Richard Hodgson and
Ralph Sarkonak

Bilingualism and Visible Language

Graphic Collisions: Languages in Contact

Department of French
797-1873 East Mall
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1W5
Canada

The problems of bilingualism and of languages in contact are ones which are best studied in an interdisciplinary context. Languages "collide" in many different ways and for many different reasons. The "collisions" or *contacts* (and the resulting *conflicts*) can take place for historical, political, social, cultural, and economic reasons, or simply because the source language has become fashionable. They can take place within the boundaries of a single country, often a former colony of the "mother" country, or between such geographically distant countries as the United States and Japan. Just as the *contexts* of language contact can vary, so can the types of contact, whether it be interference, integration, or code-switching.

"It is thus in a broad psychological and socio-cultural setting that language contact can best be understood ... On an interdisciplinary basis research into language contact achieves increased depth and validity."   Uriel Weinreich[1]

"The subject of bilingualism, then, is a very real concern to a substantial number of people whose lives involve the use of two or more languages. It does not exist merely to satisfy the strange appetites of social scientists."   Kenji Hakuta[2]

KIDNAPPÉ, GEBABYSIT, SOLRAININGOTAS: These three words from French, Dutch and a Chicano poem say it all, concretely, graphically, visibly. "Kidnapped," "babysat," and "sun-raining-drops" — Juan Herrera's poetic neologism — such is the reality of life in the world of today, a world in which it has been estimated that half of the globe's population is bilingual.[3] Here the bilingualism[4] is centered on words which underscore the linguistic contact between English and French, English and Dutch, and English and Spanish respectively. Whether they fall into the categories labelled "integration" or "code-switching" (see below), the important point is that in their lexical, morphological, and orthographic configura-tions, these words remind us that bilingualism is not, nor has it ever been, a mere academic problem, something, in the words of Hakuta quoted above, "to satisfy the strange appetites of social scientists."

In order to come to grips with the problem of bilin-gualism, it is necessary to cross the boundaries which traditionally have separated the various disciplines devoted to language phenomena. Fields as diverse as sociolinguistics, the comparative study of two or more languages, as well as typography and the analysis of literary texts — all have a contribution to make to the study of "languages in contact and/or conflict." By its very nature, the subject tends to lead to *inter-disciplinary* projects. Hence the word "collisions" in our title is to be read not only as those of the

languages in contact, but also of the approaches taken
to study such a problem. Surely it is proof of the
complexity of the subject that such diverse disciplines
and methodological approaches can and must be
utilized if one is to arrive at even a partial under-
standing of such a widespread human phenomenon.

A Concrete Problem

Unlike much that has been published on bilingual-
ism, the focus in this issue is squarely on written
language, both in a societal context, as well as that of
the individual. Like others which have appeared in
Visible Language, this project is "concerned with
research and ideas that help define the unique role
and properties of written language."[5] The colliding
languages are therefore to be taken literally in their
visible form, both the material and the literary.[6]
Of course, spoken language is of central importance
to bilingualism. However, here it will be studied
primarily as it relates to written language, e.g. the
problem of spelling foreign borrowings. What is at
issue, then, are the visible, graphic aspects of lan-
guage contact, and in particular the concrete manifes-
tations of bilingualism in various national settings
such as English and French in Canada, Spanish
and English in the United States.[7] Thus our focus is
mainly on *specific* bilingual contexts, while at the
same time the wider theoretical implications of the
question will also be raised. To be more precise, our
focus is on the sociolinguistic dimensions of bilingual-
ism, rather than on the psychological or psycholin-
guistic aspects. Finally, it should be stated that the
question of bilingual education as such will not be
touched upon, although some of the issues raised here
do have important implications for that field.

Types of Contact

Language contact takes place in a myriad of forms
and situations, all of which involve both linguistic
and extralinguistic factors.[8] Historical and political
considerations are often the most important. When

two linguistic groups are in contact, the contact is rarely one of equals: there is usually a majority or dominant language and a minority or dominated language. One thinks immediately of the complex and troubling situation of French and English in Canada.

For historical reasons going back to the exploration of the American continent by Frenchmen in the sixteenth century, and the establishment of the first European enclaves along the St. Lawrence River and on the shores of the Bay of Fundy in the seventeenth century, French gained a foothold in Canada which was to long outlast the military defeat of France in 1759.[9] Today, although the province of Quebec is 87% French-speaking, 67% of the population of Canada as a whole is English-speaking and only 13% of the total population is bilingual.[10] Furthermore, as English has grown in prestige and use, even French-speaking Quebeckers have felt their language to be threatened by the onslaught of English across the continent and, indeed, throughout the world:

The darker, aggressive side of global English is the elimination of regional language variety, the attack on deep cultural roots. Perhaps the most dramatic example of the power of English can be found in Canada, which shares a 3000-mile border with the USA. Canadian English has been colonized by American English, especially in the mass media, and the French-speaking third of the community living mainly in Quebec, has felt threatened to breaking point.[11]

