

# LANGUAGE AND BORDERS

*Bonnie Urciuoli*

Department of Anthropology, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York 13323

**KEY WORDS:** language contact, bilingualism, codeswitching, language and ethnicity, language and nationalism

---

## ABSTRACT

Linguistic elements such as phonemes, lexemes, and syntactic or morphological rules cannot be taken for granted as the shape in which border-making elements come. From the actor's viewpoint, border-making elements take on their social reality as "languages," "accents," "mixing," or "words." These terms emerge among the people to whom language identities matter, in relations shaped by the politics of ethnicity, race, and class within the nation and by the politics of ethnic nationalism.

## Introduction

The phrase "language and borders" suggests that language differences signify categories of person defined by ethnic or national origin and that these categories are opposed to each other. People act in ways that are taken as "having" a language, which is equated to "belonging" to an origin group. Borders emerge in specific contexts as a metonymy of person, language, and origin category. This metonymy can be fleeting or quite rigid and in varying degrees politicized.

Weinreich (235) and Haugen (105) provided key texts in the study of these issues, both published in 1953. Weinreich related structural influence to social factors shaping language contact situations. Haugen conducted a historically specific study of bilingual behaviors evolving in ongoing social and cultural interaction. Weinreich's concern with structural phenomena, particularly interference, rests on an idea of language defined by phonological, grammatical, and lexical relations. This relatively reified linguistic system is controlled by a bilingual individual; individuals may be grouped by shared traits such as

nationality, race, and gender. Haugen's concern with the plasticity of linguistic behavior rests on the idea that what people perceive as a given language depends on the conditions of their perception, which depend on the development of specific relations and institutions in specific places and times; hence, Haugen (106) formulates such relations as a linguistic ecology.

The idea of a linguistic ecology is compatible with Hymes's (125) and Jakobson's (130) speech-event model, in which code is one of several elements of context, the interpretation of which depends on functional relations among the whole. The lexical-phonological-grammatical structure is embedded in a wider system of communicative competence. In Silverstein's (204) terms, the semantico-referential becomes one of several functions. As Gal (76, 77) has pointed out, until these connections are drawn and linked to a larger set of political and economic structures, one does not have the analytic wherewithal to show how linguistic identities come to be deployed as they are. Similarly, Irvine (127) argues that there is no simple correlation of linguistic differentiation to social practice. Linguistic practices and elements operate as cultural and symbolic capital in Bourdieu's (28) sense, although as Woolard (238) cautions, how dominant political structures reproduce linguistic capital is not a simple isomorphic or presupposed relation.

Treating codes as monoliths mapped onto social groups is a running theme in much work from the 1960s and 1970s on the sociology of language (65, 66, 97) and in work from the 1960s to the present on language and social psychology (85–88, 146). These literatures are concerned largely with social actors expressing attitudes, loyalties, and other affective expressions toward minority languages in major post-industrial societies. In that context it is not surprising that language and social psychology work, and macro-oriented sociology of language work (such as Fishman's) (65–67), generally treated codes as structural monoliths. This was less the case in the micro-oriented sociology of language: For example, Gumperz & Wilson (98) examined social interaction and structural convergence, and Blom & Gumperz (26) used the concepts of situational and metaphorical switching to examine the ways in which the alternation of linguistic features from local and standard varieties of Norwegian index social relations. Work on codeswitching and bilingualism has evolved from these approaches, from Hymes (125) and from Labov (143). This work is highly tuned to the complexity of linguistic structures and social use, though the literature has often treated the codes involved in switching and bilingualism as affective monoliths, i.e. as if each separate linguistic package had its own affective value, reflecting a pervasive Euro-American tendency to link language and ethnicity.

Nationalist language ideologies in Britain and Europe came to a head in nineteenth-century Herderian romantic nationalism, although they have longer geneses in political and economic relations within and among nation-states

and in European colonial expansion (41, 90). The genesis of the notion of language and borders lies in the shared “imagining” (5) of spatially bounded, linguistically homogenous nations. According to Hobsbawm (123:46), it is worth asking why this particular type of community came to be so quickly and widely imagined by so many people, especially since nationalist languages are generally literacized, a limited realm of social experience for most inhabitants of nineteenth-century Europe. The vision of language based on a print (grammar and dictionary) model, developed by nineteenth-century nationalist intellectuals became deeply presupposed in academics. The vision must have begun breaking apart as scholars turned their attention to language contact phenomena. The groundwork laid by the work described above prepared the way for analytic shifts in the late 1970s and early 1980s, most evident in work on pidginization and creolization (see 133 for discussion) and on codeswitching and language shift, which are the foci of the next section.

### *Codeswitching and the Nature of Code*

The problem of what constitutes a language has been illuminated by studies of codeswitching over the past two decades (82, 120, 170–172, 176, 248; see also 4, 53, 56, 111). Codeswitching situations may over time lead to some degree of syncretism [i.e. the neutralization of linguistic oppositions under certain conditions (120:57)], formal or pragmatic or both, depending on the linguistic typology involved and the structural politics of the switching situation (see 98, 105, 120, 202). A syncretic situation may or may not result in formal, i.e. morphological or syntactic, convergence (for discussion of formal syncretism in Spanish-English bilingualism and Spanish–Native American bilingualism, see 12, 25, 60, 137, 148, 167, 174, 178, 190). There may also be functional syncretism, in which either code may accomplish the same social work in certain contexts.

In examining the relations between codes, salient problems include constraints on codeswitching, and whether there is a fundamental distinction between switching and borrowing. Based on quantitative work on Spanish-English switching in New York, Poplack (185) proposed an equivalence constraint (switches only occur where the order of constituent elements in either language is not violated) and a free morpheme constraint (bound morphemes are not switched). Research from the 1980s, including work on Arabic and French (17), and Spanish and Hebrew (20), demonstrated that the equivalence and bound morpheme constraints did not apply universally. Focusing on intrasentential switching, Myers-Scotton (170, 172) argues that the problem of constraints should be reconceptualized as involving a matrix language, which sets the morphosyntactic frame, and an embedded language, which (along with the matrix language) supplies constituents. Which language serves as matrix for which speakers depends on social factors, so it is not possible to predict

simply from language structure alone how switching will be constrained. Myers-Scotton (171:129), Gardner-Chloros (82:64), and Romaine (192:286) also argue against the distinction made by some analysts between switching and borrowing on the grounds that such a distinction presupposes a separate-ness of grammars that ignores historical process—in effect, recreating the monolith problem with which this section started.

Within possible structural constraints, what is actually switched depends on the ways in which the social actors, given their relationships and the specific context, interpret the codes involved. Gumperz & Hernández-Chávez (95, 96) developed the metaphorical approach into an intimacy-distance explanation of Spanish-English switching, an approach further developed by Gumperz's students and colleagues into analyses of language and identity emergent in workplaces, courtrooms, and other public settings (94). Studies of Mexican-American and Puerto Rican switching have examined conversational and narrative strategies (2, 3, 15, 148, 215, 216, 226, 227), child-language socialization (83, 124, 162, 244, 245), and community-wide patterns (147, 180, 199, 248). Zentella (248) uses Goffman's (89) notion of "footing" to analyze switching and finds, as did Valdés (226), that at times switching itself, rather than the specific code choice, accomplishes the social work of discourse.

In these studies, it becomes evident that an us-vs-them contrast cannot be ascribed to every instance of switching. In situations of unmarked (170, 172) or "smooth" (186) switching, as is the case among New York Puerto Rican bilinguals, switching is frequently intrasentential and highly automatized (147, 180, 248). Functional convergence is likely to develop in this situation (222). Code contrast is much more likely to emerge in switching in the kinds of public places in which politicization of identity is a direct issue. In such places, linguistic distinctions may be mapped onto categories of person such that a borderline in the sense of who belongs and who does not can cut right through the public arena. Heller's work (109, 110, 112–114) demonstrates how carefully switching may be negotiated in Montreal, in encounters among colleagues or among strangers, when code choice is maximally marked. Gal's (75) study of German and Hungarian in Austria foregrounded the complex historical specificity of conditions bearing on code choice: Code meanings shift over time; presentations of self through code depend on network affiliations; age, generation, and network affiliations work differently for men and women.

