

Review Article

Language Use and Social Change, edited by W. H. Whiteley. Oxford University Press for the International African Institute, 1971. 406 pp., £3 net.

Language use is one thing, social change another. The title of this book faithfully conveys its ambitious aim, which is to characterise the theoretical and empirical problems of language use in areas of social change. Here are collected the 22 papers given at the Ninth International African Seminar at Dar Es Salaam in 1968, which had as its title 'Social Implications of Multilingualism in East Africa', and which was under the chairmanship of the late Professor W. H. Whiteley. Now that these papers are in print, however, they have received a new collective name - to suggest perhaps a generality of import, but also to fit the mould of such titles as 'Language in Culture and Society' (Hymes, 1964). The editor squarely identifies his book in the tradition of the socio-linguistic literature that began approximately around the time of Hymes' collection; suggestively, he cordons off the papers that are 'General and Theoretical Studies' from those that are 'Empirical Studies within Africa'.

This book however is an attempt to stake out a special place for the phenomenon of the multilingual person or community. Lambert puts it well, albeit in extreme fashion.

'The bilingual child ... may well start life with the enormous advantage of having a more open, receptive mind about himself and other people, and he is likely to become especially sensitive to and wary of ethnocentricism. ...

'I believe that bicultural bilinguals ... and their children are ... the ones most likely to work out a new, non-ethnocentric mode of social intercourse which could be of universal significance.'

Maybe indeed the bilingual is the heuristic device par excellence for solving the world's problems; nevertheless, multilingualism within the nation-state can itself create great problems that require the attention of the professional politician. As Mosha explains,

'... the many problems ... relating to language ... must be solved effectively in order to give the processes of national development a chance to succeed by providing the developing nation with: (a) an adequate system of linguistic communication, national identification, and consciousness, and (b) a means to cultural unity.'

The scope of the enquiry, then, is very wide. Even the first phonemic sounds a baby utters carry their own social significance in such a situation. Everything about language, about language-and-culture, somehow matters, has to be taken into account. The disturbing result is, in this book, an extraordinary inconsistency on the part of the contributors to know what to put into the footnotes and what to leave in the main body of the text. How much more so the inconsistency concerning frames of reference, let alone some sort of theory. The crucial relationship between language and (a) and (b) is nowhere properly examined and elaborated. How and under what sort of circumstances does a language 'take off' into self-sustained growth? If, indeed, the job of the politician is to manipulate language usage and language

loyalty, then the duty of the sociolinguist is to distinguish carefully government propaganda from the fruits of his own researches. The studious evasion by 'applied linguistics' of such questions, and of the insights of theoretical linguistics, renders much of its work, as N. V. Smith says,¹ largely trivial.

In his Introduction to the volume Whiteley writes of language surveys that are 'concerned to establish the basic facts'; a body of facts, however cannot exist as a body, without a theory: the problem, then is rather how to provide a methodological frame for all the 'facts' that keep coming in, to establish a clear and consistent terminology which² is so patently wanting in this book. 'Sociolinguistics', writes Pride,² 'studies the varied linguistic realisations of sociocultural meanings ...'; it studies the realisations, 'the facts', rather than the process of the 'unpacking' from the cultural idiom into language. Understandably, certain facts are more equal than others, depending upon one's point of view: a casual aside in one paper becomes the central theme in another, or, more pertinently, the other way about. Does a bilingual, for example, when in conversation with another bilingual (of the same two languages), choose one of his two possible languages out of any special reasons? Parkin's whole paper is devoted to analysing how language choice may be used to manipulate audience reaction at weak points in social structure (e.g. status differences at public meetings); Lambert in his article on the psychology of French-Canadian bilinguals, faintly acknowledges the possibility of manipulating audience reaction in a couple of passing comments. It is never clear to what extent respective authors are aware of shifting the emphasis, now on this, now on that. Language sensitivities, to take another example, are well-documented; Fishman's advice to the researcher runs nevertheless: 'If language issues are not particularly sensitive, he (the researcher) can ask directly by means of a census-type approach'. (How sensitive? Can such curt asides on central questions tell us anything?)

