



LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATIONS

WORKING PAPERS
OF
THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AUSTRALIA

11

1973

MONASH UNIVERSITY

Preprint of a review of E. Haugen, The Ecology of
Language. To be published in Language.

E. HAUGEN AND THE HISTORY OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS

J. V. Neustupný

Monash University

The study of linguistics has traditionally been the object of less intensive attention than the study of language. Although it would be neither illegitimate nor unuseful to follow this practice and to discuss E. Haugen's essays collected in The ecology of language* as a piece of evidence about LANGUAGE, I wish to consider this book primarily as a testimony about the science of LINGUISTICS. During the 40 years of his activity in linguistics, Haugen has developed a sociolinguistic system of considerable independence and complexity, a system which has played a substantial part in the development of contemporary sociolinguistics and post-structural linguistics in general.

1. 'The ecology of language' (hereafter abbreviated as EL) covers the history of HAUGEN'S SOCIOLINGUISTIC THOUGHT since 1938, the publication date of his essay 'Language and immigration' (EL 1). In his 'Author's postscript' (EL:340-3) Haugen classifies his own contribution to sociolinguistics into two chronological periods, each of them characterized by a different topical range. The first period (1938 till mid-fifties) was concerned with bilingualism and borrowings. The second period (since the late fifties) is predominantly one of building up a theory of language problems

* The ecology of language: Essays by Einar Haugen.
Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford: Stanford
University Press 1972. Pp. XIV, 366.

and of laying foundations for international linguistics ('Semi-communication' (EL 10), 'National and international languages' (EL 12)).

1.1 First period. In the first period fall the type of studies I propose to call Sociolinguistics I. As a whole these studies are a by-product of structural linguistics, an offshoot which de facto attacks structuralism, notably the rule of limitation to langue and to the study of a single variety of langue. None of the linguistic studies of this type appeared in Joos' 'Readings in linguistics' and their entire scope was not displayed until Hymes' 'Language in culture and society'.

The full play of determinants which made Haugen participate in this type of sociolinguistics would need more data for complete clarification. Some of the factors are, however, obvious: Haugen's interest in literature, philology and language teaching - all documented in A.S. Dil's 'Bibliography of Einar Haugen's works' (EL:344-366); and of course the fact that Haugen himself is bilingual, which led directly to his studies in linguistic borrowing, and finally to his 'Norwegian language in America' (1953) and 'Bilingualism in the Americas' (1956).

1.2 Transition. These two books represent, in many respects, a transitional phase between the two main periods of Haugen's sociolinguistics. Only the first work has been represented in EL by its Chapter 4, 'The confusion of tongues'. Although the importance of the book, and the role Haugen's teaching and publications on American Norwegian played in the development of bilingual studies, should by no means be under-estimated, I would suggest that 'The Norwegian language in America' stands rather before, and 'Bilingualism in the Americas' after, the commencement of Haugen's second period of sociolinguistic investigations. His vision of further expansion of the bilingualism studies into an interdisciplinary effort, transcending traditional linguistic interests, appears much more vigorously in 1956 than in 1953.

Also, the theoretical framework of 'Bilingualism in the Americas' shows a difference of more than a mere three years. His definition of 'bilingualism' has further broadened to cover all degrees of proficiency, and all types of what has later been called 'varieties'; the concepts of 'native', 'colonial', 'immigrant' and 'creolized' languages have been established; psycholinguistic problems of 'the bilingual individual' and 'ethnolinguistic' problems of the 'bilingual community' are recorded; the difference between language as a symbol and language as an instrument is postulated, etc.

Perhaps the most decisive factor in this development was the changed atmosphere in American and world linguistics, just ripe to switch over from structuralism to post-structural linguistics. By post-structural I mean a new developmental stage of linguistics which succeeds structural linguistics in the wider sense of the word (it is not only Bloomfieldian descriptive linguistics), while denying, in accordance with a new social situation of the fifties and sixties, the validity of the basic characteristic features of linguistic structuralism : limitation of linguistics to the study of grammatical competence (usually with the exclusion of semantics), onesided emphasis on the referential function of language, lack of interest in linguistic variation, emphasis on independence of language from other social and natural facts, staticism and strict application of two-valued logic, the requirement of the independence of linguistics from other metatheoretical systems and mutual independence of various levels of language description (e.g. phonology and syntax), acceptance of arbitrary description, etc. With regard to the chronology of the first post-structural trends in sociolinguistics it should be mentioned that Weinreich's 'Languages in contact' appeared in 1953, and the first bibliographical items for S. Ervin, J. Gumperz, J. Fishman, W. Lambert, W. Mackey and others are recorded in 'Bilingualism in the Americas'.