### *What Do the Natives Know about Code?*

As the direction of work over the past fifteen years suggests, and as Singh (206, 207) has critically pointed out, one cannot assume that a specific code always carries a specific message. One cannot even always assume speakers and linguists would agree as to what the code is. Hill & Hill (120) found that

Mexicano and Spanish exhibited syncretisms that often ran counter to speakers' perceptions of their own code behavior since speakers were not always in a position to know the source of their usages; more to the point, a linguist's classification of code and the judgments native speakers might assign have different goals. The rhetorical purposes that emerge in codeswitched discourse are very much tied into the long-term political economy of language (76) that shapes not only the language situation itself but social actors' relations. Puerto Ricans in New York, who codeswitch with each other in highly routinized ways, may or may not express awareness of Spanish used with or by African-American neighbors, but they are sensitive to white Anglos using Spanish: They map language difference onto race-class difference, just as it has been mapped onto them (221). Poplack (186) notes that the "flagged" (by hesitation or other prosodic phenomena) French-English codeswitching in Ontario-Hull is saturated with overt rhetorical purpose as the "smooth" Puerto Rican Spanish-English switching in New York is not. The French-English switching is more marked than the Spanish-English. Spanish-English switched segments are also rhythmically and intonationally linked (220); those phenomena, along with the operation of Poplack's equivalence constraint and a certain degree of discourse-functional integration, create a situation of minimal markedness. This seems to be the case with much in-group switching, such as that described for US Norwegian-English (105), urban Wolof speakers (208), for the children of Italian migrant workers in Germany (10), and for Moroccan Arabic and Dutch in the Netherlands (176).

One of the most important points that emerges from the literature on switching is that, as Gardner-Chloros notes in her study of Alsatian-French switching, "it is not always possible to assign a linguistic unit to one system alone" (82:48). Similarly, Romaine (192:281) argues that "the idea that any given speech event must belong to a particular named language" may not be a useful concept in dealing with codeswitching and that codeswitching may not in fact involve separately stored, independent codes. She also argues that the idea of an "individual" linguistic competence may hold little meaning outside the context of testing procedures, which is the ideology that dominates public, particularly educational, policy on bilingualism. Most studies of bilingualism that have any serious policy implications have been set up as yardsticks of competence, measured as test answers, but never as assessments of community-based communicative competence (147).

### *When Is a Code No Longer the Same Code?*

The literature on language shift and language death also offers insight as to where code "ends." The elements of language change that can be measured formally may not be isomorphic with what speakers see themselves doing. Language shift is often characterized by systemic simplification, as Dorian

(47) found in shifts over generations as Scots Gaelic in East Sunderland is replaced by English (see also 48). Such shifts are not limited to minority or disappearing languages. Morphological simplification has been found among French speakers in Ontario (169) and in the Turkish of immigrant children in Berlin (183). Whereas minimal shift has been found by some researchers in the verb system of Puerto Rican Spanish in New York (188, 213), Zentella (248) in particular finds considerable tense, mood, and aspect shift in the Spanish of second-generation New York Puerto Ricans, as does Silva-Corvalán (203) among Los Angeles Mexican-Americans. Silva-Corvalán also asks why investigators are so concerned with proving there are no shifts, i.e. that US Spanish has remained "pure." The answer lies partly in the inherited terminology. Mougeon & Beniak (169) point out that sociolinguistic investigators often work with minority languages and hesitate to set up research that might target those languages as "impure," an attitude that ends up reinforcing a kind of covert purism. Perhaps, Dorian (49) argues, it makes no sense to take a hard formal (i.e. purist) line as to what constitutes the "real" version of a minority or majority language. Citing work on revival efforts conducted among Irish (158) and Tiwi (151) speakers, Dorian argues that revival may require compromise. What matters in the end is not a pure historical continuity but what speakers do with languages.

As Dorian (47) found in her study of East Sunderland Gaelic, there are "semi-speakers" whose formal production is different from that of full speakers but who do use the language with their older kin. Their lexical and grammatical production is measurably different, but their pragmatic skills are appropriate. A similar shift is taking place in Dyrbal of younger speakers (201). Whatever the formal situation, speakers may do pragmatic work to create a sense of boundary. In Cape Breton Gaelic (166), speakers use what lexical and grammatical resources they have to create, in greetings and other formulaic ways, their sense of belonging together. Similarly, "terminal speakers" of Arvanítika in Greece, who exhibit formal differentiation from full speakers, construct innovative performances in which to make the most, performatively speaking, of their "skewed" skills (219).

Language shifts are inextricably tied to shifts in the political economy in which speech situations are located (47, 75). This connection can be seen in generational shifts in perceptions of Breton linguistic value (141) and in the replacement of a local New Guinea language by Tok Pisin among younger speakers (140). The attendant codeswitching and the adults' assessments that children themselves are responsible for the shift suggest that the force behind the tip [when a speaker population suddenly shifts or "tips" from one language to another; see Dorian (47)] to Tok Pisin is its symbolic potential in the local political economy of talk. Formal diminution may not always result from speakers having imperfect models but rather from the distribution of style



options across the two languages involved in a politicized set of relationships, e.g. among Mexicano-Spanish speakers (118).

Although language shift can be caused by obliteration of a way of life or even more tragically a whole people, it may also be part of a less drastic set of processes, e.g. a larger set of economic shifts, as in Ireland and Canada (58, 59). For Jews and Berbers in Morocco, giving up a language may not mean giving up a culture (18). For Swedish migrants to the United States in the late 1800s, embracing English meant not being subject to class-based judgments of their Swedish (103).

### *What Pulls Linguistic Elements into a Language?*

Although language elements add up to language, they do not add up so readily to *a* language. As suggested in the foregoing discussion about the social deployment of language in contact and shift situations, the sense of a compendious language emerges when people perform it. Social actors bring into being a sense of boundedness, which may also map onto a border. This point can be obscured in conventional sociolinguistics. Romaine (191:101) has argued that variable rule-based sociolinguistic theory assumes that “languages exist in the real world in the same way that physical phenomena do” since the variable rule presupposes that speakers share a set of basic rules (implying a normative state of the language) and that varieties are described by modifications of those rules (142, 143). Pousada & Greenlee (187) criticize sociolinguistics overconcern with linear models based on the production of individual speakers and its underconcern with the ways in which forms, as used, acquire sociopolitical meaning. The concerns raised by Romaine and by Pousada & Greenlee proceed from what Friedrich characterizes as a linguistic “rage for order,” which masks the fact that “language is unordered or poorly ordered to a greater extent than would be surmised from linguistic theories” (74:139). LePage & Tabouret-Keller (152:5) make a similar point: What cannot be ordered is too often set aside as so much noise. Thus, for example, although speech rhythms and intonation are important indices of social location and value, they have drawn little attention in sociolinguistics and studies of bilingualism and language contact. Yet as Gumperz and his associates have shown (93, 94), prosodics and accents (which are not semiotically reducible to phonological variation) are key in the perception of ethnic and race boundaries that thread their way through ordinary situations and that have real-world consequences for people’s social options.

Lambert and his associates have paid attention to accents and other aspects of code perception in relation to stereotypes and social behavior (146). In their matched-guise studies of reactions to tape-recorded linguistic cues, they in effect studied ethnic-cultural personality stereotypes indexed by these verbal cues and explored how respondents typified their actions in response. Giles

and his associates consistently examined accents not simply as phonological variation but as indexes of stereotypic personality and character traits. In this way, accents are perceived as aspects of person. Already interested in perceptions of accents, Giles (84) formulated accommodation theory in critical response to Labov's notion of contextual style. According to Giles, styles could not be distinguished only by "attention paid to speech" but must also be assessed in terms of interactive language behaviors (e.g. accent) converging toward or diverging from each other. Giles subsequently developed this approach into a systematic assessment of ethnic accents and stereotypes (85–88). Similarly, Ryan, Brennan, and Carranza examined reactions to Mexican-American accents as reactions to social stereotype (31, 32, 196). In their investigations, respondents were found more likely to react pejoratively to an accented speaker heard as lower class than an accented speaker heard as middle class (197:156). Employment decisions were found to be affected by speakers' perceived ethnicity (134). Ethnicity was assigned to a speaker on the basis of the speaker's perceived performance. Respondents judged speakers as hypothetical cultural actors in terms of both ethnicity and character and thus oriented themselves to speakers along axes of status and solidarity. The matched-guise has been used to investigate Castilian-Catalan attitudes of status and solidarity (239) in which language judgments were assessed as embodied elements of *habitus* (27) located in a political economy of language. A recent edited volume contains several studies of the politicization of accent, and of other aspects of politicized pragmatics (81).

