and responsibilities on those who use it as their *first* language and those who use it as their *second* language, in regard to what Kachru calls the need for 'attitudinal readjustment' on the part of both groups. These readjustments include things such as dissociating English from the colonial past, not regarding its influence as evil, accepting literature produced by writers who use it as a second language, and the like. Two questions are raised in regard to the possibility of implementing such attitudinal readjustments; first, whether there is a coordinating agency which has a realistic view of the international and national functions of English, and, second, whether non-native users of English feel at the moment that agencies in the U.S.A. or England involved with the teaching and diffusion of English can offer any significant leadership. The answers to these questions are not simple, and they are certainly not the objective of Kachru's present paper.

Milán's paper focuses on codification issues of Spanish and considers four models: Nebrija's, which he calls classical; the Academy's, neoclassical; Bello's, functional; and Lenz's, critical. In fact, only the last two are models of New World Spanish; the first two are an important part of the historical background on codification of the Spanish language.

Nebrija's Grammar shows a structural parallelism with Latin. Nebrija had some explicit objectives, such as reducing variability in the written language; facilitating the learning of Spanish, the language of the most powerful empire at the time, by speakers of other languages; helping in the process of dissemination of the Catholic faith; and making it easier for Spaniards to learn Latin. Quite an ambitious project, as Milán points out.

Milán's paper sketches the historical antecedents of language policy in the New World and suggests that, although Spanish conquerors had a complete language plan, Nebrija's program to teach Spanish to the conquered population was not followed; in fact, there are indications to the contrary, in that Charles V and Phillip II as well

... favored religious instruction in the native language for the sake of expediency; this policy made the acquisition of the Amerindian languages by Spanish missionaries a priority; the teaching of Spanish to the conquered population became secondary; the Jesuits undertook the task of studying, learning, and even codifying these languages.

Examples of such codifications include the following: Maturino Gilberti,

*Arte de la lēgua de Michuacā*, Mexico 1558, on Tarascan; Domingo de Santo Tomás, *Gramática o arte de la lengua general de los indios de los reynos del Perú*, Valladolid 1560, on Inca; Alonso de Molina, *Arte de la lengua mexicana y castellana*, Mexico 1571, on Nahuatl and Spanish; Juan de Cordova, *Arte de la lengua zapoteca*, Mexico 1578, on Zapotec; Antonio de los Reyes, *Arte en lengua mixteca*, Mexico 1593, on Mixtec; Ludovico Bertonio, *Arte y gramatica mvy copiosa de la lengua aymara*, Rome 1603, on Aymara. Perhaps the titles of three grammars prepared by Luis de Valdivia are more explicit about their intended use: *Arte y gramática general de la lengva que corre en todo el reyno de Chile, con vn vocabulario, y confesionario . . . Ivnamente con la doctrina christiana y cathecismo del Concilio de Lima en español y dos traducciones del en la lengva de Chile*, Lima 1606, on Araucanian. The titles of his two other grammars, one on Millcayac, 1607, and another on Allentiac, 1607, are roughly equivalent (Rowe 1974). It was not until 1767, with the expulsion of the Jesuits, that their work in the area of native languages and religious instruction imparted in them came to an end. But religious instruction had to continue, and Charles III imposed Spanish in 1770. A number of other grammars were produced before 1770. Considering these events one may choose to disagree with Heath and Mandabach's implication (second paragraph of the section on the U.S. legacy) that the Castilian empire viewed language as an instrument of forced assimilation. Although, in general their contention seems to be true, it obviously needs clarification. The cultural differences were significant and so were the demographic ones; one may feel tempted to make a comparison among the most widely spoken Indian languages in the area conquered by the Castilian empire and the areas of North America. Compare, for example, the seven million speakers of Quechua located in Peru (5 million), Bolivia (1.5 million) and Ecuador (500,000), with about 150,000 speakers of Navajo, even though the Navajos have been privileged when compared with other American Indian groups (actually, there were only 7000 Navajos a century ago); or 1.5 million speakers of Aymara, or 1.75 million speakers of Guarani with 10,000 speakers of Cherokee, or 30,000 speakers of Cree. These figures may not be very telling if taken in isolation without considering other sociopolitical factors. There is at present as it probably was during the conquest, a larger number of Indian language speakers in the Spanish World and this is in no way a justification of some of the atrocities committed by Spanish conquerors.