The post-structural stage of linguistics has not, so far, produced an integrated paradigm. It consists of a number of trends and varieties of linguistics, each of them relatively independent, and each of them falsifying different structuralist assumptions. Generative grammar represents one set of such varieties of post-structural linguistics, sociolinguistics another one. The first and most vigorous post-structural variety of sociolinguistics, which I shall call Sociolinguistics II, reveals obvious connections with the interest in bilingualism within Sociolinguistics I, and develops from this into a general theory of linguistic variation.¹

1.3 Second period. Haugen's work in his second sociolinguistic period forms an important component of Sociolinguistics II. As noted above, his main focus of interest shifts from the general problems of bilingualism to the consideration of language problems, or as he has termed it, to language planning.

There are several features of Haugen's theory of language problems which confirm that his work in this period is not simply an extension of his previous work - though admittedly closely related with it - but belongs to a new post-structural variety of sociolinguistics. The first feature can be seen in Haugen's PROGRAMMATIC CONFIDENCE. It is by the end of the fifties that he openly attacks the structuralist policy of 'leave your language alone', first with some reluctance and apologetic overtones (1959 and 1961, EL:143), then with full confidence and programmatic zeal (1962, EL:150).

The second feature which distinguishes Haugen's work in this period from that of Sociolinguistics I is a conscious striving toward a firm THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK. While in 1953 Aasen's efforts toward the creation of a new Norwegian language are still referred to by the metaphorical expression 'linguistic revolt' (Haugen 1953: 154), in 1959 Haugen uses for the first time the term 'language planning', and subsequently develops his theory of language planning. The only major theory of language problems available in structural

linguistics was the Mathesius-Havránek theory of the Prague School, which appeared in the thirties mostly in Czech. Haugen's theory has not merely been the only such theory in American sociolinguistics, but one that has greatly influenced modern approaches to the issue and has been used as a basis for such projects as the International Research Project on Language Planning Processes (cf. Jernudd 1971:492).

Two slightly different models of language planning were published by Haugen in 1966, one in W. Bright's volume, *Sociolinguistics* ('Linguistics and language planning', completed in spring 1964, EL 8), and another one in the *American Anthropologist* ('Dialect, language, nation' completed in summer 1964, EL 11). The second of these models is also presented in Chapter 1 of 'Language conflict and language planning' (Haugen 1966, completed November 1965). The first model presents a sequential analysis into

- (1) fact-finding (problems),
- (2) consideration of alternative plans of action (alternatives and evaluation),
- (3) making of decisions (policy), and
- (4) implementation.

It also contains the discussion of three 'criteria', namely

- (1) efficiency,
- (2) rationality, and
- (3) commonalty.

The second model presents the 'criteria' and adds what Haugen later (1969, EL:288) called 'procedures':

- (1) selection of norm,
- (2) codification of form,
- (3) elaboration of function, and
- (4) propagation (acceptance by the community).

In 'Language planning, theory and practice' (1969, EL:14) a revised version of the sequential analysis is presented together with the

'procedures', while the 'criteria' recede in the background. It may be of interest to note here that some of these notions, as Haugen himself readily acknowledges, have been borrowed from Havránek, Kloss, Ray, etc. This fact however does in no way diminish the uniqueness and strength of Haugen's theory, which brought all these concepts together and provided them with a suitable data background of Haugen's work on language planning in Scandinavia.

Thirdly, it is not merely the presence of a programme and a theoretical framework that distinguishes Haugen's second sociolinguistic period from Sociolinguistics I. I wish to argue that in this period Haugen's thought is characterized by a NEW APPROACH to language problems. It is this approach that most decidedly transcends the limits of structural linguistics and lends Haugen's theory its post-structural character.

In defying the concept of a self contained langue, any theory of language problems is basically antistructuralist. It remains, however, a fact that even during the period of structural linguistics a certain amount of thought was always given to language problems. Historically speaking the more recent approaches to language problems can be classified into three developmental stages (policy, cultivation, and planning)² which roughly parallel the historical stages of the general linguistic theory (pre-structural, structural, post-structural), and the recent stages of the development of language (early modern, modern, contemporary - cf. Neustupný, forthcoming). Needless to say, this typology should be viewed as a generalization of a high order, valid for the majority of historical cases, but not necessarily for all.