LePage & Tabouret-Keller (152) explore linguistic assessments as categorizations of people and their actions. Working from investigations of Caribbean creole processes, they argue that monolithic codes are not given. What does exist, in any society, is the fact of linguistic variation from which people deploy language forms in "acts of identity." From such acts, people's sense of community, group, and language emerge in specific places and times. The problem that cannot be reduced to linear terms is how particular variables generate particular meanings. For example, as the Hills found, the contrastive symbolic positions of Mexicano and Spanish (117, 120) emerge in a historically specific political economy and are formulated in speakers' consciousness of particular linguistic elements—sometimes loan words, sometimes morphology and pronunciation. This consciousness is variable. Such elements become features of actors' voices in a Bakhtinian sense so that people constantly recreate their idea of those codes in specific and politicized relationships, e.g. in the purist consciousness of speakers whose actual speech may not be "pure" Mexicano in a formal sense.

A sense of linguistic cohesion may emerge from the ordering of codes in domains of institutionalized use. Fishman (67) argues that domains play an important role in code maintenance. The situation of Spanish and Guarani



furnishes a classic case (195). In their massive study of Puerto Rican bilingualism in Jersey City (in which the idea of Spanish-English switching as a distinct language variety was first advanced), Fishman et al (68) found evidence of Spanish-English functional compartmentalization based on informants' self-report. Later ethnographic work on New York Puerto Rican bilingualism (9, 181, 248) and Texas border Mexican-American bilingualism (116, 131, 165) shows bilingual situations that appear stable and uncompartimentalized. On the other hand, there is evidence that Lakota bilingualism is stable when its use is structured by domain and unstable when it is not (91). The low/high (L/H) aspect of functional compartmentalization can be problematic. Welsh and English in Bangor have no simple L/H relation; either can be H in different circumstances (154). In some cases, functional differentiation is still under negotiation and has language policy implications as is the case for Swahili and English in Kenya (55, 145). Sometimes there is both compartmentalization and linguistic shift, as among East Sunderland Gaelic speakers for whom there is partial or complete code compartmentalization (47). Perhaps, argues Woolard (241:360), a distinction should be made between function alone and personal relationship. Woolard also notes that Fishman's original formulation had a complexity that has been lost in subsequent uses of the concept. When codes are ordered by function alone, shift is more likely to occur; when codes are ordered by relationships, shift is less likely. This suggests a strong link between the value of code and the value of relationships.

### *Where Do Borders Come From?*

In many instances, language and group identity are not isomorphic (45, 126, 159, 160), and people do not always see language shift vitiating their cultural identity (9, 18, 58). Any sense of language mapping onto culture, and culture onto national identity and thus onto border, must be mediated through macro-micro interstices in relationships.

Linguistic elements are semiotically complex (182, 204): As referential and grammatical elements they are symbolic; they are indexically grounded in human relations; and they are frequently iconic. This semiotic complexity mediates the cultural experience of language (74, 121). Depending on its social use, a linguistic element can be indexically presupposed (taken for granted as part of the social scene) or indexically creative, i.e. performative, bringing into being a change in social reality. When languages take on sharp edges, i.e. borders, they are mapped onto people and therefore onto ethnic nationality (which may or may not map onto a nation-state). Given that ethnicity has become nonlocalized as people move into "global ethnoscapes" (7:191), much of what the "border" represents is in effect deterritorialized, as is, for example, the case with foreign languages, especially Spanish, in the United States (see below).

Performative aspects of language boundedness have been explored widely in recent years. Mannheim (159, 160) documents how Spanish colonial policy overlaid a language-ethnicity isomorphism onto Inka linguistic territory. Fabian (63) charts the sites in which Swahili, codified by European administrators, emerges as an instrument of organization and control. Woolard (239) examines the interplay of national language policy and historical regional and social factors in people's attitudes toward and use of Catalan and Castilian, and she (242) charts shifts in attitudes over a decade of Catalan language policy. Urla (223, 224) examines the use of census and mapping as informational techniques that reify Basque in Spain. Gal (78) also examines the ways in which census-taking in Hungary created categories of German and Hungarian speakers for purposes of state policy and the ways in which speakers themselves recast the language-ethnicity link in resistant, often ambiguous ways. Silverstein (205) shows how media, educational institutions, and self-help courses have reified American English monoglot standard as a "pure, natural" conduit for meaning available to any US resident willing to work hard enough.

In the literature on national language planning, spreading, standardization, and purism, the key issue is how a language becomes transformed and unified, that is, what are the performative mechanisms and the social relations in which are they embedded? (Much of this literature is reviewed in 243:60ff; see also 42, 156, 234, 236.) Extensive studies of language policy and spread are available for Norway (104), Mexico (107), Israel (16), Africa (144, 161), India (189), Tok Pisin in New Guinea (193), and the United States (230), as well as briefer discussions of Mexican indigenous languages (36, 40), Ireland (38, 217), Algeria (46), India (51), Russian in the former USSR (99), post-Cold War Germany (37), China (101), Iran (135), North Korea (150), Latvia (184), Yugoslavia and the Philippines (212), and Andean Quechua (232). Puristic policies demarcate boundaries via legal mechanisms to keep out "foreign" elements and, indeed, to define foreignness (132, 135, 211). Language is seen as social action and symbolic resource (28), creatively indexing social distinctions within a society (16, 46, 212). Issues examined include control of key domains, especially education and law (36, 101, 107, 193, 232); overt or covert ideologization of linguistic elements (37, 99, 150) and the effect this may have on what had been one language (189, 212); the breaking up of older networks and the redefinition of ethnicity (38, 217); the incongruity of policy and practice and the difficulties of rationalizing and controlling outcomes (40, 104, 144, 161); and the problem of getting speakers to think of themselves as members of a nation (184).

General and comparative discussion of minority language issues is provided in References 50, 64, 164, and 237. Of particular interest is the performative reworking undergone by the French-English border within Canada

over the past two decades—for example, the development of language policy in Quebec leading up to Bill 101, which established French as Quebec's only official language (29), and the subsequent events leading to the Meech Lake accord and its dissolution (30, 59). This legal reinforcement of the ethnic language border, for example, in the battle over which language business signs are to be in, is part and parcel of a larger process in which national and folkloric practices are reified in the construction of a Quebecois cultural boundedness (100).

A particularly productive literature examines the ways in which people are confronted with the ramifications of nation-state issues in routine interactions. Here we see borders emerging to thread their way across relationships in ordinary circumstances; and here we see the intersection of macro- and micro-linguistic levels of analysis, as elements of talk take on value in a linguistic marketplace (113). This intersection can put the speaker into what amounts to the cross-hairs of a language-culture dichotomy. Learning a foreign language can put the speaker in a culturally ambiguous situation: Non-Welsh who learn Welsh seem contradictory since Welsh speakers are Welsh and non-Welsh do not speak Welsh (218). The naturalization of language in Japan means that for English-speaking Japanese in US businesses (198) and for foreign celebrities speaking Japanese (168), speaking English or Japanese poorly makes them more highly regarded by the Japanese than does speaking it well.

In minority language situations, the value of the minority language is often tied to a literacized and/or puristic version, so that hegemonic relations are reconstituted even through the minority language (see also 117). Corsican language learners find themselves in a position in which they can never simply talk; they must always prove their status (129). "Pure" Walloon is ideologically identified with the written form so that actual speakers are typified as speaking their language badly—a trap in which Tamazight speakers in Morocco, a different linguistic ecology, do not find themselves (92). Some Basque speakers, faced with a modernist rationalized Basque mapped onto a bounded nation, respond by crashing into an unbounded eclecticism, e.g. creating a Basque rock scene (225). Linguistic rationalizations of Breton revivalists run counter to the linguistic ecology of actual Breton-speaking peasants. Revivalists assume that peasants embody and perform a pure natural Breton-ness; this is not always the case, which creates situations of ambiguity and irony (163). Linguistic boundedness may be created by erasing actual practices that do not fit politically salient categories, at the same time making invisible people in risky or ambiguous positions (128).