Many of the Indian languages used in Spanish America today are spoken by significantly more speakers than there were at the time of the Spanish conquest, and the numbers are still increasing. There are certainly more speakers of Quechua today than there were in the sixteenth century. The thesis that in fact in many areas the new conquerors promoted or contributed to maintaining the native languages could be argued for. In the case of

Quechua, for instance, all the literature prior to the Spanish conquest was handed down orally. In spite of their great technological skills, the Incas never developed a writing system. The records they kept were through the *quipus* (Quechua for 'knot'), consisting of cords of different colors knotted in a very complicated way. The Spanish conquerors introduced the Roman alphabet and although spelling has not been standardized even today, it stimulated literary production in many of the native languages; the drama *Ollantay*, about the life of the Inca courts, is without any question the best-known work of ancient Quechua literature, written anonymously in 1470 and most probably preserved until now because of its transcription into the Roman alphabet. Perhaps the most outstanding example is the *Popul Vuh*, sacred book of the Mayas, which describes Maya history and traditions, beginning with the creation of the world. It was also written down in the Roman alphabet in the middle of the sixteenth century. In contradistinction to the Incas, the Mayas possessed a fully developed writing system, which has posed a formidable challenge to linguists and scholars since the sixteenth century.

The release of the Academia's *Gramática* in 1771, one year after Charles III's decree, was timely. The Spanish Academy was modeled after the French Academy and founded in 1713. In 1730 it produced a *Diccionario*, and 41 years later a *Gramática*. The influence of classical grammars is still apparent, as Milán points out, for instance in the articulated, though unrealistic, case system for Spanish, which follows the Latin cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, ablative.

The first codification of Spanish in America was Andrés Bello's *Gramática*, in which he attempted to offer a grammar for Spanish speakers of the New World. His organismic and evolutionary approach provided the theoretical justification for a departure from the traditional grammar offered by the Academy. Milán gives a clear account of the warm reception Bello's *Grammar* received in America, and in Spain as well. He also describes its impact on future efforts toward codification. The last example discussed by Milán is Lenz's *La Oración y sus partes*, also highly respected in Spain and in America, although it never equalled Bello's codification in prestige or influence.

Keller maintains in his paper that there are four main areas of Spanish official-language use in the U.S.: voting, the mass media, the classroom, and the courtroom. He actually claims that Spanish enjoys 'official status' in these areas. He contends that in order to answer the question that serves as a title to his paper, it is necessary to know how language planners have actually worked, how they have chosen between different alternatives, and what they have recognized as their goals in all the areas in which Spanish has been used. The thrust of the paper is 'the corpus planning of Spanish as the language of instruction in the United States classroom'. More specifically, the issue



discussed is which varieties of Spanish should be used in the classroom. Without any doubt, this is an issue of great importance but it seems more an issue related to 'selection of norm', to used Haugen's terminology, in education, i.e. language status rather than corpus.

Keller distinguishes three language policies in regard to language use in the classroom, advocated by three different groups: (1) those who exalt the use of the vernacular and denigrate 'world standard Spanish', (2) those who exalt 'world standard Spanish' and denigrate the use of the vernacular, and (3) those who foster bidialectalism by adding the 'world standard variety' to the vernacular the child brings into the classroom. Keller enlists himself in the third group.

He also reports that in 1974 there were eight types of Spanish used in bilingual-education programs. I will omit the details of the typology here. Keller himself seems to endorse what he describes as type 8 and says: 'a number of programs have been written in type 8, including one of my own'. This type uses 'controlled "world standard Spanish", using only language in the standard for which there are no alternate regionalisms or ethnic varieties'. This may scarcely sound to some readers like 'fostering bidialectalism', and, if it does, it needs further clarification. I can conceive of a form of bidialectalism (adding type 9 to the list) consisting of 'controlled' bidialectalism, i.e. restricted use of the vernacular specific to a region and restricted use of 'world standard Spanish' (whatever this may mean). Naturally, this may only be advisable in situations where linguistic homogeneity obtains, at least with regard to the use of the vernacular within the school population. But this is not always the case. A solution of these problems can hardly be universally valid. What is advisable in a given context may not necessarily be so in another sociolinguistic context, and what may be advisable for one group may not necessarily be so for another group.

Another source of puzzlement for some readers may be the understanding of the very concept of 'world standard Spanish'. What kind of standard variety is it?

Keller is right in saying that 'there are as yet no grammars of United States Spanish'. There is, however, a wealth of material related to language codification, including phonology, lexicon, and grammar (see Solé 1970; Teshner et al. 1975), which is relevant to a description of the corpus of United States Spanish(es).

A good portion of Keller's paper deals with status planning and claims that the status of U.S. Spanish is 'only partially realized, or is temporary, indirect, crypto, or quasi'. He claims that 'the official status of Spanish is a very recent phenomenon, traceable back to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Bilingual Education Act of 1968'. One should be reminded of the official status of Spanish in New Mexico around 1860 and at least until the

Constitution of 1912, which ensured the publication of Spanish versions of the laws for the first 20 years of statehood and was then extended (see note 4 to my paper, this volume; Kloss 1977: 125-140). I personally do not believe that either the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 give Spanish an official status. To say that U.S. Spanish 'has now acquired an official status in certain areas of public life, particularly suffrage and education' runs up against the use of the term 'official' in the sociolinguistic literature (Kloss 1977, especially p. 140; 1971, especially p. 259; Bell 1976; Dittmar 1976), and obscures the difference between officially sponsored, supported, or promoted, and official language proper.