As is usual in a language-contact situation, the minority language is affected more than the majority language. The dominated language is the one which borrows the dominating language's words and structures, even to the point where the very future of the minority language may be in jeopardy. In the context of Quebec, not only is French surrounded by English on all sides, so to speak, but English has permeated

the essence of spoken French, especially in a form known as *joual* (from Fr. *cheval*, "horse"). Characterized by extensive creolization and anglicization, *joual* represents the results of centuries of political domination:

> Joual ... is what happened to a language under oppression, but not oppression from people who speak the same language as the oppressed — from people who speak another [language].[12]

Although contacts of a social and cultural nature are often rooted in history and politics, the daily existence of the bilingual speaker is eloquent testimony to the continued nature of this linguistic (over) exposure. As Lauro Flores states in his contribution, "the alternation and combination of English and Spanish respond to the *social* situation of the Chicanos, a situation in which several levels of both languages coexist, influence each other and, therefore, come into play in the linguistic evolution of this people" [Our italics].[13] The linguistic configuration of the literary text, in this case Chicano poetry, mirrors the social contacts of the two linguistic groups in a bilingual community where code-switching is a common and indeed necessary occurrence if the bilingual is to communicate his thoughts and ideas. And in another part of North America, Phyllis Wrenn has studied a similar form of language contact in Franco-Acadian. She writes: "the presence of unassimilated and only partially integrated English words and phrases underscores the linguistic reality behind the isolated and sporadic lexical borrowings: [the nineteenth century's writer's] world, like that of her twentieth century compatriots, was a bilingual existence."[14] The textual artifact mirrors the writer's life which in turn mirrors the language and the society of her contemporaries. Here again bilingualism is part and parcel of the cultural fabric of the society in question, whether that society be that of the twentieth century Southwest or nineteenth century New Brunswick.

Other language contacts are grounded in economics and even fashion, as demonstrated in present day Japan by the use of so-called "Japlish," a hybrid of Japanese and English.[15] No doubt it is not by chance that the word used to describe the "marriage" of these languages in contact is an English word. Today's global village is more often than not bilingual, and it is largely bilingual in English due to the cultural prestige and economic clout of the United States:

It is the non-linguistic forces — cultural, social, economic and political — that have made English the first world language in human history and instilled its driving force. Language is neutral, passive: only the uses to which it is put make it active.[16]

The educated Roman's existence was a bilingual one because of the cultural prestige of Greek. Latin was spread throughout not just the Roman Empire but later on much of Christendom. One should also not forget that French remained the language of the cultural elite, throughout both Europe and the world, for over two hundred years, from the Enlightenment to the middle of this century. Finally, it is often economic realities which give rise to the birth of pidgin languages, such as Chinook in the American Northwest where white traders used a lingua franca to communicate with the Indians.

Conflicts and Convergences

Language contacts occur in three general types of political situation: intra-national, inter-national and a third or intermediate category which brings into play (ex)colonial languages, i.e. the linguistic stuff and remains of empire.

On the national scene, the officially bilingual state, such as Belgium, Canada, or Wales, is a rarer phenomenon than the monolingual state, such as the United States.[17] Official and individual or even group bilingualism are not to be confused, since the

Official Languages
in Contact

A page of The Constitution Act, 1982 of Canada, an officially bilingual country, which sets out in English and French, the equal authority in law of both versions of the document. Note the two-column format, the English and French glosses, and the use of both the English and French names of Quebec, e.g. the acute accent is used to spell Québec in the French version, whereas the word is written without an accent in English, which is standard practice in Anglophone Canada. The head of state, the Queen (la Reine), receives a capital in both languages, whereas her representative, the Governor General, like the Great Seal, is not capitalized in French following normal French-language practice. The use of bold face, roman and italic type is identical in both versions; the punctuation, however, follows the practice of the language in question. The translations mentioned in article 55 refer to Canada's earlier constitutional documents, many of which, including Canada's original "constitution," The British North America Act (1867), were passed by the imperial British Parliament at Westminster in English only. Article 59 of the document illustrated spells out certain exceptions to another section entitled "Minority Language Educational Rights." *Reproduced with the permission of the Minister of Supply and Services Canada.*

Repeal of Part IV.1 and this section
54.1 Part IV.1 and this section are repealed on April 18, 1987. (SI/84-102)

French version of Constitution of Canada
55. A French version of the portions of the Constitution of Canada referred to in the schedule shall be prepared by the Minister of Justice of Canada as expeditiously as possible and, when any portion thereof sufficient to warrant action being taken has been so prepared, it shall be put forward for enactment by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada pursuant to the procedure then applicable to an amendment of the same provisions of the Constitution of Canada.

English and French versions of certain constitutional texts
56. Where any portion of the Constitution of Canada has been or is enacted in English and French or where a French version of any portion of the Constitution is enacted pursuant to section 55, the English and French versions of that portion of the Constitution are equally authoritative.

English and French versions of this Act
57. The English and French versions of this Act are equally authoritative.

Commencement
*58. Subject to section 59, this Act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation issued by the Queen or the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada.