Boundedness may be created by those in power exercising "elite closure" through use of elite language (173) and through people with no power saying in effect that if they cannot fit in, they will draw linguistic lines explaining who they really are (57). Because literacization is key in making respectable

what lies within the boundaries, selecting orthographies to represent the “right” (and least deviant-seeming) version of the language can be politically fraught (33, 194, 200). Issues of literacization and of language and education shape the power dimension emergent in English pragmatics and therefore reinforce boundedness in a range of cultural situations (81).

Language is mapped onto a sense of cultural border in narratives of ordinary experiences, for example, in francophone women’s stories about being married to anglophones (114), in Puerto Rican women’s Spanish narratives showing internalization of majority attitudes toward them (215), in stories passed on by older Puerto Rican women to daughters and other younger relations about taking control over their language and education in their working-class lives (14), and in codeswitched elements of O’Odham and English that project different elements of the narrator’s complex identity (122).

Native Americans have been particularly affected by English boundedness. Leap (149) documents the tight controls that reservation boarding schools placed not only on English but on all “deviant” Indian behavior, in which process “Indian English” formed. Leap also documents ways in which students formed small enclosed areas, within those schools, in which to be Indian, for example, by praying in Ojibwa or joining Navajo friends on the track team. Basso (13) demonstrates the construction and reinforcement of a white vs Apache contrast when English is used in joking performance. Kroskrity (138) describes Tewa perception of English as pushy and controlling on the one hand, and educated and informed on the other, so that switching to English could sharply express contrasting social identities. By contrast, Tewa-Hopi switching is often unmarked; when it does express contrastive identities, it does so less sharply than English-Tewa. Tewa may be used in war songs to define a Tewa-Hopi distinction, whereas Tewa in ceremonial songs may emphasize empathy with Hopi. Sociohistorical shifts in boundaries between groups are thus incorporated into performance.

The emergence of boundedness in school, service encounters, and work-sites brings into focus the intersection of the macro- and the micro-level of sociopolitical structure as actors play out culturally stereotyped personae. Actors use that knowledge strategically (109, 110, 112), taking into account how discourse organization feeds stereotypes (94). The legal arena is a place of particular risk in this regard, as actors may be erased through a privileging of reference, in the ways in which minority defendants’ testimony is construed by legal authorities (54), in the privileging of court interpreters’ phrasing over that of witnesses (21), and in the ways that people with accents are, in the face of job discrimination, held legally responsible for getting rid of such “obscuring” language features (155, 161a). In these ways, border emergence traces the political fault lines that locate social actors’ relations in a linguistic ecology.

*Spanish-English Bilingualism and the US Border*

Several works address the development, social location, and pragmatics of Spanish in the United States: the interplay of linguistic structure, patterns of use and policy, linguistic attitudes, and language pedagogy (19, 24, 53, 60, 61, 136, 190); the interplay of identity, language, and sociopolitical issues (139); the demographics of its spread and use (231); and the structure of the border variety of Spanish called *pachuco* or *caló* (11, 177). How different Latin groups view and retain Spanish-English use varies with ethnic and class location (79, 102). The press forms an important public voice in Spanish maintenance, although the Spanish press in the United States differs stylistically and pragmatically from the Spanish press outside the United States (80). The Spanish-English contrast, mapped onto class and race differences, emerges whenever public institutions bear on private concerns (e.g. in dealing with public documents) or whenever people have to negotiate across power relations (e.g. talking to a doctor) (44, 62, 222, 229). Schools are a frequent site for this emergence. Bilingual education policy has been a major focus of investigation by linguists and language policy scholars (69). The class and race differences that are mapped onto language are reproduced in the practices and performances that make up students' experience (73, 233). Linguistic boundedness is potentially emergent in all sites of Spanish use in the United States, whether by Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, or Central and South Americans. But the US-Mexican border presents a special focus for bilingualism, given the history of US-Mexican relations and Mexican labor migration into the United States.

The isomorphism between English-American and non-English-un-American has had a long gestation, although it was not ideologized in the earliest decades of US history (108). By the 1870s, the English border was being legally wrapped around potentially disruptive groups, beginning with policies aimed at eliminating Native American languages (149). By 1906, US naturalization law required new citizens to speak English. Anti-immigrant-language sentiment grew as the immigrant population grew, culminating in English-only laws ca 1920, particularly anti-German laws during World War I (39: 68ff, 157). The primary targets of English-only sentiment in the past two decades have been Spanish-speakers, particularly Mexican, Central American, and Caribbean (1, 43, 209). Public perceptions of English and Spanish are informed by a zero-sum metaphor: The greater the public presence of Spanish, the greater the threat to English (246). The image of English endangered by irrational demands informs the way questions are asked in English-only polls (247) and the phrasing of ballot initiatives (240). Such resentment is exacerbated by Spanish-speakers successful in business, as in Florida (34). In the same political context, bilingual education policy is especially politicized,

often demonized (52). All this reinforces US perceptions of a “porous border” (35).

Demographic patterns drawn from the US census are instrumental in establishing geographic proximity as a key factor in Spanish language maintenance (22, 23). Patterns of use and attitudes are locally and historically specific, varying from point to point along the urban border complexes ranging from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific (116). Juárez Mexicans express strong nationalist sentiments toward Spanish and some positive assessments of English but deprecation of the mixed-language behavior of El Paso residents, in effect mapping the border onto language ideology (115). El Paso remains resolutely bilingual as Juárez remains monolingual, a kind of beachhead for *juarenses* (210). In Tucson, Spanish is acquiring new functions, becoming “passively legitimated” (131). Valdés (228) argues that in the study of these patterns, standard interference and codeswitching models may be inadequate, because border bilingualism has its own configuration.

People who embody the border consistently find themselves socially invisible except as stereotypes. Anglo students studying Spanish treat the word “Mexican” as taboo and seek to erase connections between Spanish and the border (175). In response to the public erasure of bilinguals’ routine experiences, writers such as Anzaldúa (6) have explored the creation of literary personae in which the border emerges in multivalenced projections of self in the author-reader relation, valences upon which Torres (214) comments. Flores, Yudice, Attinasi, and Pedraza (70–72) similarly explore ways in which constructions of identity in a range of literary and performance venues confound easy assessments of identity as unmarkedly Anglo vs folklorically Latin: A Latin identity emerges as an internalization of multiple modes of being. Paredes (179) and Limón (153) have explored the emergence and construction of the border in folkloric performance. In particular, Paredes addresses analysts’ inabilities to see that performance for what it is, thus giving a peculiarly US cast to border people, the kind of cast that Hill (119) explores in American English appropriation of “junk Spanish.” Arteaga (8) draws a contrast between, on the one hand, “objective” distinctions between US and Latin identity (e.g. legal criteria for being classified as Hispanic in the US, or “literal” representations of nations in maps or historical writings), and, on the other hand, the poetic construction of a complex Latin border self.

## Conclusion

As studies of codeswitching (in conjunction with work on pidginization and creolization) suggest, linguistic elements such as phonemes, lexemes, and syntactic or morphological rules cannot be taken for granted as the shape in which border-making elements come. From the actor’s viewpoint, border-making elements take on their social reality as “languages,” “accents,” “mix-



ing,” or “words.” These elements can put speakers at risk. Thus, for example, in the United States, accented second-language speakers may face job discrimination because of language traits and find themselves without legal recourse in a system that privileges a “pure, natural” English defined entirely in referential terms. The processes through which English becomes such a social fact are erased, and the sense of boundedness is reinforced.

Border-marking language elements are locational markers: They assign people a place, often opposing places between those who “have” the language and those who do not. Borders are places where commonality ends abruptly; border-making language elements stand for and performatively bring into being such places.