Spolsky and Boomer offer a lucid account of the issues surrounding the modernization of Navajo. The study not only is informative concerning the development of Navajo but also casts some light upon a number of related sociolinguistic issues. Athabascan languages, as noted already by Sapir in 1921, have been less susceptible to language borrowing from the languages they have been in contact with, mainly Spanish and English, than other languages. The authors explain this fact on the basis of structural differences: 'it is not easy to fit an alien word into the grammar of Navajo'. Lexico-statistics reflect that increased contact with English results in increased borrowings: from fewer than 40 words borrowed from English in 1945 to over 500 in 1971, identified through taped interviews with children.

The essay provides a clear account of the different stages in language codification, from the work of missionaries in the preparation of an Ethnological Dictionary in 1910 and a Grammar in 1926, to the subsequent work by Fred Mitchel, and then by Sapir and many others. Sapir's work in orthography has been perhaps the most influential. The authors note that extensive contact began to occur in the 1940s with a number of Navajos leaving the Reservation to be drafted or to take jobs. Modernization brought roads to the area, and the mineral and energy resources found on the Reservation caused a number of changes. The Navajo Reservation, controlled by the federal government, has never had a formal, explicit language policy. In spite of the facts that the 1868 Treaty was published bilingually, that voting regulations were issued, that Congressional bills were passed and translated into Navajo, and even, more recently, that bilingual education programs were sponsored, Navajo is not an official language. All official writing, as the authors note, is English. Even more, the draft resolution requiring the recognition of the existence of written Navajo which is to be presented to the Navajo Tribal Council is still available only in English. Spolsky and Boomer characterize the situation as diglossic, with Navajo preferred for oral use and English being used in writing.

Modernization efforts began in the mid-1930s and included the areas of 'medicine, parliamentary procedure, modern transportation and communica-

tion systems, federal and chapter governments, legal proceedings, and agriculture'. Medical dictionaries were developed in 1941 and 1956 under the auspices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. 'Both were intended to list and standardize common medical terms used in interpreting'.

In a more general area, it is interesting to note the role of interpreters in language modernization. The Navajo Tribal Council has conducted its affairs in Navajo. In order for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other officers who do not speak Navajo to communicate with the Tribal Council, interpreters have been needed. Spolsky and Boomer point out that the 'Tribal Council interpreters have had a key role in creating terms to explain and describe the various concepts presented to BIA officials and other specialists who appear before the Council'. The Council has insisted that interpreters do not use borrowings, so they have been forced to participate in the process of coining new words. A number of linguists, notably Young and Morgan, were employed by the BIA as Navajo linguists and were involved in projects that required terminological development. More recently, the development of new terminology has come through four schools with bilingual programs. The Native American Materials Development Center, funded by the Office of Education, has been involved with some formal control of the terminological development. One of the prevailing problems in modernization of Navajo has been the lack of commitment that teachers showed in regard to the process itself. Regarding the need for standardization, Spolsky and Boomer note that, although there is lexical and phonological variation on the Reservation, it is difficult to track down. Language variation does not seem to make standardization an urgent need. The most significant efforts on standardization are related to the work of Young and Morgan, whose revised edition of their dictionary is forthcoming. The attitudes toward modernization among Navajos are still ambivalent, as they seem legitimately concerned with passing down to future generations the rich legacy of the Navajo language and culture, perhaps more concerned than with modernization. Clearly, corpus planning is a delicate job, as Fishman says in his essay. For,

Corpus planning is often conducted within a tension system of changing and conflicting loyalties, convictions, interests, values, and outlooks. On the one hand, authentication/indigenization of the new is admired and courted but, on the other hand, it is often too limiting in reality and too rural/old-fashioned in image to serve or to be acceptable if uncompromisingly pursued. Successful corpus planning, then, is a delicate balancing act, exposed to tensions and ongoing change.