The first approach to language treatment which I called POLICY approach, is characteristic for periods of linguistic unification when selection (or creation) of whole varieties or sectors of language are at stake, and when such selections are politically feasible. This approach often combines with nationalism in political thought, and historical or synchronic typologies plus marked

activity in the school grammar in linguistic thought. The systems of language treatment in 19th century less developed parts of Europe, where new languages were standardized and new nations formed, are typical examples. The Norwegian situation of the Knudsen and Aasen era, as presented by Haugen (EL 6, Haugen 1966), belongs here.

The second approach, which I have named CULTIVATION approach, originates usually after a certain degree of unification is achieved and more microscopic problems become conspicuous. The new system appeals to individuals rather than to representatives of the community. Details of morphology, spelling, lexicon, style etc. are discussed. It is the maintenance (in the sense of 'servicing') of language that remains politically feasible.

The American approach to language problems has for a long period been an example of a weak cultivation approach without governmental participation. The slogan of 'leave your language alone' establishes the monopoly of one single evaluation criterion: the usage. Variation in usage continues to exist but does not attract attention. As Haugen reminds us, it was not until the 1940 Michigan conference sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies that the problems of America's multilingualism emerged before the linguist in an organized manner (Haugen 1956: 13). It may be of interest to note in this context that Haugen's own attitudes during the first period also occasionally reveal his inherent cultivation approach. While dealing with the American situation in this period he does not direct his research apparatus toward the problem of language selection (referred to later by Fishman as maintenance and shift), but concentrates on a typical cultivation-type problem of interference. His concern seems to be primarily with the individual bilingual speaker - his deviation from the accepted standard, and his right to his own usage. The same attitude can be

observed also with regard to the language situation in contemporary Norway. In 1959 his picture was still one of two styles of the same language which were coming close one to the other (1959-1961, EL:142). This coincides with the inherent conviction of a structural linguist that developed communities do not suffer from the policy-type problems, and with their genuine surprise whenever language riots occur in the developed world (cf. Zgusta 1962). However, in his 1972 postscript to EL, Haugen rightly admits that 'his belief that the two [standards] were only "stylistic norms" has been shaken by the intransigence of the combatants' (EL:343). I would guess that his admittance is not merely a consequence of further developments in Norway but reflects a new, third approach to language problems.

This third approach which deserves Haugen's favorite term 'language PLANNING', has been called forth by the same factors which led to the turn toward post-structural linguistics in general: the renewed visibility of social stratification within communities, the emergence of world-wide networks, the recognition of the utility of science, and the optimism with regard to the possibility of a planned intervention into the life of the society. Thus under the planning approach definition of language problems widens considerably. Both the problem of selection of varieties and the problem of their maintenance ('servicing') are discussed. The former trend, which resembles the older policy approach, is especially conspicuous both with regard to the 'developing' and 'developed' languages. The latter trend, resembling the cultivation approach, is often used for English : e.g. the Labov-type of sociolinguistics and Bernstein's interest in restricted and elaborated codes, although not always formulated as a discussion of language problems, are among the representative examples of this trend.

With the three types of systems of language treatment in mind it will now be obvious that the theoretical approach to language planning presented by Haugen in the sixties is intrinsically different from

the structuralist attitudes to language problems. It is not only more programmatic and theoretical, but reveals a considerably broadened conception of problems in linguistic variation, and can safely be characterized as a component of the post-structural Sociolinguistics II.

It should also be noted that two other post-structural lines of thought can be observed in Haugen's sociolinguistics: one is the already mentioned interest in international linguistics. In his paper 'National and international languages' Haugen observes that 'If we transfer this situation to the international scene, we see that the world as a whole is in much the same state as were the nations of Europe at the time of the Renaissance and as many new nations are today'. (1966, EL:263). This is an interesting idea which deserves more elaboration. The second line of post-structural thought can be characterized as an attempt to reconcile linguistics with the fact of linguistic indeterminacy, gradience and the dynamic character of language (cf. Bailey, forthcoming). This idea appears quite early in Haugen's writings. In 1950 he wrote that 'language is probably not a closed system at all, but a complex congerie of interacting systems, open at both ends, namely the past and the future!' (EL:74). The same motif reoccurs with great frequency in his papers of the seventies (1970 EL:300, 304; forthcoming, EL:317; 1971, EL:335).