Once the researcher has collected his facts, it follows that linguistic variations correspond to a sociocultural meaning; hence instead of labelling them by any suitable algebraic notation one announces the language of power, the language of solidarity, informal language, transactional language, and so on. The assumption is that language is forever functionally specific, and manifestly functional at that; thus where 'parameters' fail to account for variation within a particular social setting or 'domain', a 'factor-analysis' is super-added, the notion of redundancy, it would seem, being out of the question. It would appear that sociolinguists have reacted too sharply to the position of the transformationalist grammarians: Postal's view³ that 'There is no more reason for languages to change than there is for automobiles to add fins one year and remove them the next' derives from a view of language as a body of rules where the loss of a rule or the addition of a rule that would produce linguistic change is a formal but essentially a quite arbitrary matter. However the sociolinguistic converse is equally narrow - language is seen as so totally embedded in social reality that it cannot undergo change purely from factors within the system but only from systematic alternations between linguistic and sociolinguistic mechanisms.⁴ By placing language back into society, total explicability, it is felt, is nearer to being achieved.

There is a good deal of information in the book on the relation between specific languages and specific cultures. Thus for example Barbara Neale begins her paper with the declaration: 'Any study of the Indian Community (in Nairobi) is an exercise in componential analysis, where language ... and other cultural characteristics are used to define

the individual....' Similarly Abdulaziz attributes 'its Bantu-based culture' as an 'extra-linguistic factor which has given Swahili its great assimilating power in East Africa.' He continues: 'The language is therefore not just a vehicular lingua franca. It is an important factor for establishing cultural, social and political values amongst its interlocutors'. Speaking English in Tanzania during the colonial era implied adoption of a 'Black European' mentality and the rejection of indigenous cultural values, we are told. Values are always difficult to handle, justify and define even at the best of times, but in the hands of the sociolinguists they have supreme explanatory power:

'... present-day values in Kenya tend to polarise along the axes of modernity and authenticity, and the linguistic exponents of these are English and the local language respectively, with Swahili occupying an intermediate position, offering something of authenticity and something of modernity.' (Whiteley).

The difficulty of establishing absolute criteria to demarcate languages distinct from dialects means in practice that it is often the politician's stooge at the national Language Academy who decides which linguistic realisations match which sociocultural meanings; language is commonly used to manipulate the feelings of speakers in terms of their closeness with or distance from speakers of related languages or dialects: those men who 'standardise' languages demarcate, as Southall's article is at pains to show, linguistic boundaries and discontinuities that may never have existed previously. Terms like 'cultural vitality' and 'group's sense of identification' are the standard catchwords here. The total failure in Whiteley's book to distinguish the official view from the 'situation on the ground' is typified in the article by Joshua Fishman, who treats as his starting-point the variety of elite views on language problems; he bases a detailed typology on 'locally made (and unmade)' interpretations of 'perceived' national traditions without going into who makes the interpretations and how. Even however assuming that one is interested in the 'facts' rather than the process, if one wants to understand a language situation, elites are a bad place to begin: consider a comparison of what the Irish elite has to say about the importance of Gaelic with what the British elite has to say about the importance of Welsh. Curiously, though, Fishman does indicate in a footnote that there might be 'prolonged functional failures' of policies implemented by elites. It would be interesting to know how language would represent cultural values in such a situation. Neither the Basque nor the Breton case, to take two obvious examples from Europe, are however mentioned in the book.

Another way into the problem is to be found in the articles written by those contributors with educational interests. Lambert's views on the potential of bilinguals to move toward non-ethnocentric modes of behaviour have been quoted above; Southall, in a detailed article on cross-cultural semantic themes in East Africa - sociolinguistics of a very different kind from that found elsewhere in the book² - concludes that such themes are eminently suitable for use as a classroom device for teaching East Africans about themselves. Robinson, however, in an exposition in the tradition of Basil Bernstein, is yet another kind of sociolinguist: he rightly finds that by studying the varied linguistic realisations of sociocultural meanings one is doing little more than establishing correlational links between language and culture without examining how and why non-linguistic markers function alongside with comparable significance. Instead, Robinson shows how a 'restricted' code in language actually generates specific patterns of perception for a stable sub-culture within a society, and is hence functional rather than dysfunctional in society. Joan Maw, writing about her teaching experiences in Uganda, complains of the traditional

but misguided assumption implicit in educational policy in Africa that the indigenous languages are in the position of the 'restricted' code; in colonial times there was a functional purpose in confining the natives to knowledge of the 'restricted' code only - and hence Lugard's philosophy for Northern Nigeria, quoted by Mazrui: 'The premature teaching of (the) English (language) ... inevitably leads to utter disrespect for British and native ideals alike, and to a de-nationalised and disorganised population.' Such insights may well prove most valuable for a sociolinguistic contribution to social history. Ironically, though, we do not get in this book even some attempt to make correlations: we are left with cryptic comments like those of Fishman '... different patterns of dress, of diet, of recreation, and of education may coexist within one and the same speech community' without further elaboration. Similarly Gorman decides that '... a very marked shift in language behaviour takes place ... as children grow older', telling us nothing meanwhile on how this might correlate with non-linguistic political or social change. In this book language remains one thing, social change another.