## IMPLEMENTATION IN CHINA AND THE SOVIET UNION

Two contributions to this volume describe eloquently the issues of implementation of language planning in the two Communist superpowers. Barnes offers an informative historical account of language policy decisions in China and the attempts at implementing them. He notes that the question of a national language program coincides with the first steps of the Ch'ing Dynasty to start a program of mass education in 1903. The plan was to require that the spoken language of Peking, used for a long time as the language in which state affairs were conducted, be incorporated into required courses in Chinese literature. It was intended as a policy more than as a mandate, and the implementation of the program was to be dependent on the initiative and resources of local educational agencies. The result, as could be expected, was not very significant, and the national language program did not survive the revolution. An interesting observation is that Pekingese did not enjoy great prestige *vis a vis* the other regional languages, in spite of its geographic and demographic dominance. The yardsticks for the relative prestige of the Chinese languages were more cultural than linguistic. Even the officers to be appointed in the imperial service had to possess thorough knowledge of the classical Confucian literature, which was evaluated through imperial examinations. As Barnes says,

A regional language derived and perpetuated its status as an oral medium through which universal wisdom was acquired. This status was enhanced by the fact that much of this venerated early literature could in some regional pronunciations still be intoned in an approximation of the original sound, while, in North Chinese, regular processes of phonological change had made this impossible.

North Chinese, *putonghua*, or Mandarin, has been taught for cross-language communication nationally since 1956. In the southeastern inland and coastal areas, the first language is a regional variety other than *putonghua*. Thus a national program is likely to achieve cross-language communication between the two-thirds of the Chinese who speak some form of *potonghua* as a national language, and the other third who speak a regional variety other than *putonghua*. As Barnes reports, dialectologists have pointed out that the main source of unintelligibility between *putonghua* and the other regional languages is phonological. Nevertheless, the differences are great. On the other hand, these languages 'share a common word order and lexicon'.

The conflicts of prestige that existed between regional languages older than North Chinese, which could claim to represent more authentically the culture of ancient teachers, took a significant turn in 1913, when the Ministry

of Education of the new republican government at a conference recommended the promotion of North Chinese as a phonological basilect to which several other significant regional sounds would be incorporated. As is conceivable, this trend met with opposition at different stages. It was in 1956 that the People's Republic of China adopted a policy of nationwide use of North Chinese 'as the medium of education in schools and as the principal medium for communication among speakers of other regional languages'. Two significant documents were issued concerning the national language program: (1) 'The Directions of the State Council Regarding the Promotion of the Common Language' of 1956, and (2) 'The Directions of the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China Regarding the Promotion of the Common Language in Elementary, Middle, and Normal Schools' of 1955. Both of these documents formulate plans for the incorporation of *putonghua* in public activities. The language was also to become 'the medium of instruction for Chinese language and literature classes in grades one through seven in the fall of 1956'. A teacher-training center was established in Peking to assist teachers that were to begin to teach in *putonghua*. The government has not taken an authoritarian attitude in imposing *putonghua*; it has acted as a facilitator. Barnes points out that

Marxist theory notwithstanding, the *putonghua* policy does not necessarily imply the decay of the regional languages. . . ; what is interesting is to note the apparent acceptance in regional-language areas of the need for bilingual competence by those whose grandfathers, just two generations earlier, would have balked at the choice of North Chinese to fill this role.

The essay also contains a lucid description of the vicissitudes of the implementation of *pinyin*, or the Chinese phonetic alphabet. This has been, without any question, a major language-planning problem in China.

Lewis's paper elaborates on the last chapters of Lewis (1972) and offers a comprehensive account of the implementation of language planning in the Soviet Union. Lewis suggests that language planning in the Soviet Union does not escape from the requirements of the 'national plan'. He says that 'for the Soviet regime, language planning is important because it is part and parcel of the work of the Communist Party; language planning leads to literacy and so opens the way to an understanding of Marxism; Lenin maintained that an illiterate person is outside politics and has to be taught his ABC; without this there can be no politics'. However, although the supremacy of Russian is important, the Soviet Union has an undeniable multiethnic, multilingual tradition that goes back to the Tzarist administration and to some degree still prevails. Lewis points out that as early as 1802 the Tzarist administration of education 'gave two of its six Commissioners of education responsibility for

the education of national minorities', and in 1869 Ilya Ulyanov, Lenin's father, was appointed as 'school inspector for the multiethnic province of Simbirsk in the educational district of Kazan; he introduced native languages as media of instruction into very many of the 450 schools', although, in fact, student enrollment in those schools was low.

Lewis reminds us of the combined social forces and changes that affect the Russian language favorably and the minority languages negatively, such as migration, geographic spread, etc. Thus, although multilingualism prevails in many areas, the Soviet Union, like France, has indulged in what he calls 'negative planning' and has sought to eliminate dialects in view of the fact that they may hinder political unification. In any event, there is little doubt that 'upward mobility, and particularly status within the ruling hierarchy, depends on the acquisition of Russian'. Language planning and sociopolitical ideology in the Soviet Union are closely intertwined. Literacy is a fundamental goal of language planning, and literacy requires a national language; this is defined as 'exemplifying the most highly developed, stable, and socially acceptable linguistic norms'.