2. In the preceding paragraphs our attention was directed primarily toward Haugen's sociolinguistic thought. Thought, however, is only one of several COMPONENTS OF METALINGUISTIC SYSTEMS. It is not difficult to identify at least four other types of components: enquiry, communicative idiom, application, and the social system of the discipline.

Haugen's influence in sociolinguistics derives not only from his thought but also from his system of ENQUIRY. The

structuralist enquiry was based on the informant system. The study of bilingualism has however led Haugen quite early to the recognition that 'we cannot limit ourselves to the intensive study of one or two important informants with the reasonable insurance that these will be typical of the community as a whole' (Haugen 1953: 319-20). Within the post-structural sociolinguistics which is interested in variation and hence marked by an intensive call for empirical and data oriented studies, Haugen's American Norwegian surveys, his accounts of the Norwegian language treatment, his obvious knowledge of the language policies of other European languages, his Scandinavian semi-communication studies - all these considerably supported the prestige of his theoretical work.

The discipline of linguistics considered as communication about language, is one of the aspects which most readily escapes attention in metalinguistic accounts. As linguists, we possess within our overall system of communicative competence one or more systems of rules for transcribing our linguistic thought into messages and messages back into thought. Unless we employ the addressee's METALINGUISTIC IDIOM it is most probable that our messages will either not be accepted at all or that they will be misunderstood, however close our and our addressee's thought may be. A metalinguistic idiom has basically the same structure as any other linguistic variety: there are rules which assign elements of the social situation in which a message is produced to elements of communicative competence, and elements which transform these 'underlying structures' into 'surface structures'. The specific rules of metalinguistic idioms which have monopolized the attention of linguists are terminology systems. There are however others, such as variety rules (in which variety is a paper written?), setting rules (time of publication, journal, publisher), channel rules (spoken or written, printed or mimeographed, etc.), personnel (author's, reader's characteristics), message form rules (structuring, form of references etc.), and of course other semantic rules (which topics

and terms represent the elements of thought etc.). Some of the inter- and intra-community variation in metalinguistic idioms is certainly related to variation in linguistic thought, i.e. there are, among others, pre-structural, structural, and post-structural idioms. Some of the variation however is definitely only a difference of 'style' and should not be overemphasized.³

Haugen's sociolinguistic idiom is basically a variety of the American idiom of his period. However, it is characterized by a considerable variation range. Compare for instance his 'Problems of bilingualism' (Lingua 1950, EL 3), written in a rather free style, with the strictly descriptivist form of his 'The analysis of linguistic borrowing' (Language 1950, EL 4). The contrast is sharpened both by the identical date of publication, and the topical overlapping of both papers. I wonder to what extent Haugen's American contemporaries - to say nothing of their European colleagues - were able and/or prepared to vary their idiom with varying audiences. It is necessary to see this 'bilingualism' in connection also with Haugen's wide reading. His bibliographies are exceptionally rich and can in that respect be compared to those of U. Weinreich.

Among the 17 papers collected in EL only numbers 1, 2, 5 (extract from Haugen 1953), and 9 do not seem to be orally presented papers. This shows another significant feature, viz. the growing importance of the oral medium, which somewhat precedes the beginnings of post-structural linguistics. For contemporary American linguists the existence of oral linguistics may appear as an almost natural feature of their idiom: on closer inspection it appears that it is quite recent, and still subject to considerable geographical constraints.

Haugen has been responsible for launching quite a number of new sociolinguistic terms. He says of himself 'I discovered that I had been a sociolinguist all my life. But even so, the

emphasis is on the root of the word, the linguist' (EL:342-3) and this emphasis on the LINGUIST is true of his terminology as well. No wonder that those sociolinguists who put the emphasis on the first element of the word - and they seem to be in the majority - occasionally find that Haugen's usage, for instance of the word 'planning' as applied to the situation in Norway, does not coincide with its use in social sciences (Jernudd and Das Gupta 1971).

3. I have claimed above that it was Haugen who first developed a theory of language problems within the Sociolinguistics II variety of post-structural linguistics. At present we are witnessing a trend toward integration of various sociolinguistic and generative linguistic varieties of post-structural linguistics into a single paradigm. It is, I hope, not unfair to Haugen to mention here briefly at least three additional features of the future integrated theory of language problems⁴ which can be expected to result from the influence of other post-structural meta-linguistic trends and varieties.