This division of labour can prejudice the results of the linguistic analysis no less than it can the conclusions concerning the nature of cultural values. Abdulaziz, for example, shows in vulgar Marxist fashion that it was an 'egalitarian-centred interpretation of culture' for the 'broad masses of people in Tanzania' that in fact encouraged Swahili as against the 'small urban elite (reading and writing European languages) whose way of life may have little in common with the rest of the population'. Hence when he comes to describe English and Arabic loan-words in the language, he says of them that they are 'fully Swahilized in their phonological form', whereas we can see from the article by Mosha that linguistic assimilation of foreign loan-words is a complicated process about which it is hard to generalise. The article by Fulass makes a similar error, but in the opposite direction. Amharic, he tells us, has been obliged to borrow great numbers of foreign words that deal with 20th-century technological artifacts; these words are so numerous that they actually confuse rather than assist communication: 'The reader or listener is bewildered by his inability to understand texts or speeches in Amharic;' in a footnote he continues, 'This is not because of little education. Even university-educated speakers have such complaints.' Fulass proposes a competent Ethiopian body that would instead coin new words from existing Amharic roots. His comments and his proposal indicate, however, the common notion in this book of sociolinguist as political commentator rather than as abstract theorist. For the social change incumbent upon the importation of alien words and ideas necessarily involves the specialist purveyor and interpreter (it is a common fact that loan-words do not mean the same thing in their new linguistic home as they had done in the language from which they have been borrowed - hence the 'faux amis' and the occasional mistranslations even amongst professional politicians); and the linguistic exponent of this is the development of new linguistic varieties, or registers (can the average English native-speaker properly be said to 'understand' legal language, ostensibly in his own 'language'?⁶) The piece-meal approach of Fulass' analysis, which concentrates on lexis alone, cannot effectively convey what happens to language in moments of social change by merely broaching a list of foreign terms that somehow need to be 'assimilated' into the language. German newspapers, for example, contain quantities of loan-words from English that are rarely heard in conversation. Why? Fulass' view is that borrowing should only be 'seriously entertained' (by whom?) when 'certain elements of the cognitive, aesthetic, religious, philosophic, etc., aspects of the culture in which IL (languages of the industrialised nations) is

spoken'. It is almost as if he is excluding the possibility of social change when he writes (presumably without the German case in mind), 'We can now speak of the existence of a terminological - and conceptual - gap between the societies (sic) in which IL and OV are spoken.'

The scope of sociolinguistics has been identified by at least one writer (Dell Hymes) as the 'ethnography of speaking'; that the phenomenon of the borrowing of foreign loan-words into a language cannot be comprehensively described by sole reference to face-to-face interaction however, is evident from the article by Mosha, who indicates that besides such motives as style, the need to differentiate within a semantic field, or the need to distinguish homonyms, there are other, social factors that activate it, such as membership of a given occupation, the prestige of the source language, and the extent of native literacy. Too close attention to speech and face-to-face interaction alone overlooks the role of channel, the mode in which language is transmitted (e.g. written or broadcast), which in turn has its registers (e.g. letter, newspaper or journal, TV or radio); Mosha notes that linguistic assimilation of foreign words can be tied up with the social pervasiveness of the denotator of the word in question. Ideally, then a sociolinguist should study both things, but in this book there is no case where this has been done.

Part of the problem is that between the flaps of this book are represented the views of people from widely divergent academic backgrounds who are merely gathered together in order to express themselves on the subject of language, and who do not identify themselves consistently as 'sociolinguists' - and this is true for most major collections of essays that are considered to be contributions to 'the field'; another part of the problem, which is concomitant with the first, is that concerning methodology there are, as admitted in the Introduction, 'gross differences'. This criticism could be muted somewhat were the contributors aiming themselves at formulating the most powerful generalisations, as hinted at in the editor's subdivision of the papers into general and theoretical studies on the one hand, and empirical studies within Africa on the other. However the case of multilingual Switzerland is not mentioned once in a book which purports to discuss the social implications of multilingualism, and terminological usages are so idiosyncratic as to confound rather than clarify. Thus for example Southall has 'single-language clusters' and Nida 'speech area', whatever they may be; the unexplained notion of language 'simplification' is used by Fishman and others as 'assisting' the spread of vehicular languages, and the expressions 'structure' and 'group' remain totally unexamined in the book, although many contributors seem happy to rest their hypotheses upon such shadowy entities. Hence the feeling referred to above, that much of such work cannot be anything but trivial.