Lewis describes the development and standardization of some regional languages and observes that 'perhaps the most important criterion used in code selection is the degree to which the proposed dialectal base represents the norms of the spoken language'. Basically, the same holds concerning language elaboration, since 'the historical development of a literary language, whether "folk" or "national", is characterized by closer approximation to colloquial forms'. Concerning language modernization, a basic rule has been that 'the maximum possible should be made of native resources'. There has been some degree of ambivalence concerning borrowings from Russian by the local languages, particularly during the 1920s and 1930s, although more recently 'Russian influence is more pervasive . . . since the Russian language has become the accepted model as well as a main source of lexical enrichment'. Russian is nowadays the intermediary for non-Soviet words coming from English, French, or German.

Another problem of language planning in the Soviet Union is script reform, in view of the fact that the Soviet Union is not only a multilingual conglomerate but multigraphic as well, including at one time the Arabic and Cyrillic alphabets as the most important, and Latin and some Finno-Ungaric varieties, using modified Russian scripts, as secondary. The demand for script reform became widespread with the inauguration of the Soviet regime.

Schools and the mass media, according to Lewis, have been the main agencies involved in language planning. A significant increase in formal education, including literacy programs for adults, and concurrently a development of printing and publishing in Russian and in the national languages, took place between 1914 and 1969. A substantial increase in the level of

literacy in both the national languages and Russian followed. However, Lewis reports, opportunities to use the skills available to those who are literate in non-Russian languages remain ambiguous.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Much remains to be learned in language planning from case studies. However, I submit that it is time to change the scope of the discipline and produce a real change of paradigm. One of the issues surfacing in many of the essays gathered here is the fact that language-planning processes take place in a sociocultural context and respond to ideological considerations and loyalties; this goes for status and corpus planning as well. Notwithstanding, there seems to be no good reason why language planning should be less explanatory than other social sciences, whether history or economics, with a degree of ideological contamination at least equal to that of our discipline. Explanation should definitely be a methodological goal of future language planning, leading to a theory of language planning in which hypotheses will form a network of testable assumptions and a unified body of cumulative and objective knowledge open to future refinements.

The role of evaluation, as I see it, is crucial in this endeavor. The work of both Rubin and Jernudd is unquestionably laudable. What they do is both useful and important. The surveys on status-planning and corpus-planning activities they offer give a highly professional account of what has taken place in the field. However, I see evaluation not merely as restricted to a determination of the effectiveness of decisions according to some sort of decision-making prototheory, be it rational-comprehensive, disjointed-incrementalist, or mixed-scanning (Faludi 1973a; 1973b: 217 ff.); I see evaluation as a metatheoretical reflection through which hypotheses can be generated.

#### REFERENCES

- Altoma, Salih J. (1970 [1974]), 'Language education in Arab countries and the role of the academies', *Current Trends in Linguistics* 6: 690-720. (Also reprinted in *Advances in Language Planning*, ed. by J.A. Fishman. The Hague, Mouton, 1974).
- Bell, Roger T. (1976), *Sociolinguistics*. New York, St. Martin.
- Dittmar, Norbert (1976), *A Critical Survey of Sociolinguistics, Theory and Application*. New York, St. Martin.
- Faludi, Andreas (1973a), *Planning Theory*. Oxford, Pergamon.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor (1973b), *A Reader in Planning Theory*. Oxford, Pergamon.
- Fellman, Jack (1974), 'The Academy of the Hebrew Language: its history, structure,

- and function', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 1: 95-103.
- Fishman, Joshua A. (1973 [1974]), 'Language modernization and planning in comparison to other types of national modernization and planning', *Language in Society* 2 (1). (Also reprinted in *Advances in Language Planning*, ed. by J.A. Fishman. The Hague, Mouton, 1974).
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor (1974), *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague, Mouton.
- Haugen, Einar (1966), 'Linguistics and language planning', in *Sociolinguistics*, ed. by William Bright. The Hague, Mouton.
- \_\_\_\_\_(1966 [1972]), 'Dialect, language, nation', in *The Ecology of Language*, ed. by E. Haugen, 237. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_(1969 [1972]), 'Language planning, theory and practice', in *The Ecology of Language*, ed. by E. Haugen, 287. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- Kachru, Braj B., editor (forthcoming), *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Champaign, University of Illinois Press.
- Kloss, Heinz (1969), *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec, International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
- \_\_\_\_\_(1971), 'Language rights of immigrant groups', *International Migration Review* 5 (2): 250-268.
- \_\_\_\_\_(1977), *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Rowley, Mass. Newbury House.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970 [1962]), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (second revised edition). Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Lewis, Glyn E. (1972), *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union*. The Hague, Mouton.
- Masterman, Margaret (1970), 'The nature of a paradigm', in *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, ed. by Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Neustupny, Jiri V. (1970 [1974]), 'Basic types of treatment of language problems'. *Linguistic Communications* 1: 77-98. (Also reprinted in *Advances in Language Planning*, ed. by J.A. Fishman. The Hague, Mouton, 1974.
- Rowe, John Howland (1974), 'Sixteenth and seventeenth century grammars', in *Studies in the History of Linguistics*, ed. by Dell Hymes. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Rubin, Joan (1971), 'Evaluation and language planning', in *Studies in the History of Linguistics*, ed. by Dell Hymes. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Rubin, Joan (1971), 'Evaluation and language planning', in *Can Language Be Planned?*, ed. by Joan Rubin and B. Hernudd. Honolulu, East-West Center and University of Hawaii Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_(1977), 'New insights into the nature of language change offered by language planning', in *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Planning*, ed. by B.G. Blunt and M. Sanchez, 253-269. New York, Academic Press.
- Sibayan, Bonifacio (1971 [1974]), 'Language policy, language engineering and literacy in the Philippines'. *Current Trends in Linguistics* 8. (Also reprinted in *Advances in Language Planning*, ed. by J.A. Fishman. The Hague, Mouton, 1974).
- Solé, Carlos A. (1970), *Bibliografía sobre el español en América*. Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Teshner, R.V., G. Bills, and J.R. Craddock (1975), *Spanish and English of United States Hispanos, A Critical Annotated Linguistic Bibliography*. Virginia Center for Applied Linguistics.