**Any Annual Review chapter, as well as any article cited in an Annual Review chapter, may be purchased from the Annual Reviews Preprints and Reprints service.  
1-800-347-8007; 415-259-5017; email: arpr@class.org**

## Literature Cited

1. Adams KL, Brink DT, eds. 1990. *Perspectives on Official English: The Campaign for English as the Official Language in the USA*. Berlin: de Gruyter
2. Alvarez C. 1988. An interpretive analysis of narration in social interaction. See Ref. 147a, pp. 139–91
3. Alvarez C. 1989. Code-switching in narrative performance: a Puerto Rican speech community in New York. See Ref. 81, pp. 373–86
4. Amastae J, Elías-Olivares L, eds. 1982. *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Aspects*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
5. Anderson B. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso
6. Anzaldúa G. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute
7. Appadurai A. 1991. Global ethnoscapes: notes and queries for a transnational anthropology. In *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, ed. R Fox, pp. 191–210. Santa Fe, NM: School Am. Res. Press
8. Arteaga A, ed. 1994. *An Other Tongue: Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
9. Attinasi J. 1983. Language attitudes and working class ideology in a Puerto Rican barrio of New York. *Ethnic Groups* 5: 55–78
10. Auer JCP. 1988. A conversation analytic approach to codeswitching and transfer. See Ref. 111, pp. 187–214
11. Baker GC. 1950. *Pachuco: An American-Spanish Argot and Its Social Functions in Tucson, Arizona*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press
12. Barkin F, Brandt E, Ornstein-Galicia J, eds. 1982. *Bilingualism and Language Contact: Spanish, English and Native American Languages*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press
13. Basso K. 1979. *Portraits of the Whiteman*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
14. Benmayor AJ, Vasquez-Erazo B, Alvarez C. 1988. Stories to live by: continuity and change in three generations of Puerto Rican women. *Oral Hist. Rev.* 16(2):1–47
15. Bennett A, Pedraza P. 1988. Political dimensions of discourse: consciousness and literacy in a Puerto Rican neighborhood in East Harlem. See Ref. 147a, pp. 193–209
16. Ben-Rafael E. 1994. *Language, Identity and Social Division: The Case of Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon
17. Bentahila A, Davies E. 1983. The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua* 59: 301–30
18. Bentahila A, Davies EE. 1992. Convergence and divergence: two cases of language shift in Morocco. See Ref. 64, pp. 197–210
19. Bergen J, ed. 1990. *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Issues*. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press
20. Berk-Seligson S. 1986. Linguistic constraints on intrasentential code-switching: a

- study of Spanish/Hebrew bilingualism. *Lang. Soc.* 15:313-48
21. Berk-Seligson S. 1990. *The Bilingual Courtroom: Court Interpretation in the Judicial Process*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  22. Bills G. 1989. The US Census of 1980 and Spanish in the Southwest. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 79:11-28
  23. Bills G, Hernández Chávez E, Hudson A. 1995. The geography of language shift: distance from the Mexican border and Spanish language claiming in the Southwestern U.S. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 114(4): In press
  24. Bixler-Marquez DJ, Ornstein-Galicia JL, Green GK. 1989. *Mexican-American Spanish in its Societal and Cultural Contexts*. Brownsville, TX: Univ. Texas-Pan Am.
  25. Blansitt EL, Teschner RV. 1980. *A Festschrift for Jacob Ornstein: Studies in General Linguistics and Sociolinguistics*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House
  26. Blom JP, Gumperz JG. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structures: code-switching in Norway. See Ref. 97, pp. 407-34
  27. Bourdieu P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  28. Bourdieu P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
  29. Bourhis R, ed. 1984. *Conflict and Language Planning in Quebec*. Clevedon, Engl.: Multilingual Matters
  30. Bourhis R. 1994. Introduction and overview of language events in Canada. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 105/106:5-36
  31. Brennan EM, Brennan JS. 1981. Measurements of accent and attitude toward Mexican-American speech. *J. Psycholinguist. Res.* 10:487-501
  32. Brennan EM, Carranza M, Ryan EB. 1980. Language attitudes of Mexican-American adolescents in two midwestern cities. In *Languages in Conflict: Linguistic Acculturation on the Great Plains*, ed. P Schach, pp. 148-56. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press
  33. Brown B. 1993. The social consequences of writing Louisiana French. *Lang. Soc.* 22:67-101
  34. Castro M, Haun M, Roca A. 1990. The official English movement in Florida. See Ref. 1, pp. 151-60
  35. Chock P. 1994. Porous borders: retelling America in the illegal alien crisis. *Pol. Legal Anthropol. Rev.* 17(2):45-56
  36. Cifuentes B. 1992. Language policy in Mexico. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 96:9-17
  37. Clyne M. 1993. The German language after unification: adapting assumptions and methodologies to the "New World Order." *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 100/101:11-27
  38. Commins P. 1988. Socioeconomic development and language maintenance in the Gaeltacht. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 70:11-28
  39. Conklin NF, Lourie M. 1983. *A Host of Tongues: Language Communities in the United States*. New York: Free
  40. Coronado Suzán G. 1992. Educación bilingüe en México: propositos y realidades. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 96:53-70
  41. Coulmas F, ed. 1988. *With Forked Tongues: What Are National Languages Good For?* Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma
  42. Coulmas F, ed. 1989. *Language Adaptation*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  43. Crawford J, ed. 1992. *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  44. Díaz-Duque OF. 1989. Communication barriers in medical settings: Hispanics in the US. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 79:93-102
  45. Dimmendaal GJ. 1989. On language death in Eastern Africa. See Ref. 48, pp. 13-32
  46. Djité PG. 1992. The Arabization of Algeria: linguistic and sociopolitical motivations. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 98:15-28
  47. Dorian NC. 1981. *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  48. Dorian NC, ed. 1989. *Investigating Obsolescence: Studies in Language Contraction and Death*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
  49. Dorian NC. 1994. Purism vs. compromise in language revitalization and language revival. *Lang. Soc.* 23:479-94
  50. Dow J. 1991. *Language and Ethnicity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
  51. Dua H. 1994. Hindi language spread policy and its implementation: achievements and prospects. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 107:115-43
  52. Dunn L. 1987. *Bilingual Hispanic Children on the U.S. Mainland: A Review of Research on Their Cognitive, Linguistic and Scholastic Development*. Circle Pines, MN: Am. Guid. Serv.
  53. Durán R, ed. 1981. *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex
  54. Eades D. 1993. The case for Condren: Aboriginal English, pragmatics and the law. *J. Pragmat.* 20:141-62
  55. Eastman C. 1990. Dissociation: a unified language-policy outcome for Kenya. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 86:69-85
  56. Eastman C, ed. 1992. *Codeswitching*. Clevedon, Engl.: Multilingual Matters
  57. Eastman C, Stein R. 1993. Language display: authenticating claims to social identity. *J. Multiling. Multicult. Dev.* 14: 187-202
  58. Edwards J. 1985. *Language, Society and Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell
  59. Edwards J. 1994. Ethnolinguistic pluralism and its discontents: a Canadian study and