Commencement of paragraph 23(1)(a) in respect of Quebec
59. (1) Paragraph 23(1)(*a*) shall come into force in respect of Quebec on a day to be fixed by proclamation issued by the Queen or the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada.

Authorization of Quebec
(2) A proclamation under subsection (1) shall be issued only where authorized by the legislative assembly or government of Quebec.

Repeal of this section
(3) This section may be repealed on the day paragraph 23(1)(*a*) comes into force in respect of Quebec and

---

* The Act, with the exception of paragraph 23(1)(*a*) in respect of Quebec, came into force on April 17, 1982 by proclamation issued by the Queen. *See* SI/82-97.

Abrogation de la Partie IV.1 et du présent article
54.1 La Partie IV.1 et le présent article sont abrogés le 18 avril 1987. (TR/84-102)

Version française de certains textes constitutionnels
55. Le ministre de la Justice du Canada est chargé de rédiger, dans les meilleurs délais, la version française des parties de la Constitution du Canada qui figurent à l'annexe; toute partie suffisamment importante est, dès qu'elle est prête, déposée pour adoption par proclamation du gouverneur général sous le grand sceau du Canada, conformément à la procédure applicable à l'époque à la modification des dispositions constitutionnelles qu'elle contient.

Versions française et anglaise de certains textes constitutionnels
56. Les versions française et anglaise des parties de la Constitution du Canada adoptées dans ces deux langues ont également force de loi. En outre, ont également force de loi, dès l'adoption, dans le cadre de l'article 55, d'une partie de la version française de la Constitution, cette partie et la version anglaise correspondante.

Versions française et anglaise de la présente loi
57. Les versions française et anglaise de la présente loi ont également force de loi.

Entrée en vigueur
*58. Sous réserve de l'article 59, la présente loi entre en vigueur à la date fixée par proclamation de la Reine ou du gouverneur général sous le grand sceau du Canada.

Entrée en vigueur de l'alinéa 23(1)a) pour le Québec
59. (1) L'alinéa 23(1)*a*) entre en vigueur pour le Québec à la date fixée par proclamation de la Reine ou du gouverneur général sous le grand sceau du Canada.

Autorisation du Québec
(2) La proclamation visée au paragraphe (1) ne peut être prise qu'après autorisation de l'assemblée législative ou du gouvernement du Québec.

Abrogation du présent article
(3) Le présent article peut être abrogé à la date d'entrée en vigueur de l'alinéa 23(1)*a*) pour le Québec, et

---

* La loi, à l'exception de l'alinéa 23(1)*a*) pour le Québec, est entrée en vigueur le 17 avril 1982 par proclamation de la Reine. *Voir* TR/82-97.

20

object of the bilingual state is not usually to create or foster bilingualism, but rather to preserve and protect the monolingualism of its inhabitants, and in particular of the linguistic minority.[18] The situation is further complicated by the fact that in Canada, for example, which is an officially bilingual country, there is only one member province which is also officially bilingual: New Brunswick. And since the passage in 1977 of the "infamous" Bill 101, or "Charte de la langue française," French is the only official language in the province of Quebec, although provision is made for English-language state-run schools for native-born Canadian Anglophones. As for Wales, it is an officially bilingual state within a monolingual state (the United Kingdom). Alistair Crawford's article, "Bilingual Typography," highlights the problems of typography in a country where Welsh/English bilingualism may well be leading to English monolingualism.[19] Language conflicts, however, are not limited to the bilingual state. As Ridge states,

The bilingual/bicultural dilemma is no stranger to other nations in the world. Few countries count on the benefits of having a homogeneous population; fewer still have enjoyed internal calm. Most have faced domestic rivalries, separatist movements, covert discrimination, or militant repression.[20]

The examples of the Breton and Occitan languages in what is surely one of the most centralized monolingual countries that has ever existed, i.e. France, prove the point. On the other hand, in the United States, bilingualism has always been a passing and transitional state, as succeeding waves of immigrants have been progressively anglicized and assimilated into the linguistic and cultural melting pot.

In the intermediate category, one might distinguish between imperial languages (such as Latin in the Roman Empire and Russian in the Soviet Union) and ex-colonial languages, for the geopolitical realities are different. In the case of what we call imperial

languages, one political power took over other existing countries in a more or less contiguous land mass area, while in the case of the colonial languages, the dominant political power exported its language and culture to widely separate and different parts of the world:

> The great world languages of today are languages of empire, past and present. Only two, Mandarin Chinese and Russian, continue as languages of administration within single, ethnolinguistically diverse states. The others — Arabic, English, French, and Spanish — are imperial legacies, having survived the disintegration of the empires that fostered them.[21]

Whether it be use of English in India or of French in Senegal, the continued presence of the ex-colonial language in such former British and French colonies, alongside languages indigenous to the populations of many such countries which gained their independence in this century, is definitely a major factor contributing to bilingualism as a worldwide phenomenon. To the complexities of the love/hate relationship which characterize the feelings of the ex-colonials toward the former mother countries are added the ambivalent emotions caused by using a world-class language which is not their native language.