## **PART ONE**

### **Decision Making in Language Planning**



CHARLES A. FERGUSON

## Language Planning and Language Change\*

Let me begin with a discussion of the case of Faeroese, with due apologies to Einar Haugen, analyst of the Faeroese situation (cf. Haugen 1979). My decision to begin with this example comes from the fact that a distinguished Danish scholar, a medievalist and philologist, spoke at Stanford on the rise of Standard Faeroese. I found that colloquium an especially interesting exercise. What the speaker had to say was interesting and the reaction of American linguists in the audience was interesting.

I can say that the Faeroese example is an outstanding success story in language planning. A small number of people, at most 40,000 of them, living on a group of islands belonging to Denmark, in the middle of the North Atlantic, about as far away from anyplace else as you can get, have evolved their own standard written and spoken language which has extensive use throughout the community. For example, Standard Faeroese is used as the medium of instruction in the school system, and they publish lots of books in it. The literacy rate in the Faeroe Islands is high, and when they publish a new novel in Faeroese, they print at least 2,000 copies, which are promptly snapped up. It is as though language planning had really succeeded, and, in fact, if you think about it, it is hard to find comparable speech communities elsewhere in the world – communities of such small size with their own well-recognized standard languages which are in wide use and serve as the object of language planning. I would like to look at that success story from two points of view as an introduction to what I will be saying in general: first, the history of the Faeroese speech community, and, second, the history of the Faeroese language.

What happened in the sociolinguistic history of the Faeroe Islands? How did the sociogeographic distribution and functional allocation of different languages and varieties of language change over time? First, a group of Norse-

\* This talk is dedicated to William G. Moulton. I had wanted to include a more formal paper of this same title in the *Festschrift* prepared for him but was unable to complete it in time. The talk covers some of the same ground as the intended paper, and I am pleased to be able in this way to offer him my personal appreciation.

men came and settled there, speaking a variety of the common Scandinavian language called Old Norse or Old Icelandic. After a long time Faeroese became linguistically quite separate from the other varieties of the language, simply because it was communicatively isolated for such a long period; that is, it came to be its own kind of Old Norse or Old Scandinavian. Then, of course, Christianity came and brought with it Latin as the language of the Church and of education. Eventually came the Reformation and some political changes, and then Danish replaced Latin. Danish came to be the language of education and of the Church.

For a long time after that, it was unthinkable to almost anyone in the Faeroe Islands for Faeroese to be the written language, the medium of instruction in schools, or even in any significant sense a national language. It was obvious that Danish filled those roles. But eventually some people got the idea – some Faeroese and some enthusiastic young Danes – that Faeroese could be made into a ‘real’ language and extended to other purposes. Someone devised a way to write the language, and gradually Danish came to be used somewhat less and Faeroese somewhat more.

Nowadays the Faeroese language is used throughout the society, although everyone studies Danish as a subject in school; and if they want to go to a university, it is taken for granted that they will go to a university in Denmark (or possibly Norway), where they will need to know Danish. So Danish still has a role in the society but a very different one from what it used to be. And Icelandic now has a special role too, because in recent times the Faeroese have discovered that Icelandic is the language most like theirs. If the Faeroese want to borrow words, for example to supply particular technical terms, they can now turn to Icelandic instead of Danish as a source and find words that are not so Danish-sounding and that also sound Faeroese rather than international.