- some general observations. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 110:5–86
60. Elías-Olivares L, ed. 1983. *Spanish in the US Setting: Beyond the Southwest*. Rosslyn, VA: Natl. Clearinghouse Biling. Educ.
  61. Elías-Olivares L, Leone EA, Cisneros R, Gutiérrez J, eds. 1985. *Spanish Language Use and Public Life in the USA*. New York: Mouton
  62. Erzinger S. 1991. Communication between Spanish-speaking patients and their doctors in medical encounters. *Cult. Med. Psychiatr.* 15:91–110
  63. Fabian J. 1986. *Language and Colonial Power*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  64. Fase W, Jaspaert K, Kroon S, eds. 1992. *Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
  65. Fishman JA, ed. 1968. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton
  66. Fishman JA, ed. 1972. *Advances in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton
  67. Fishman JA. 1972. Domains and the relationship between micro- and macrosociolinguistics. See Ref. 97, pp. 435–54
  68. Fishman JA, Cooper R, Ma R. 1971. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
  69. Fishman JA, Keller G, eds. 1982. *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the US*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press
  70. Flores J. 1993. *Divided Borders: Essays on Puerto Rican Identity*. Houston: Arte Publico
  71. Flores J, Attinasi J, Pedraza P. 1981. La Carreta made a U-turn: Puerto Rican language and culture in the US. *Daedalus* 110: 193–217
  72. Flores J, Yudice G. 1990. Living borders-buscando America: languages of Latino self-formation. *Soc. Text* 24 8(2):57–84
  73. Foley D. 1990. *Learning Capitalist Culture Deep in the Heart of Tejas*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  74. Friedrich P. 1986. *The Language Parallax*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
  75. Gal S. 1979. *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic
  76. Gal S. 1987. Codeswitching and consciousness in the European periphery. *Am. Ethnol.* 14:637–53
  77. Gal S. 1989. Language and political economy. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 18:345–67
  78. Gal S. 1993. Diversity and contestation in linguistic ideologies: German speakers in Hungary. *Lang. Soc.* 22:337–59
  79. García O, Evangelista I, Martínez M, Disla C, Bonifacio P. 1988. Spanish language use and attitudes: a study of two New York City communities. *Lang. Soc.* 17:475–511
  80. García O, Fishman J, Gertner M, Burunat S. 1985. Written Spanish in the United States: an analysis of the Spanish of the ethnic press. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 56:85–98
  81. García O, Otheguy R. 1989. *English Across Cultures, Cultures Across English: A Reader in Cross-Cultural Communication*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter
  82. Gardner-Chloros P. 1991. *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon
  83. Genishi C. 1981. Codeswitching in Chicano six-year-olds. See Ref. 53, pp. 133–52
  84. Giles H. 1973. Accent mobility: a model and some data. *Anthropol. Linguist.* 15: 87–105
  85. Giles H, ed. 1984. The dynamics of speech accommodation. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 46 (Special Issue)
  86. Giles H, Coupland J, Coupland N. 1991. *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  87. Giles H, Johnson P. 1987. Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 68:66–99
  88. Giles H, Saint-Jacques B, eds. 1979. *Language and Ethnic Relations*. Oxford: Pergamon
  89. Goffman E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  90. Grillo RD. 1989. *Dominant Languages: Language and Hierarchy in Britain and France*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
  91. Grobsmith E. 1980. Aspects of Lakota bilingualism. In *Languages in Conflict: Linguistic Acculturation on the Great Plains*, ed. P. Schach, pp. 119–28. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press
  92. Gross J. 1993. The politics of unofficial language use: Walloon in Belgium, Tamazight in Morocco. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13: 177–208
  93. Gumperz J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  94. Gumperz J, ed. 1982. *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  95. Gumperz JG, Hernández-Chávez E. 1972. Bilingualism, bidialectalism and classroom interaction. In *Functions of Language in the Classroom*, ed. C. Cazden, V. John, D. Hymes, pp. 84–108. New York: Teachers Coll. Press
  96. Gumperz JG, Hernández-Chávez E. 1975. Cognitive aspects of bilingual communication. In *El Lenguaje de los Chicanos*, ed. E. Hernández-Chávez, AD Cohen, AF Beltramo, pp. 154–64. Arlington, VA: Cent. Appl. Linguist.
  97. Gumperz JG, Hymes D. 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston

98. Gumperz JG, Wilson R. 1971. Convergence and creolization: a case from the Indo-Dravidian border. In *Pidginization and Creolization of Language*, ed. D Hymes, pp. 151–67. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
99. Haarmann H. 1992. Measure to increase the importance of Russian within and outside the Soviet Union—a case of covert language-spread policy (a historical outline). *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 95:109–29
100. Handler R. 1988. *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec*. Madison: Univ. Wisc. Press
101. Harrall S. 1993. Linguistics and hegemony in China. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 103:97–114
102. Hart-González L, Feingold M. 1990. Retention of Spanish in the home. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 84:5–34
103. Hasselmo N. 1980. The linguistic norm and the language shift in Swedish America. In *Languages in Conflict: Linguistic Acculturation on the Great Plains*, ed. P Schach, pp. 48–57. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press
104. Haugen E. 1966. *Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
105. Haugen E. 1969. [1953]. *The Norwegian Language in America*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
106. Haugen E. 1972. The ecology of language. In *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen*, ed. ADil, pp. 325–39. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
107. Heath SB. 1972. *Telling Tongues: Language Policy in Mexico Colony to Nation*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press
108. Heath SB. 1992. Why no official tongue? See Ref. 43, pp. 20–30
109. Heller M. 1982. Negotiations of language choice in Montréal. See Ref. 94, pp. 108–18
110. Heller M. 1985. Ethnic relations and language use in Montréal. In *Language of Inequality*, ed. N Wolfson, J Manes, pp. 75–90. Berlin: Mouton
111. Heller M, ed. 1988. *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
112. Heller M. 1988. Strategic ambiguity: code-switching in the management of conflict. See Ref. 111, pp. 77–96
113. Heller M. 1992. The politics of codeswitching and language choice. *J. Multiling. Multicult. Dev.* 13:123–42
114. Heller M, Levy L. 1992. Mixed marriages: life on the linguistic frontier. *Multilingua* 11(1):11–43
115. Hidalgo M. 1986. Language contact, language loyalty and language prejudice on the Mexican border. *Lang. Soc.* 15: 193–220
116. Hidalgo M. 1995. Language and ethnicity in the “taboo” region: the U.S.–Mexico border. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 114(4):In press
117. Hill JH. 1985. The grammar of consciousness and the consciousness of grammar. *Am. Ethnol.* 12:725–37
118. Hill JH. 1989. The social functions of relativization in obsolescent and non-obsolescent languages. See Ref. 48, pp. 149–64
119. Hill JH. 1993. Hasta la vista, baby: Anglo Spanish in the American Southwest. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13(2):145–76
120. Hill JH, Hill KC. 1986. *Speaking Mexicano: Dynamics of Syncretic Language in Central Mexico*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press
121. Hill JH, Mannheim B. 1992. Language and world view. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 21: 381–406
122. Hill JH, Zepeda O. 1993. Mrs. Patricio’s trouble: the distribution of responsibility in an account of personal experience. In *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*, eds. JH Hill, J Irvine, pp. 197–225. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
123. Hobsbawm E. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
124. Huerta-Macias A. 1981. Code-switching: all in the family. See Ref. 53, pp. 153–68
125. Hymes D. 1974. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
126. Hymes D. 1984. Linguistic problems in defining the concept of “tribe.” In *Language in Use*, ed. J Baugh, J Sherzer, pp. 7–27. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
127. Irvine J. 1989. When talk isn’t cheap: language and political economy. *Am. Ethnol.* 16:248–67
128. Irvine J, Gal S. 1994. *Language ideology and linguistic differentiation*. Presented at Annu. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 93rd, Atlanta
129. Jaffe A. 1993. Obligation, error and authenticity: competing cultural principles in the teaching of Corsican. *J. Linguist. Anthropol.* 3:99–114
130. Jakobson R. 1960. Concluding statement: linguistics and poetics. In *Style in Language*, ed. T Sebeok, pp. 350–77. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
131. Jaramillo J. 1995. The passive legitimization of Spanish: a macrosociolinguistic study of a quasi-border: Tucson, Arizona. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 114(4):In press
132. Jernudd B. 1989. The texture of language purism, an introduction. In *The Politics of Linguistic Purism*, ed. B Jernudd, M Shapiro, pp. 1–19. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
133. Jourdan C. 1991. Pidgins and creoles: the blurring of categories. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 20:187–209
134. Kalin R, Rayko D. 1980. The social significance of speech in the job interview. In *The Social and Psychological Contexts of Lan-*