Finally, there is inter-national bilingualism, i.e. the influence of a foreign language on an officially monolingual state, as caused by the sociocultural and economic factors already mentioned. In his article, "Foreign Loanwords in Dutch: Integration and Adaptation," Henry Schogt points out how, in the process of *adopting* an English word, Dutch has *adapted* it visibly and therefore made it unrecognizable to a native English speaker.[22] The word in question is *Tiesjirt*, ("T shirt"), another version of which exists in Japan where it is called *T-shatsu*. The two examples are all the more interesting because of the fact that the word (along with the thing) has been exported to two "old" continents, Europe and Asia. Here the cultural prestige of the source contact

language, English, is of paramount importance. Geographic proximity is not a factor here, since the contact occurs largely via jet planes and the electronic media.

Again we are confronted with the international character of English in the contemporary world atlas of languages. English has become the "Latin" of the modern world, hence the multitude of borrowings from English and the predominant nature of its influence on almost all other languages. According to a study mentioned by Fishman, "English was the only official language or co-official language in 20 countries. In an additional 36 countries it held a privileged status..."[23] Now the borrowings and influence are, in the case of inter-national, as opposed to intermediate, bilingualism at least partially voluntary, since here we are dealing with cultural rather than political imperialism. However, the cultural pressure is no doubt (almost) as great as the political. To come back to the case of the anglicized dialect of French in Quebec known as *joual*, one if its earliest and most eloquent critics wrote:

This brings us to the heart of the problem, which is a problem of civilization. Our schoolchildren speak joual because they think joual, and they think joual because they live joual.... The joual life is rock'n'roll and hot dogs, partying and bombing around, etc. It is our whole civilization that is joual.[24]

While it would be incorrect to equate bilingualism with biculturalism — many bilinguals are monocultural[25] — there can be no doubt that the all-pervasive influence of English on the languages and cultures of the world today is creating something like the beginnings of a world culture. Proof of that is to be found in the fact that even the often ethnocentric French cannot resist the impetus and momentum of English borrowings, which lead to the creation of what one French writer named "Franglais," a kind of mid-

Atlantic pidgin which now includes such terms as *le car ferry*, *l'Hovercraft*, *le Walkman*, not to mention *le break dance* and *le compact disk!*[26]

Contexts and Codes

Bilingualism affects the smallest units of language, sounds of course, but also the characters of type used to print *letters*, for, as Crawford points out in his article on bilingual typography, "the two languages [of a bilingual text can] remain in perpetual confusion and conflict." Furthermore, since the incidence of characters will always be different in different languages, using a type font designed for another language will create obvious problems. In the case of the history of Welsh printing practices, the wrong characters were often used since the setting of texts was materially determined by the contents of the English typesetter's font. Cultural, political or social domination lead directly to typographical domination, the result being that the reading of a unilingual text set according to what are different "rules of the game" becomes difficult if not well nigh impossible. Intra-national bilingualism (within one political entity) thus can lead to the point where the minority or dominated language becomes *visibly* affected, altered and even made illegible, due to the very nature of the two languages which are in perpetual contact and here, conflict. Ideally, of course, things should work out very differently.

> "In combining any two languages into one typographic harmony, the designer will have to deal with copy of different length (representing the same message) differing in the size of the average word, sentence and paragraph; and differing in the incidence of certain letters of the alphabet, characteristic of each language."[27]

The risk of typographical conflict will be all the greater if the languages share the same writing system. This is obviously not the case with Japanese

and English: Roman letters can be utilized in Japanese texts and this will not affect the integrity and identity of the base language since the two systems remain visibly and typographically different, however much the two languages come into contact. On the other hand, the risk of real conflict, as in the case of Welsh and English, will be all the greater if the languages share the same alphabet. As Crawford points out in his contribution to the present issue, "The Welsh language had the additional disadvantage in as much as it did not *seem* to have a visual identity of its own precisely because it *appeared* to use the same alphabet system as English."

The question of *words* in conflict poses the problem of interference and integration. Interference carries with it the negative connotation of perceived error or deviation from the linguistic norm of one language due to the influence of another language with which the speaker/writer of the first is in contact. However, as Haugen points out, what may be seen one day as interference (for example the word *data* used as a singular in English) may become accepted usage the next:

The traditional term for such interlingual influence has been *borrowing* (hence the many terms involving "loan," German *Lehn...*). The term *interference* was introduced by Weinreich as "a deviation from the norms of one language under influence from those of another"....This definition is elastic since any such deviation will, if repeated and accepted by the community, become part of the norm, whereupon it ceases to be a case of interference.[28]

Integration can thus be seen as "the assimilation and convergence of the characteristics and rules of the contact languages."[29] As the Commissioner of the Commissariat Général de la Langue Française, Philippe de Saint-Robert, recently pointed out, "Borrowed words can play a part in the life of a language as long as the language has a genius for

integrating them and not submitting to them."[30] In point of fact, the matter is a delicate one and the distinction tends to blur. According to Mackey, "The question of whether or not a given element belongs to both codes or only to one does not take a yes/no answer. It is also a matter of degree."[31] To come back to one of our original examples, in contemporary Dutch, *gebabysit* would appear to be an accepted and assimilated borrowing (morpho-syntactic and lexical integration), whereas "he wants I should go" is still perceived in English as morpho-syntactic interference.