The only point that I want to make here is that over a period of 1,000 years or more the distribution of functions of different languages in the Faeroe Islands has changed considerably. First was Old Norse, which became Faeroese; next there was Latin with Faeroese; Danish gradually replaced Latin; and finally Faeroese took over most of the functions of Danish, and Icelandic was added in a very limited function.

Now let us turn to the history of the language itself. Faeroese, like all other languages, developed dialect variations, and the first time a text in Faeroese (other than old ballads) was written down, someone translated the Gospel of Matthew into Southern Faeroese. That turned out to be a mistake. Most people thought that Southern Faeroese – the language of ‘those backward people down in the southern part’ – could not possibly be used for anything serious like the Word of God. Actually, most people apparently felt that the Word of God really came in Danish, but if it had to be in Faeroese it

should not be in Southern Faeroese. Then as time passed someone else, more wisely, picked the kind of Faeroese spoken in a more central area – what can be called the capital. (The ‘capital’, however, probably never had more than 500 residents until very recent times).

People accepted the new written variety more willingly and thus they began the process of standardization whereby a particular form of the language became accepted throughout the Faeroe Islands as a supradialectal norm. During the standardization process the question of what spelling to use repeatedly arose, a relatively etymological spelling versus a more phonetic spelling. Eventually the question was resolved and people agreed on an orthography. Then there was the question of what to do for new terminology in the processes of elaboration and modernization: where should they get suitable loan words and how should native terms be coined? Once again decisions were made, in general, to reject certain sources of loan words, to make up certain kinds of native Faeroese ones. Sometimes there have been exceptions to the general policies. For example, ‘sad to say’ (as the Danish scholar put it), the word for ‘telephone’ is *telefon*, pronounced Faeroese style, not a made-up Faeroese word, perhaps based on an Icelandic source since the Icelanders have a pure Icelandic word for ‘telephone’. The only point that I want to make is that all these problems were settled one way or another, so that one particular variety of the language was extended and accepted, an orthography was adopted, and ways of enriching or elaborating the vocabulary and forms of discourse were established.

Language planning was definitely involved. These changes did not just happen by chance, ‘naturally’, without conscious intervention. Some of the change was unconscious, no doubt, but there were individuals who said, ‘let’s do this’ or ‘let’s do that’. Institutions were involved, decisions were made in Denmark and in the Faeroes, in churches and in schools, and so on. At every stage there was language planning and the language planning had some effect. That is, it constitutes a part of the explanation of what happened.

As I said, it is a success story for language planning. Many of us tend to think in those terms, but at the Stanford colloquium I mentioned earlier, I noticed that my fellow American linguists were squirming. Sometimes they just sat still, but at other times you could actually see them squirm. One of the troubles was that the lecturer kept saying, in effect, ‘and so then people made the decision to change the language in such and such a way, and then they changed it’. American linguists cringe at that. And then, what is more, the Danish scholar would occasionally say something which revealed his own point of view. Once he commented that it was fortunate that a particular kind of spelling went out of favor. A little bit later he said ‘and you realize, with a language that has case endings like that, you can do a better job of planning’. Every time he made a personal evaluative comment like these, the American

linguists would squirm. I thought that gave a good indication of the problems American linguists have in relating language planning to language change. By a nice coincidence, all the American linguists present at that meeting had attended, several weeks before, an international conference on historical linguistics (cf. Traugott et al. 1980) at which about 60 papers were given. Not a single paper mentioned language planning, and the American linguists felt at home in that kind of setting, whereas they did not feel at home in a setting which mentioned planning in connection with change.

Efforts devoted to language planning and studies of language-planning processes have generally been well separated from systematic studies of language change.<sup>1</sup> In fact, language planners are typically impatient with attempts to understand processes of change or even to study the effects of planning. And, on the other hand, the strong tradition of the study of language change in nineteenth- and twentieth-century linguistics has typically distrusted language planning or assumed that language-planning efforts were irrelevant to the fundamental processes of change. Yet it must be clear to even the most casual students of either phenomenon, if they think directly about the question, that language planning is useless if it does not have an effect on language change, and that a theory of language change is incomplete if it does not allow for the possible influence of language planning. That is really the point of what I want to say. In the remarks that I make, however, I want to make that point again and again from two perspectives, both of them familiar to this group.

One is the perspective of change and planning in a speech community, and the other is the perspective of change and planning in language itself. Let me give some examples, in case Faeroese has not been enough. Change has taken place in the language situation in the English-speaking world in many ways over the centuries. The most obvious example, the one that comes to mind to most of us, is the period of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, when the distribution of languages in the British Isles changed drastically. At the beginning of that period English was the ordinary conversational language, French was the language of Parliament and the courts, and Latin was the language of education, the church, and science. By the end of that period, English was the language of conversation, the courts, Parliament, and most education; Latin still had a small but honored place in education and science, and the only remnants of the use of French were the numerous French expressions in the language of the law (Jones 1966). So over a period of several centuries a great change came about in the allocation of different language varieties in that speech community.