- guage, ed. RN St. Clair, H Giles, pp. 39–50. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
135. Karimi-Hakkak A. 1989. Language reform movement and its language: the case of Persian. In *The Politics of Linguistic Purism*, ed. B Jernudd, M Shapiro, pp. 81–104. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
  136. Klee CA, Ramos-García LA. 1991. *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-Speaking World: Iberia, Latin America, United States*. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual
  137. Klein F. 1980. A quantitative study of syntactic and pragmatic indications of change in the Spanish of Bilinguals in the US. In *Locating Language in Time and Space*, ed. W Labov, pp. 69–82. New York: Academic
  138. Kroskrity P. 1993. *Language, History and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press
  139. Kruszewski ZA, Hough RL, Ornstein-Galicia J. 1982. *Politics and Society in the Southwest: Ethnicity and Chicano Pluralism*. Boulder, CO: Westview
  140. Kulick D. 1992. *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction: Socialization, Self and Syncretism in a Papuan New Guinean Village*. Cambridge: Univ. Press
  141. Kuter L. 1989. Breton vs. French: language and the opposition of political, economic, social and cultural values. See Ref. 48, pp. 75–89
  142. Labov W. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Cent. Appl. Linguist.
  143. Labov W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  144. Laitin D. 1992. *Language Repertoires and State Construction in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  145. Laitin D, Eastman C. 1989. Language conflict: transactions and games in Kenya. *Cult. Anthropol.* 4:51–72
  146. Lambert W, Hodgson RC, Gardner RC, Fillenbaum S. 1960. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.* 60(1):44–55
  147. Language Policy Task Force. 1982. *Intergenerational Perspectives on Bilingualism: From Community to Classroom*. New York: CUNY Cent. Puerto Rican Stud.
  - 147a. Language Policy Task Force. 1988. *Speech and Ways of Speaking in a Bilingual Puerto Rican Community*. New York: CUNY Cent. Puerto Rican Stud.
  148. Lavandera B. 1981. *Lo Quebramos* but only in performance. See Ref. 53, pp. 49–66
  149. Leap W. 1993. *American Indian English*. Salt Lake City: Univ. Utah
  150. Lee H-B. 1990. Differences in language use between North and South Korea. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 82:71–86
  151. Lee J. 1987. *Tiwi Today: A Study of Language Change in a Contact Situation*. Canberra: Res. School Pacific Stud., Aust. Natl. Univ.
  152. LePage RB, Tabouret-Keller A. 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  153. Limón J. 1992. *Mexican Ballads, Chicano Poems: History and Influence in Mexican-American Social Poetry*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  154. Lindsay C. 1993. Welsh and English in the city of Bangor: a study in functional differentiation. *Lang. Soc.* 22:1–17
  155. Lippi-Green R. 1994. Accent, standard language ideology and discriminatory pretext in the courts. *Lang. Soc.* 23:163–98
  156. Lowenberg P. 1988. *Language Spread and Language Policy: Issues, Implications and Case Studies*. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press
  157. Luecke F. 1980. Legal restrictions on foreign languages in the Great Plains States 1917–1923. In *Languages in Conflict: Linguistic Acculturation on the Great Plains*, ed. P Schach, pp. 1–19. Lincoln: Univ. Nebr. Press
  158. Maguire G. 1991. *Our Own Language: An Irish Initiative*. Clevedon, Engl.: Multilingual Matters
  159. Mannheim B. 1991. *The Language of the Inka Since the European Invasion*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
  160. Mannheim B. 1992. The Inka language in the colonial world. *Colonial Latin Am. Rev.* 1:77–108
  161. Mansour G. 1993. *Multilingualism and Nation Building*. Clevedon, Engl.: Multilingual Matters
  - 161a. Matsuda M. 1991. Voices of America: Accent, antidiscrimination law, and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *Yale Law J.* 100:1329–1407
  162. McClure E. 1981. Formal and functional aspects of the code-switched discourse of bilingual children. See Ref. 53, pp. 69–94
  163. McDonald M. 1989. *We Are Not French: Language, Culture and Identity in Brittany*. London: Routledge
  164. McKay SL, Wong C, eds. 1988. *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource? A Social and Educational Perspective on Language Minorities in the United States*. Cambridge: Newbury House
  165. Mejías H, Anderson P. 1984–1987. Language maintenance in southern Texas. *SW J. Linguist.* 7:116–24
  166. Mertz E. 1989. Sociolinguistic creativity: Cape Breton Gaelic's linguistic “tip.” See Ref. 48, pp. 103–16
  167. Milán W. 1982. Spanish in the inner city: Puerto Rican speech in New York. See Ref. 69, pp. 191–206
  168. Miller L. 1995. Crossing ethnolinguistic boundaries: a preliminary look at the *gaijin*



- arento in Japan. In *Asian Popular Culture*, ed. J. Lent, pp. 162–73. Boulder, CO: Westview
169. Mougeon R, Beniak E. 1991. *Linguistic Consequences of Language Contact and Restriction: The Case of French in Ontario, Canada*. Oxford: Clarendon
170. Myers-Scotton C. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-Switching*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
171. Myers-Scotton C. 1993. *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence From Africa*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
172. Myers-Scotton C. 1993. Common and uncommon ground: social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Lang. Soc.* 22: 475–503
173. Myers-Scotton C. 1993. Elite closure as a powerful language strategy: the African case. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 103:149–63
174. Niño-Murcia M. 1995. The gerund in the Spanish of the north Andean region. In *Spanish in Four Continents: Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism*, ed. C Silva-Corvalán, pp. 83–100. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press
175. Nocon H. 1995. Is the word “Mexican” taboo? The impact of the border on Spanish students’ integrative attitude and motivation. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 114(4):In press
176. Nortier J. 1990. *Dutch-Moroccan Arabic Code-Switching Among Moroccans in the Netherlands*. Dordrecht: Foris
177. Ortega A. 1991. *Caló Orbis: Semiotic Aspects of a Chicano Language Variety*. New York: Lang
178. Otheguy R, García O, Fernández M. 1989. Transferring, switching and modeling in West New York Spanish: an intergenerational study. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 79:41–52
179. Paredes A. 1993. *Folklore and Culture on the Texas-Mexican Border*, edited and with an introduction by R Bauman. Austin, TX: Cent. Mex. Am. Stud.
180. Pedraza P. 1987. An ethnographic analysis of language use in the Puerto Rican community of East Harlem. *Cent. Puerto Rican Stud. Work. Pap. No. 12*. New York: CUNY
181. Pedraza P, Attinasi J, Hoffman G. 1980. Rethinking diglossia. *Language Policy Task Force, Cent. Puerto Rican Stud. Work. Pap. No. 9*. New York: CUNY
182. Peirce CS. 1956. Logic as semiotic: the theory of signs. In *The Philosophy of Peirce: Selected Writings*, ed. J. Buchler, pp. 98–119. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
183. Pfaff C. 1991. Turkish in contact with German: language maintenance and loss among immigrant children in Berlin (West). *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 90:97–129
184. Plakans A. 1993. From a regional vernacular to the language of a state: the case of Latvian. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 100/101:203–19
185. Poplack S. 1981. Syntactic structure and social function of code-switching. See Ref. 53, pp. 169–84
186. Poplack S. 1988. Contrasting patterns of codeswitching in two communities. See Ref. 111, pp. 215–44
187. Pousada A, Greenlee M. 1988. Toward a social theory of language variability. See Ref. 147a, pp. 13–92
188. Pousada A, Poplack S. 1982. No case for convergence: the Puerto Rican verb system in a language contact situation. See Ref. 69, pp. 207–37
189. Rai A. 1991. *A House Divided: The Origin and Development of Hindi-Urdu*. Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press
190. Roca A, Lipski JM. 1993. *Spanish in the United States: Linguistic Contact and Diversity*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter
191. Romaine S. 1981. On the status of variable rules in sociolinguistic theory. *J. Linguist.* 17:93–119
192. Romaine S. 1989. *Bilingualism*. New York: Blackwell
193. Romaine S. 1992. *Language, Education and Development: Urban and Rural Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea*. Oxford: Clarendon
194. Romaine S. 1994. Hawai’i Creole English as a literary language. *Lang. Soc.* 23: 527–54
195. Rubin J. 1968. *National Bilingualism in Paraguay*. The Hague: Mouton
196. Ryan EB. 1973. Subjective reactions toward accented speech. In *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*, ed. R Shuy, R Fasold. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press
197. Ryan EB. 1979. Why do low-prestige language varieties persist? In *Language and Social Psychology*, ed. H Giles, R St. Clair, pp. 145–57. Baltimore, MD: Univ. Park Press
198. San Antonio P. 1987. Social mobility and language use in an American company in Japan. *J. Lang. Soc. Psychol.* 6:191–200
199. Sánchez R. 1983. *Chicano Discourse: Sociohistoric Perspectives*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House
200. Schieffelin BB, Doucet RC. 1994. The “real” Haitian Creole: ideology, metalinguistics and orthographic choice. *Am. Ethnol.* 21:176–200
201. Schmidt A. 1985. *Young People’s Dyirbal*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
202. Scollon R, Scollon SBK. 1981. *Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex
203. Silva-Corvalán C. 1994. *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
204. Silverstein M. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories and cultural description. In *Meaning in Anthropology*, ed. K Basso, H