The contact between two languages can also take the form of *code-switching*, that is of switching from one language to another within a single utterance. While one thinks of code-switching at the level of texts, as say in a work of literary criticism where the critic cites the text studied in the original Latin or French within his own commentary or discourse in English, such a shift can also affect smaller units, including words:[32]

> **code-switching involves shifting from one grammatical system to another. It is distinguished from borrowing in that the latter involves taking a term from another language and adapting it to one's own grammatical system, phonologically, morphologically, syntactically or semantically. Where the two systems are maintained as distinct entities but juxtaposed within the same discourse, we have a case of code-switching.[33]**

Thus it can be seen that a tripartite distinction can be made in which partial interference is the middle or transitional stage between complete code-switching and total assimilation or integration. As Grosjean states, "switching...is the alternate use of two languages...; interference, the overlapping of two languages, and integration, the use of words or phrases from one language that have become so much a part of the other that it cannot be called either switching or overlapping except in a historical sense."[34]

Finally, it should be noted that all three processes — from switching to integration via interference — can be found in both nonliterary as well as literary texts, not to mention daily speech. Among our contributors, Schogt's examples are nonliterary, Flores's are literary and Wrenn's are both nonliterary and literary. The question is further complicated by the fact that all linguistic levels may be involved in the processes of interference and/or integration occurring between the source and target languages: phonological and orthographic, morphological and syntactic, not to mention lexical and semantic. And in the case of code-switching, the language shifts may be so frequent that it is difficult if not pointless to attempt to establish the so-called base language of the utterance. The languages in contact may thus produce what could be said to be a truly *bilingual* text.

The Authors' Contributions

Alistair Crawford raises a question which has seldom been studied, although the practice itself is not that uncommon: bilingual typography. Central to Crawford's argument is the crucial question: must typography continue to have a "peripheral and limited" relationship to language? This problem is in turn related to the one that we raised earlier concerning the political dimension of the bilingual problem. In fact, the two problems are closely linked since it is less likely that the typography in a minority language will ever have been studied or refined. Crawford places the emphasis squarely on "the cultural domination of the majority language over the minority," a domination which is of course reflected in typographical practice. "The history of printing and typography is also a history of politics." What is more, "the history of language is also a history of suppression," i.e. suppression of the rights of the linguistic minority. Note that here we are dealing with majority rule in the context of one political jurisdiction (although the status of Wales as a country is somewhat problematic given its partial political autonomy). Many a demo-

crat would no doubt applaud official bilingualism in the context of a bilingual community. As mentioned, such bilingualism is often instituted not to encourage individual bilingualism, although that too may be attained, but rather to protect the rights of the dominated language (in numerical and therefore political and sociocultural terms). What would be less obvious to that democrat is that under the cover of official bilingualism, even the most rigorously bilingual document may not only hide but actually perpetuate the domination of the minority. Not in the actual message or due to an inaccurate or insulting translation — all of which, to our own personal knowledge, have been only all too common in Canada — but rather because of the actual typography of the text. Who is to tell how often a reader in a bilingual country, such as Wales or Canada or Belgium, has stopped reading a text printed in the minority language (but set according to the typographical practices of the majority language), due to eye strain, fatigue, or outright frustration? Of course, the linguistic oppression would be invisible to a monolingual who does not know the language in question and therefore does not concern himself with whether or not the typography is *language-based*. The point is that each language has its own "visual characteristics" which are unique to it and which must be taken into account when typefaces are designed. As Crawford puts it so clearly and succinctly,

> No two languages could ever manifest themselves in precisely the same visual shape even if they use the same alphabet since the particular frequency of letters associated one with another is distinct and determines the visual presentation of the language: its shape and format.

The "shape and format" of each language is indeed unique, something which has often been appreciated more by poets, such as Mallarmé and Apollinaire, than designers, one fears. Ideally, then, to prevent typographical interference, the minority language

should have its own typographical system distinct and separate from the majority's language system, especially if the former uses the same alphabet as the latter. If not, the collisions risk being very graphic indeed, all the more so since they will (by definition) remain *invisible* to so many designers and typographers. What is needed, then, is a kind of typographic and bilingual good will: the will to *see* the other's language as a unique and independent system. By reminding us of the importance of each language's shape and format, Crawford's article is a fitting beginning to this, our quest to study languages in contact and conflict.

Henry Schogt's study takes the reader to the realm of lexical and orthographic borrowings from a variety of source languages into modern Dutch. As a case study in loanwords, Schogt's study provides the concrete underpinning to any theoretical formation of the more general problem of interference and integration. One presumes that borrowings are made to fill lexical gaps or *lacunae* in the target language. However, much more is at stake here, since it is also a question of fashion, prestige and broad cultural appeal. The frequency with which the target language borrows from specific source languages is never an arbitrary matter. One could say that the contact is not just a "brief encounter"! As Schogt points out, the frequency of borrowings reflect the cultural and political hegemony of the source language. Hence, the number of Germanisms borrowed during World War II and the occupation of Holland. If French loanwords were common in an earlier time, today's borrowings reflect the prestige and importance of English as an international language and the United States as cultural model: "the preference for English stems from a desire to be dynamic and up-to-date, or at least to give that impression." Schogt's study devotes great attention to the details of spelling loanwords, for this is a kind of measuring stick by which one may tell the extent to which the foreign language is familiar to the general Dutch population.