First, the future theories of language problems will require that not simply the rules of language treatment (policy, cultivation, planning, etc.) but all similar rules are incorporated. One major type are rules of simple processes of correction (e.g. reissuing a miscomprehended utterance) which are not governed by such highly organized systems as the systems of language treatment. Another major type of solution of language problems are the systems of language teaching. The whole area of language problems must be mapped, and all components accommodated within the integrated theory.

Secondly, it will not suffice to collate all these components and place them side by side with the grammatical rules of language. The various systems of solution of language problems must be accommodated within a single theory, and this theory must be connected with the existing grammatical theories of language. Notice that Haugen's theory of language planning was an addition to grammar

but did not form with it one integral whole. It seems to me that this requirement can be satisfied if we reformulate 'language problems' as the occurrence of an 'inadequacy' marker which may switch on certain 'correction', 'treatment' or similar rules operating along with or subsequent to generative rules of language. Language planning then can be treated as one extreme case of a linguistic process known to us in forms such as Labov's hypercorrection, speaker's correction of his lexical selection, request for clarification, correction of children's speech, translation of a book, a foreign language teaching class, an act of literary criticism etc.

Thirdly, there is the requirement of encompassing within the theory of language problems not merely grammatical competence but the whole of the communicative competence of language users. Haugen's theory, although in some respects overstepping the boundaries of 'grammatical linguistics', is basically grammar-lexicon-phonology centred. It does not pay sufficient attention to language problems of communicative settings, networks, topics, channels, etc. The right of an individual to his language, the establishment of the modern language of drama, communication of social distance among participants, speech particularism, and many other 'micro-linguistic' problems (cf. Neustupný, forthcoming) constitute salient language problems which must be fully accounted for within a post-structural theory of language problems.

Even when these and other changes in the theories of language problems may take place, Haugen's contribution will remain of basic value - the more so as his chapter written for a historiographer of linguistics seems to be still adding newer and newer pages.

FOOTNOTES

¹It seems to make sense to group under the heading of Sociolinguistics II all sociolinguistic work pertaining to linguistic variation (Fishman-type, Gumperz-type, Labov-type, etc.). In the same way I propose to call all trends analogous to Hymes' 'ethnography of communication' Sociolinguistics III.

²This scheme alters somewhat my original suggestions presented at the symposium Current Frontiers in Linguistic Anthropology, Kyoto 1968 (cf. Neustupný 1970). I am greatly indebted to B. Jernudd for continuous discussion of the scheme and suggestions toward its improvement (cf. Jernudd 1973).

³A typical negative reaction of an intolerant 'cannibal' linguist to a foreign idiom relegates variation to incoherence in thought : topics which do not agree with one's own idiom supposedly originate in misunderstanding of the role of linguistics.

⁴An excellent survey of new developments in the discipline is available in Rubin 1973.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, Ch.-J. Forthcoming. Contributions of the study of variation to the framework of the new linguistics.
- Haugen, E. 1953. The Norwegian language in America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 2 vols.
- _____ 1956. Bilingualism in the Americas : a bibliography and a research guide. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- _____ 1966. Language conflict and language planning. The case of modern Norwegian. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Jernudd, B. 1971. Review of E. Haugen, Language conflict and language planning : the case of modern Norwegian. Lg. 47:490-3.
- _____ 1973. Language planning as a type of language treatment. Language planning : current issues and research, ed. by

- J. Rubin and R. Shuy, 11-23. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- _____ and J. Das Gupta. 1971. Towards a theory of language planning. Can language be planned? ed. by J. Rubin and B.H. Jernudd, 195-215. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.
- Neustupný, J.V. 1968. Some general aspects of 'language' problems and 'language' policy in developing societies. Language problems of developing nations, ed. by J.A. Fishman, Ch.A. Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta, 285-294. New York: Wiley.
- _____ 1970. Basic types of treatment of language problems. Linguistic Communications I. 77-98.
- _____ Forthcoming. The modernization of the Japanese system of communication. Language in Society.
- Rubin, J. 1973. Language planning: discussion of some current issues. Language planning: current issues and research, ed. by J. Rubin and R. Shuy, 1-10. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Zgusta, L. 1962. Simeon Potter's Modern Linguistics: some remarks. Archiv orientální 30. 156-165.