- Selby, pp. 11–55. Albuquerque: Univ. NM Press
205. Silverstein M. 1987. Monoglot “standard” in America. *Work. Pap. Proc. Cent. Psychosoc. Stud.* No.13. Chicago: Cent. Psychosoc. Stud.
  206. Singh R. 1983. We, they and us: a note on code-switching and stratification in North India. *Lang. Soc.* 12:71–73
  207. Singh R, Lele J, Martohardjono G. 1988. Communication in a multilingual society: some missed opportunities. *Lang. Soc.* 17: 43–59
  208. Swigart L. 1992. Two codes or one? The insiders view and the description of code-switching in Dakar. *J. Multiling. Multicult. Dev.* 13:83–102
  209. Tarver H. 1989. Language and politics in the 1980s: the story of US English. *Pol. Soc.* 17:225–45
  210. Teschner R. 1995. Beachheads, islands and conduits: Spanish monolingualism and bilingualism in El Paso, Texas. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 114(4):In press
  211. Thomas G. 1991. *Linguistic Purism*. London: Longman
  212. Tollefson JW. 1993. Language policy and power: Yugoslavia, the Philippines and Southeast Asian refugees in the United States. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 103:73–95
  213. Torres L. 1989. Mood selection among New York Puerto Ricans. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 79:67–77
  214. Torres L. 1991. The construction of the self in US Latina autobiographies. In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. C Mohanty, A Russo, L Torres, pp. 271–87. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
  215. Torres L. 1992. Women’s oral narratives in a New York Puerto Rican community. In *Women Making Meaning: New Feminist Directions in Communication*, ed. L Rakow, pp. 244–62. London: Harper Collins
  216. Torres L. 1995. *Puerto Rican Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
  217. Tovey H. 1988. The state and the Irish language: the role of Bord na Gaeilge. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 70:53–68
  218. Trosset C. 1986. The social identity of Welsh learners. *Lang. Soc.* 15:165–92
  219. Tsitsipis L. 1989. Skewed performance and full performance in language obsolescence: the case of an Albanian variety. See Ref. 48, pp. 117–37
  220. Urciuoli B. 1985. Bilingualism as code versus bilingualism as practice. *Anthropol. Linguist.* 27:363–86
  221. Urciuoli B. 1991. The political topography of Spanish and English: the view from a New York Puerto Rican neighborhood. *Am. Ethnol.* 18:295–310
  222. Urciuoli B. 1995. *The Semiotics of Exclusion: Puerto Rican Experiences of Race, Class and Language*. Boulder, CO: Westview
  223. Urla J. 1988. Ethnic protest and social planning: a look at Basque language revival. *Cult. Anthropol.* 3:379–94
  224. Urla J. 1993. Cultural politics in an age of statistics: numbers, nation and the making of Basque identity. *Am. Ethnol.* 20(4): 818–43
  225. Urla J. 1993. Contesting modernities: language standardization and the production of an ancient/modern Basque culture. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13:101–18
  226. Valdés G. 1981. Codeswitching as deliberate verbal strategy. See Ref. 53, pp. 95–108
  227. Valdés G. 1982. Social interaction and code-switching patterns: a case study of Spanish-English alternation. See Ref. 4, pp. 209–29
  228. Valdés G. 1990. Consideraciones teórico-metodológicas para el estudio del bilingüismo inglés-español en el lado mexicano de la frontera. *Mex. Stud. Estud. Mex.* 6: 43–66
  229. Vásquez O, Shannon S, Pease Alvarez L. 1994. *Pushing Boundaries*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press
  230. Veltman C. 1983. *Language Shift in the United States*. New York: Mouton
  231. Veltman C. 1988. *The Future of the Spanish Language in the United States*. New York: Hispanic Pol. Dev. Proj.
  232. von Gleich U. 1994. Language spread policy: the case of Quechua in the Andean republics of Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru. *Int. J. Soc. Lang.* 107:77–113
  233. Walsh C. 1991. *Pedagogy and the Struggle for Voice: Issues of Language, Power and Schooling for Puerto Ricans*. New York: Bergin & Garvey
  234. Wardhaugh R. 1987. *Languages in Competition: Dominance, Diversity, and Decline*. Oxford: Blackwell
  235. Weinreich U. 1963. [1953]. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton
  236. Williams C. 1991. *Linguistic Minorities, Society and Territory*. Clevedon, Engl.: Multilingual Matters
  237. Wolfson N, Manes J, eds. 1985. *Language of Inequality*. Berlin: Mouton
  238. Woolard KA. 1985. Language variation and cultural hegemony: toward and integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *Am. Ethnol.* 12:738–48
  239. Woolard KA. 1989. *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
  240. Woolard KA. 1989. Sentences in the language prison: the rhetorical structuring of an American language policy debate. *Am. Ethnol.* 16:268–78

## 546 URCIUOLI

241. Woolard KA. 1989. Language convergence and language death as social processes. See Ref. 48, pp. 355–67
242. Woolard KA, Gahng T-J. 1990. Changing language policies and attitudes in autonomous Catalonia. *Lang. Soc.* 19:311–30
243. Woolard KA, Schieffelin BB. 1994. Language ideology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 23: 55–82
244. Zentella AC. 1981. *Tá bien*, you could answer me *en cualquier idioma*: Puerto Rican code-switching in bilingual classrooms. See Ref. 53, pp. 109–31
245. Zentella AC. 1982. Codeswitching and interactions among Puerto Rican children. See Ref. 4, pp. 354–85
246. Zentella AC. 1988. Language politics in the U.S.A.: the English-only movement. In *Literature, Language and Politics in the 80's*, ed. BJ Craige, pp. 39–53. Athens: Univ. Georgia Press
247. Zentella AC. 1990. Who supports Official English and why?: The influence of social variables and questionnaire methodology. See Ref. 1, pp. 161–77
248. Zentella AC. 1995. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York City*. Oxford: Blackwell



## CONTENTS

### OVERVIEW

- The Life of an Academic: A Personal Record of a Teacher,  
Administrator, and Anthropologist, *Ernestine Friedl* 1

### ARCHAEOLOGY

- Clocking the First Americans, *David J. Meltzer* 21  
The Archaeology of Slavery in North America, *Theresa A. Singleton* 119  
Political Economy in Early Mesopotamian States, *Norman Yoffee* 281  
Tasmanian Archaeology: Establishing the Sequences, *Rhys Jones* 423  
Frontiers and Boundaries in Archaeological Perspective, *Kent G. Lightfoot and Antoinette Martinez* 471

### BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

- Biological Changes in Human Populations with Agriculture, *Clark Spencer Larsen* 185  
Miocene Hominoids and Hominid Origins, *Brenda R. Benefit and Monte L. McCrossin* 237  
Toward a Life History of the Hominidae, *B. Holly Smith and Robert L. Tompkins* 257  
Osteoporosis in Biocultural Perspective, *William A. Stini* 397  
Hormones, Sex, and Gender, *Carol M. Worthman* 593

### LINGUISTICS AND COMMUNICATIVE PRACTICES

- Literacy and Literacies, *James Collins* 75  
Advances in Maya Epigraphy, *Victoria R. Bricker* 215  
Metrical Phonology, *Michael Hammond* 313  
Language Acquisition in Crosslinguistic Perspective, *Edith L. Bavin* 373  
Language and Borders, *Bonnie Urciuoli* 525

SOCIOCULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The Persistent Power of "Race" in the Cultural and Political Economy of Racism, <i>Faye V. Harrison</i>	47
Ethnography In/Of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography, <i>George E. Marcus</i>	95
Consumption and Commodities, <i>D. Miller</i>	141
Science as Culture, Cultures of Science, <i>Sarah Franklin</i>	163
Kinship Studies in Late Twentieth-Century Anthropology, <i>Michael G. Peletz</i>	343
The Mexican-US Border: The Making of an Anthropology of Borderlands, <i>Robert R. Alvarez, Jr.</i>	447
Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things, <i>Liisa H. Malkki</i>	495
The Local and the Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism, <i>M. Kearney</i>	547
All Made Up: Performance Theory and the New Anthropology of Sex and Gender, <i>Rosalind C. Morris</i>	567

THEME I: BORDER ISSUES

The Mexican-US Border: The Making of an Anthropology of Borderlands, <i>Robert R. Alvarez, Jr.</i>	447
Frontiers and Boundaries in Archaeological Perspective, <i>Kent G. Lightfoot and Antoinette Martinez</i>	471
Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things, <i>Liisa H. Malkki</i>	495
Language and Borders, <i>Bonnie Urciuoli</i>	525
The Local and the Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism, <i>Michael Kearney</i>	547

THEME II: GENDER

All Made Up: Performance Theory and the New Anthropology of Sex and Gender, <i>Rosalind C. Morris</i>	567
Hormones, Sex, and Gender, <i>Carol M. Worthman</i>	593

INDEXES

Author Index	619
Subject Index	641
Cumulative Index of Contributing Authors	657
Cumulative Index of Titles	659