Paradoxically, knowledge of the source language may well slow down the process of integration. The choice of Dutch as a case study of loanwords is a good one, not just because the language is not as well known as French, thus permitting a fresh look at the linguistic phenomena in question, but also because of the geopolitical situation of Holland. A small country at the crossraods if not the center of Europe, officially monolingual Holland has traditionally been intellectually and culturally receptive to new ideas and welcoming to the foreigners who, throughout history, arrived with their philosophies and languages. Such an attitude is reflected in the openness of the Dutch; and one might say that the language contact here has generally been a happy affair.

Like Schogt, Bernard Saint-Jacques studies foreign borrowings in the context of daily life. As in the case of Holland, Japan is also a monolingual country; furthermore, it has been seen as one of the most monolingual countries on the face of the globe today. However, Japan too has been open to other languages, particularly in her writing system. Today Japanese combines three types of writing: ideographic or morphemic (the kanji of Chinese origin), syllabic and now alphabetic. The relatively recent vogue of Roman letters and, especially, of English words printed in Roman, offers an example of change. Traditionally foreign words were written in the katakana syllabary. Today the "second Chinese invasion" of Japan has nothing Chinese about it, except for the paradigm of assimilation, by which the Japanese incorporate various writing systems originating in languages very different from their own. Saint-Jacques emphasizes the point, as Schogt does, that fashion plays a big part in this adoption of foreign words and letters. In today's Japan, our alphabet, not just the words written in it, has a positive connotation: the Roman alphabet is modern, it is "in," as Saint-Jacques puts it and as his illustrations so aptly demonstrate. Closely linked to commercialism, the alphabet is often used to sell a

product and in fact the product being sold is less the article itself than the concept or notion of foreignness and modernity. The message actually conveyed may turn out, as it often does, to be totally redundant, as in the graphically bilingual titles of newspapers. The fact that some of the borrowings appear strange or amusing to native speakers of the source languages proves that referential meaning has very definitely taken a backseat to connotation. It is the "shape and format" of those so foreign-looking characters and words which attract the Japanese. Reading Saint-Jacques's study is an opportunity for us to see our own language and to appreciate its unique visibility, a visibility which all too often we do not see since there is no other writing system to set it off, to put it in high graphic relief. The French poet and teacher of English, Stéphane Mallarmé, once said that one never sees a word better than from the out-side, from a foreign country.[35] Perhaps we have to journey to Japan (at least in our imagination) in order to visualize and appreciate the essential "foreignness" of our own all too familiar writing system.

Amongst many other excellent qualities, Phyllis Wrenn's article functions as a transition between, on the one hand, Schogt and Saint-Jacques, and, on the other hand, Flores. Like the former two, she treats borrowings and the question of adaptation and integration, and like the latter, she also treats code-switching, especially for aesthetic purposes in the context of the literary text. What is more, the literary language which Wrenn discusses is not in the high-flown or sublime mode; rather it deals with everyday life situations. On the other hand, one should point out that, unlike the previous articles mentioned, Wrenn is dealing with texts of some length, as opposed to the context of language as such or short utterances (in the case of advertising slogans).

Once again we find ourselves in the situation of bilingualism, both official and individual, the majority language being English and the minority Acadian

French as it is used in the maritime provinces of Canada, especially Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. A minority within a minority, the Acadians are of course French Canadians but could not, nor would they want to, be considered as Quebeckers. Unlike French-speaking Quebeckers, who account for 87% of the population of Quebec, the Francophone population only constitutes 34% of New Brunswick. Interestingly, Acadians are the most bilingual of Canadians: just over 50% are bilingual.[36] Such is the inheritance of empire from the point of view of descendants of ancestors who were doubly colonial, both of the French and British empires in North America. In 1755, some 16,000 Acadians were expelled by the British from their homeland (cf. Longfellow's poem "Evangeline"). Many ended up settling in Louisiana where they became known as Cajuns (from Fr. *Acadiens*). Later, some were to embark on the long hike back to Acadia, a tale that has been told in a recent bestseller written by one of the authors studied, Antonine Maillet.[37]