In this connection the high value attached to the questionnaire as one of the most reliable discovery procedures is I think open to serious doubt. There are several problems involved. The first is that questionnaires ignore what Parkin calls folk assumptions in his article, or the difference between what people say and what people say they say (more on this point below); Gorman in fact recognises this problem but has no suggestions to make. The second problem is that within the book there is a large measure of disagreement as to what is actually to be put into the questionnaire: in Fishman's crude door-to-door language census there is the question 'Can you understand a conversation in English', whereas Berry puts in rather 'How well do you understand languageX?', and then follows this up with seven questions that refer to the use of X in seven different kinds of situation.

However even this latter more sophisticated type of questionnaire does not take into account a third problem, noted by Robinson, namely that different people see language (in general) as being useful for different things; hence children's answers to 'wh' questions (who, when, why, what, etc.) vary as to mode of answer and to amount and type of information offered; however Lambert's research, based on responses to texts read aloud, gives us no information as to their semantic content. A fourth objection rests upon doubt as to whether a child could actually answer Gorman's question:

'The child was asked to indicate which languages various members of his family could speak, write, read or understand and to rate their 'proficiency' in each mode of use along a four-point scale.'

Children, it will be seen, do not in a multilingual environment appear to understand much about adult language differences or allegiances, so it is hard to grasp what Gorman expects from such questioning. It seems, lastly, that Gorman implicitly recognises the limitations of the questionnaire method in his espousal of such 'other information considered to be relevant' as teachers' assessments of children's language attainments. Indeed, over-attention to the statistics involved, to the charts which are the end-product, plus the problems that surround sampling universes may well obscure the nature, or rather the description, of the language habits of bilinguals. The quantitative approach may be of use in epigraphy or in the study of medieval manuscripts, but for face-to-face interaction it hardly seems the most suitable technique.

The use by Parkin of the methods of social anthropology successfully shows that the Robinson-Bernstein elaborated-restricted code duet oversimplifies the nature of social stratification, particularly on the question of how much mobility there is between strata. The sociolinguist as political commentator must avail himself of such methods if Robinson is right when he says that 'any educational system controlled by the high-status groups will be designed to preserve the status-quo.' The situation with the methods of linguistics looks rather different, however: as Robinson points out, transformational analyses of 'elaborated' code users are probably not going to be able to predict validly the language capacity of 'restricted' code users. Curiously enough, Chomskyan techniques and terminology appear now and again in the book, but with some intriguing mutations (read 'mutilations'): Fishman and Cooper distinguish language proficiency from language usage in an attempt presumably to give their work the airs of Chomskyan respectability by paralleling the latter's competence and performance distinction, but how they can justify that 'reading' falls into the former category whereas 'speaking' falls into the latter remains a mystery. Again, Gumperz and Hernandez describe some 'selection constraints' that operate in the speech of bilinguals who switch languages in mid-sentence, such that *he era regador (he was an irrigator) are ruled out as 'impossible'. Is this deep structure or surface structure? Are they distinguishing competence from performance? Can performance features, like slips of the tongue, interruptions, noise, etc. result in bilinguals uttering such 'impossible' sentences? One is left with the impression that the eclectic frames of reference dotted about the book satisfy the authors on the criterion of thoroughness, but in practice it is only misleading, counter-productive, and, again, trivial.

What, then, can be done? What can be done in order to avoid committing 'the field' to that sort of 'reality' where a valid contribution consists of (as in the case of one article in the book) the mere

arrangement on a chart of the various languages that elite families in the Cameroons used when visited by the sociolinguist at dinner-parties. To avoid being trivial it is necessary to develop a conceptual apparatus that can compare whole systems; it must be able to account for apparent negative cases, so that we cannot sympathise with Nida who found that the resurgence of the Guarani language in Paraguay had to be dubbed 'an apparent exception'. Sociolinguistics is still uncertain on the level of observational adequacy; it has made few steps in descriptive theory, let alone shown a preoccupation with universals; its handling of etics is at best awkward. The best parts of the book, however, are those that deal more or less with emic considerations, and it may be that emics per se could direct sociolinguistics at this stage more competently than other approaches.