A second example of change in the language situation is the twentieth-century shift in the functional allocation of language varieties in the Chinese-speaking world. Early in the century, say around 1920, an archaic form of

literary Chinese, often called *wenli*, was the normal variety used in writing, in contrast with the usual spoken form of the language. Spoken Chinese shows deep dialect cleavages, but a variety of spoken Mandarin based on North Chinese dialects, particularly educated Peking usage, was already in wide use as a kind of spoken lingua franca. The written language, also originally based on the Chinese of Peking, was even more widely recognized as the norm of written communication throughout China, although it was usually read with the pronunciation of the local dialect or in a special local traditional pronunciation. Major local varieties such as Cantonese were sometimes used as media of instruction in the schools.

By the end of the 1970s, the use of *wenli* has retreated to a small fraction of its former distribution, and a kind of Mandarin referred to as *Putonghua* ('common speech') is widely used for both spoken and written purposes. While written Chinese is often still read with local dialect phonology, the traditional local reading pronunciations are rapidly disappearing and the use of local dialects in the schools has decreased markedly. *Putonghua* has spread extensively as the national language, both spoken and written, being superposed on the everyday spoken Chinese of those areas which do not have North Chinese dialects as mother tongues. Thus, in the space of 50 years, a radical change has come about in the functional allocation of language varieties in China: not only is there a much higher proportion of literacy in the population, but one commonly written variety has lost functional ground and one commonly spoken variety has gained.

These are typical examples of what is happening over and over again in speech communities, and I chose them because they are so typical and familiar. Yet linguists interested in language change have not examined this kind of change very systematically, fundamental though it is to understanding the facts of language.

The other perspective of language change is the study of the structure of the language or language variety itself. Let me again give two examples: (1) in Middle English and continuing through the present day, there has been a dramatic change in the organization of the English vowel system, that is, the old 'e's became 'i's, and the old 'a's became 'e's, and so on — the incredible, fascination phenomenon called the 'great vowels shift'. The shift is still continuing, and the cycle has not run its course. These structural changes and their present-day synchronic echoes have been the subject of many phonological studies (e.g. Chomsky and Halle 1968; Wolfe 1977). A tremendous influx of French loan words into English changed the whole nature of the English vocabulary, so that within a relatively short period (a couple of centuries) the English lexicon was inundated with a different kind of vocabulary, which irreversibly altered some of the phonological and morphosyntactic characteristics of the language.

Once again, such processes of change have to be understood; they occur in all languages. One of the most general classifications of language change is a three-fold division which dates back to the neogrammarians of the nineteenth century and was widely accepted among American linguists of the Bloomfield tradition. All changes are (a) exceptionless sound laws making their way through the language, or (b) borrowings either from another language or from another dialect in the same language, or (c) analogical new formations. This classification has proved of value as a guide for research and a stimulating framework for analysis, but it has many shortcomings. Even if modified to include syntactic laws and such notions as 'conspiracies' of different changes which lead to similar outcomes, the 'drift' of related languages changing in the same ways for long periods of time, and the development of 'areal' characteristics, the classification is still inadequate, because most changes seem to involve all three aspects and because it gives no understanding of the processes of change in actual language behavior.

Labov's classification (1972) of 'changes from above' and 'changes from below' is better, especially as it is fleshed out with detailed descriptions of actual trajectories of change. But this has mostly been applied only to phonological as opposed to lexical, syntactic, orthographic, or other changes. Other classifications that are better for phonology than for syntax, lexicon, etc., are Hoenigswald's classification (1960) by outcomes: split, merger, replacement, etc., and Kiparsky's simplification vs. addition of rules (1968).

What is probably needed is not a small exhaustive list of nonoverlapping categories of changes but rather an identification of basic tendencies which are operative in all changes, and then careful delineation of many specific changes in terms of these tendencies, so that general principles of classification and explanation can be found. For example, some time ago I hazarded an identification of tendencies of that sort and I named three types: physiological constraints, which are based on perceptual and articulatory characteristics of human beings; cognitive processes, based on natural human processes of memory, comparison, classification, and the like; and social processes, that is tendencies related to human social behavior and communicative processes in general (Ferguson 1975). I am only trying to use this classification as an example. With this approach, every change is assumed to have the possibilities of involving all three types of tendencies, and more specifically, it is assumed that in the short term, social tendencies are able to outweigh the other two, but in the long term, the other so-called natural changes will tend to win out. Also, with this approach it is assumed that in any change, conflicting tendencies of the same type may be operative, that some tendencies may be more powerful than others, and that in the long term, under different circumstances and in different languages, there will be a significantly larger number of some outcomes, so-called 'universals', rather than others.