Wrenn has accumulated an imposing amount of documentation on code-switching and orthographic (as well as other forms) of integration in written texts. Crucial to her argument is the point that we are not dealing merely with a form of anglicized and there-fore impoverished French, a typical accusation that is made against such language mixing. For Wrenn, it is rather a question of the writers' playing with the languages in contact. However, such play is not merely gratuitous; rather it is part and parcel of the aesthetic process of writing a literary text. Now the texts in question have a highly visual impact, due to the unfamiliar spelling adaptation (integration) of words which would no doubt be otherwise familiar in English. Reading thus requires an extra effort and "it is because of this effort that the written text gains its significance as *visible* language" (author's empha-sis). Since complete visibility would no doubt lead to total unreadability — here one thinks of the use of Roman characters in Japan —, "the varied treatment

of the orthography of English words, like that of the French text itself, thus represents a compromise between accessibility, readability and novelty."
What we are dealing with, then, is an acute situation of languages in contact for a variety of reasons: historical, societal, cultural, political, as well as specifically linguistic and literary. Presenting a strong similarity with the situation of their Welsh counterparts, the Acadians live the bilingual life of a language minority within the confines of their own homeland. Anglicisms reflect a reality of daily life, the situation of two unequal languages in contact within one political entity. The words of the writers, like the world about which they write, overlap all the while underscoring the languages in contact. Bilingualism is "bred in the bone" — in the tissue of human beings and texts alike.

Lauro Flores's lucid account of code-switching in Chicano poetry rounds out the issue, giving it a completeness which would be otherwise lacking. It is fitting to come home, so to speak, to the situation of languages in contact within an officially monolingual country, not just any country, but that which, according to some, has been home to more bilinguals than any other.[38]

As in Wrenn's article, Flores answers the charge that by mixing the languages, the poets in question are just butchering both languages, creating a bastardized hybrid of little interest or creative fertility: "code-switching provides Chicano and other bilingual poets with a broader set of stylistic choices and, therefore, allows them to enhance the aesthetic value of their works." The beautiful poetic image, *solrainingotas*, aside from furnishing an excellent example of language contact within the bounds of one compound word, also aptly answers the charge of language butchery. It is not by chance that the poetry analyzed here was written by poets who think of themselves as *Chicanos*. The word replaced the expression *Mexican-American*, much as *Québécois* came to replace the term *French-Canadian* in the

1960s. As Flores puts it, "many Chicanos felt [the old label] placed them in limbo, in the nothingness of the hyphen connecting the two words."[39] Once again the important link between culture and language, or rather languages, is emphasized, for it is not without irony that "in asserting their autonomy and cultural uniqueness, Chicanos decide to use, or at least partially through the technique of code-switching, the language of the dominant culture," as Flores states. As in Wrenn's analysis of Franco-Acadian texts, the reality of the bilingual text corresponds to the reality of daily life in two languages, complete with all the problems that bilingualism can and no doubt does create, but also with all of life's joys and sorrows, in short, with all the stuff of poetry. The contact is doubly vivid, for it exists in both the thematic content of the works, as well as the verbal structures and patterns of the words upon the page. The colliding of the cultures and the languages is thus eminently graphic, and totally visible for all to see, to read and to enjoy.

Graphic Collisions

The contacts are there for all to behold, in the words, in the texts. And the collisions are GRAPHIC. Why collisions? Perhaps because the word leads to two readings or models. In the first, the contact, or the conflict, is seen as a situation that is costly, unpleasant, and to be avoided. In this case, one thinks of an automobile collision. However, there is another kind of collision that can also stand as the symbol of our enterprise: like colliding subatomic particles, the contact of languages can be seen as a natural process with positive effects, such as the renewal or revitalization of the languages in contact. Here, one might evoke the metaphor of (trans)fusion, for the processes are life giving. As Haugen points out, a "confusion of tongues" need not necessarily lead to a "confusion of communication."[40] Au contraire. Problems there are, but surely the possible, even probable release of linguistic energy that results from languages in contact is well worth the price of these not so predictable COLLISIONS.

Notes

1 Weinreich, Uriel. 1968 *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems.* The Hague: Mouton, 4.

2 Hakuta, Kenji. 1986. *Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism.* New York: Basic Books, 6.

3 Grosjean, François. 1982 *Life with Two Languages. An Introduction to Bilingualism.* Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard UP, vii. Nor is bilingualism a problem which only affects "other" people in foreign countries. As Hakuta points out, "In its short history, the United States has probably been host to more bilingual people than any other country in the world" (*Mirror of Language*, 166).

4 Cf. "In the present study, two or more languages will be said to be **in contact** if they are used alternately by the same persons. The language-using individuals are thus the locus of the contact.

"The practice of alternately using two languages will be called **bilingualism**, and the persons involved **bilingual**" (Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, 1).

5 Wrolstad, Merald. 1986 "General Information," *Visible Language*, XX, 1 (Winter) 3.

6 Cf. ibid.

7 For this reason, a merely *visual* language such as ASL (American Sign Language) used by the deaf will not be discussed here, although it is certainly part of the question of bilingualism in contemporary American society. Cf. Grosjean, *Life with Two Languages*, 84-88.

8 "Bilingualism, in addition to being a linguistic concept, refers to a constellation of tensions having to do with a multitude of psychological, societal, and political realities" (Hakuta, *Mirror of Language*, 9).

9 For a brief description in English of the historical background to bilingualism in Canada, see Ralph Sarkonak, "Accentuating the Differences" in Sarkonak, R. (Ed.). 1983 *The Language of Difference: Writing in QUEBEC(ois).* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 4-12.