The article by Mazrui starts with the question to what extent do members of a speech-community see their language as integral to cultural cohesion, in this case the 'Islamic languages' of Africa. Although Mazrui appears to believe that the latter languages are intellectually more advanced than their pagan neighbours' - begging the philosophical question whether language as a medium of communication can suitably convey the potent mysteries of religion - his discussion of Arab attitudes to their language is otherwise valuable. The Prophet was the divine ventriloquist in the holy Arabic tongue, hence Moslems believe in its total inimitability, and also that English, the language of the missionary schools in British Africa, enjoyed a similar status in Christianity - this is what prejudiced Moslems against learning English, retarding their 'involvement in this wave of modernity'.

This kind of analysis throws new light on the importance of the questionnaire that asks, 'Why do you want to learn language X?' If language figures prominently in a society's cultural goals, the answer to the latter question may well reflect a folk-sociolinguistics, as it were, namely how the speech-community sees itself in relation to the outer linguistic world, rather than reflecting any 'objective', absolute, etic considerations. Questionnaires may have to be treated as statements only about what people say they say, and not otherwise, as is generally the case in this volume. The analysis of foreign loan-word borrowings into a language (lexis is in general over-emphasised in this book, to the detriment of other elements of language) presupposes the notion of foreign-ness, but this is no absolute matter:

'Children from deep rural areas often do not realise before going to school that they are speaking or mixing up two different languages. This is due to absence of such socio-cultural correlates as would mark one form of speech with a particular racial or mother-tongue group. Moreover, tolerance to language shift and mixing is often high and involves the whole community. At school (however) there is the least tolerance to language shift, and children are at once made aware of the fact that there are two separate languages involved.' (Abdulaziz)

Here the notion of tolerance to language shift enters as a crucial variable; differences between languages do not necessarily exist as such but vary through space and time according to the demands of the cultural environment. In another example (taken from Alexandre's article), parents exercise their tolerance to language shift along the space dimension:

'... The choice (of African vernacular or French) ... is, in many cases, fully conscious and motivated: when living in an African milieu parents make efforts to use French, when living in France to use the vernacular. In the first case they intend to train their children for maximal efficiency at school, in the second case they try to preserve their sense of national (tribal) identity while living abroad.'

The close mutual interaction between language and culture in the sense outlined above implies that statements about 'language purity', for example, have little meaning in themselves: Andrzejewski insists that the average Somali is a language purist who would demand the dismissal of a broadcaster who used too many loan-words; 24 pages later we find Moshia insisting that Uganda are not purists concerning their language. If this is so, then, language would appear to function differently in these two societies, to have different structural relationships with other cultural goals.

The article by Gumperz and Hernandez on the phenomenon of bilingual code-switching exhibits some of the features of functionalist sociolinguistics that I have been criticising. By starting out with the idea that a language shift serves functionally within a conversation, and by proceeding with the idea that (for two Mexican Americans in conversation) English is 'normal' and unmarked, they arrive at the point where they consider that the Spanish words used convey a 'social strategy'. Idiosyncrasy and momentary inclinations are ruled out, so the occasional Yiddish interjection in the speech of some American Jews is dubbed as a 'stylistic ethnic identity marker' - without any attempt to study the Jew's or the Spaniard's attitude to tolerance of language shift, but rather finding such utterances as deserving a label because they deviate from 'standard' speech. One wonders how they would handle foreign loan-words in early stages of assimilation. Their position, indeed, has all the evidence of being a one-to-one view of the relation between language and culture.⁸

Multilingualism, as the editor tells us at the end of his Introduction, preceded Westernisation in Africa, so it cannot be the critical factor in such aspects of social change as the discontinuity between generations that sees kin ties becoming shallower. It is not in fact clear from this book whether multilingualism as such is even a valid construct at all, particularly as the editor also feels that

'In the sense that functional specificity of language variants to particular domains or settings is a fact of social life anywhere, then the multilingual societies of Africa differ in degree but not in kind from monolingual societies.'