10 Statistics cited by Grosjean, *Life with Two Languages*, 12, 15.

11 McCrum, Robert. Cran, William, and MacNeil, Robert. 1986. *The Story of English.* London: Faber and Faber, 44-45.

12 Reid, Malcolm. 1972. *The Shouting Signpainters: A Literary and Political Account of Quebec Revolutionary Nationalism.* New York: Modern Reader, 238.

13 Quoted from Flores's article, "Converging Languages in a World of Conflicts: Code-switching in Chicano Poetry," 149.

14 Quoted from Phyllis Wrenn's article, "Ortho- and Morpho-graphic Transcoding of Acadian 'Franglais,'" 124.

15 See Bernard Saint-Jacques's article, "The Roman Alphabet in the Japanese Writing System," 88-105.

16 McCrum et al., *The Story of English*, 46.

17 "Of the many situations of language contact, only a certain number have resulted in the creation of bilingual states. The bilingual state as such is a solution which has often followed a demographic regrouping as a result of war, revolution, or federation" (Dunton, A.D., Laurendeau, A. 1967. *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.* Ottawa: Queen's Printer, vol. I, 11.

18 Cf. Mackey, W.F. 1976. *Bilingualism as a World Problem. The Debate on Bilingualism.* Montreal: Harvest House, 11.

19 See Alistair Crawford, "Bilingual Typography," 42-65. According to statistics quoted by Grosjean, only 1% of the population of Wales is monolingual in Welsh, while 20% are bilingual and 79% are monolingual in English (*Life with Two Languages*, 40).

20 Ridge, Martin. 1981. "The New Bilingualism: An American Dilemma" in *The New Bilingualism: An American Dilemma.* M. Ridge (Ed.) Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 265-66.

21 Fishman, Joshua, Cooper, Robert and Rosenbaum, Yehudit. 1977.

"English the World Over: A Factor in the Creation of Bilingualism Today" in *Bilingualism: Psychological, Social, and Education Implications.* Hornby, P. (Ed.) New York: Academic Press, 103.

22 See Henry Schogt, "Foreign Loanwords in Dutch: Integration and Adaptation," 77-82.

23 Fishman et al., "English the World Over," 114.

24 Jean-Paul Desbiens, *The Insolences of Brother Anonymous* quoted by Reid, *The Shouting Signpainters*, 19.

25 Cf. Grosjean, *Life with Two Languages*, 157-66.

26 Examples are from David Mairowitz, "La belle langue kisses its linguistic interlopers au revoir," *Harper's Magazine* reprinted in *The Globe and Mail* (November 8, 1986), D5. Etiemble's book is entitled *Parlez-vous franglais?* 1964 Paris: Gallimard.

27 Oron, Asher. 1973. "A New Hebrew Sans Serif for Bilingual Printing," *London Icographic*, vol. 3 quoted by Crawford, A. 1976. "Bilingual Typography," *Planet*, vol. 33 (August) 26.

28 Haugen, Einar. 1978. "Bilingualism, Language Contact, and Immigrant Languages in the United States: A Research Report 1956-1970" in *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism*, Fishman, J. (Ed.) The Hague: Mouton, 21.

29 Rozencvejg, V. Ju. 1976. *Linguistic Interference and Convergent Change.* The Hague: Mouton, 2. Mario Pei defines *integration* as follows: "The regular use of a borrowed element, and its incorporation into an ideolect, dialect or language" (*Glossary of Linguistic Terminology* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966, 127).

30 Quoted by Mairowitz, "La belle langue...," D5.

31 Mackey, "Interference, integration and the synchronic fallacy" in *Bilingualism and Language Contact*, Alatis, J. (Ed.) 1970. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 201.

32 Code-switching can be used to refer "to the alternate use of two languages, including everything from the introduction of a single, unassimilated word up to a complete sentence or more in the context of another language" (Haugen, "Bilingualism, Language Contact, and Immigrant Languages," 21).

33 Sanchez, Rosaura. 1983. *Chicano Discourse: Sociohistoric Perspectives.* Rowley, Mass.: Harvest House, 140.

34 Grosjean, *Life with Two Languages*, 289. Grosjean points out that the term "interference" has been used less often in recent research; some researchers prefer to use a more neutral term such as "transference." (ibid.)

35 "on ne voit presque jamais si sûrement un mot que de dehors, où nous sommes; c'ést-à-dire de l'étranger" (Mallarmé, "Les Mots anglais" in *Oeuvres complètes* Paris: Gallimard, 1945, 975.

36 Statistics cited by Grosjean, *Life with Two Languages*, 15-16.

37 Antonine Maillet, *Pélagie-la-Charrette* (Paris: Grasset, 1979).

38 Cf. note 3.

39 Cf. "*Québécois* won out, not only as 'mere' signifier, but as the mark of a unique right of passage in the evolution of an entire nation" (Ralph Sarkonak, Editor's preface to *The Language of Difference: Writing in QUEBEC(ois)*, iv).

40 Haugen, "Bilingualism, Language Contact," 34.