If this is so, where then to begin the analysis, if the conceptual apparatus needed for the enquiry into multilingualism is to require no special tools? Certainly not with prophecy - that is best left to the professional politician, though it seems the scholar is sorely tempted, as this book well attests. Nor with its converse back into time, with history; Polome's comment that 'The linguistic situation in Lubumbashi is a clear reflection of the historical growth of the town under the colonial regime' may well be true, but diachronic relations cannot help sociolinguistics much until its synchronic house can be put in order. Starting-points used to expedite the latter vary in the book within a wide range: Southall starts with cross-cultural semantic themes, Parkin with situations, Neale ethnic groups, (hence she is interested in 'language distribution'), Robinson linguistic codes, Fishman elites,

Lambert with psychological membership groups and sympathetic orientations, Criper and Ladefoged with levels of political administration. No-one, incidentally, has yet published a testing of Bernstein's hypothesis in Africa. This wide variety of academic language poses some problems of mutual intelligibility, since there seems little a priori agreement on what is a sociolinguistic statement; Alexandre confesses his work is based upon material culled from informants who, he says, told him what they thought he wanted to hear in order 'to humour my own prejudices'.

On the question of how to overcome the problems created by academic diversity in a field in which members from a number of disciplines are interested, but who somehow cannot agree with each other in such a way as to make it here impossible to compare results or produce wide generalisations or universals, it is worth drawing attention to the fact that in order to conceal the nature of many research projects as being merely attempts at the correlation of language and culture, 'the field' is justified post rem as being essentially 'interdisciplinary'. Fishman has some amazing proposals to collect people from different disciplines to contribute to this interdisciplinary subject, which, he says, no single discipline can describe adequately. Methodologically the virtue of such a many-sided approach would be that it would be able to indicate 'areas of interdisciplinary overlap as well as uniqueness'. Far, however, from showing signs, as Fishman would assure us, that it is suffering from an overdose of 'disciplinary redundancy', sociolinguistics, as represented in this book, is trying to pose a totally new question, different from the preoccupations of other disciplines. The borrowing of an idea or two from another discipline more often than not leads no further than to a ratification of one's own entrenched position rather than to an attempt to integrate them methodologically at a high level of abstract generalisation. Thus Bernstein has been quoted and used in this book, rather than tested or integrated. But at this stage in the development of sociolinguistics, use must consciously be made of the methodological premises of related fields: thus if Gumperz and Hernandez say 'Social structure, like syntax, aids in the interpretation of sentences' they are really required to follow the analogy through and see whether in fact social structure functions in the sentence in any fashion that would make sense to a linguist, quite apart, that is, from the need to develop ways of talking about social structure as one can about noun phrases and verbal complements. Indeed, can sociolinguistics provide us with a new type of phoneme?

How a new discipline comes to be born may well be a matter of gestation. In this sense this book is a valuable contributory seed, however the infant has already, prematurely, been named with the device of academic tekonymy which perhaps adds an insult to abortive injury. The umbilical cord is seen to be cut in the moment when authors begin only to quote each other and gradually to close themselves off from the intrusions of the outer academic world. This has already happened, which is what gives one the sense of the abortion. The parents are nonetheless easy to identify, and so it is saddening that Professor Whiteley was cut down so suddenly last summer that he did not live to see the offspring hopefully growing in the future into a creative maturity.

Notes

- (1) See: N.V. Smith, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, vol. XXXV, 3, 1972; p. 683.
- (2) J.B. Pride, in J. Lyons (ed.), New Horizons in Linguistics, 1970; p. 301.
- (3) P.M. Postal, Aspects of Phonological Theory, New York 1968, page 283; quoted in J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics, 1972 p. 516.
- (4) Details of this theory of language change can be found in William Labov's article in Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), p. 516-38.
- (5) I am thinking of the distinction made by Ardener in E.W. Ardener (ed.), Social Anthropology and Language, ASA vol. 10, Tavistock 1971; p. lxxvi - lxxvii.
- (6) For the notion of register consult Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, The linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching, London 1964, ch. 4; reprinted in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Language, Mouton 1968, pp. 139-169, especially pp 149-156.
- (7) Hymes' original article on this is to be found in Gladwin and Sturtevant (eds.), Anthropology and Human Behaviour, Washington D.C., Anthropological Society of Washington 1962; reprinted in Fishman (ed.), p.99-138.
- (8) Gumperz and Hernandez did however discover in the course of their research that in the Mexican-American case English was generally used to introduce new information, whereas Spanish provided 'stylistic embroidery to amplify the speaker's intent'. If generally valid, this could constitute a valuable sociolinguistic contribution to theoretical linguistics within the framework of the approach of Halliday to be found in his article in Lyons (ed.); p.141-65, esp. p. 143..