

debated whether an English academy should be established to regulate the language, the idea of such an institution came from France. The proposal was rejected largely because the English did not wish to duplicate what they regarded as French "tyranny."

In France, as in other countries, the process of standardization was intimately tied to the history of the nation itself. As the people developed a sense of cohesion around a common government, their language became a vehicle and a symbol of their unity. The process is reasonably well documented in the histories written for the older European languages. But the period since the French Revolution has seen a veritable language explosion, which has been far less adequately studied. In many countries a process that elsewhere took centuries of effort on the part of a people and its writers has been compressed into a few short years or decades. In a study of the new standards developed since 1800 for Germanic languages, Heinz Kloss has suggested that there may be a typical profile for what he has called the "Ausbau" of a new language (Kloss 1952:28). First comes its use for purely humorous or folkloristic purposes. Then lyric writers may adopt it, followed by prose narrators. But it has not reached a crucial stage of development until success is achieved in writing serious expository prose, or what he calls "Zweckschrifttum." Beyond this comes the elaboration of the language for purposes of technical and scientific writing and government use. Each of these "domains" (as Fishman [1964] has called them) constitutes a challenge for the language in its attempt to achieve full development.

While making a survey of the world's standard languages, Ferguson proposed (1962) to classify them along two dimensions: their degree of standardization (St. 0, 1, 2) and their utilization in writing (W 0, 1, 2, 3). Zero meant in each case no appreciable standardization or writing. St. 1 meant that a language was standardized in more than one mode, as is the case, for example, with Armenian, Greek, Serbo-Croatian, and Hindi-Urdu. He also included Norwegian, but it is at least arguable that we are here dealing with two languages. St. 2 he defined as a language having a "single, widely accepted norm which is felt to be appropriate with only minor modifications or variations for all purposes for which the language is used." W 1 he applied to a language used for "normal written purposes," W 2 to one used for "original research in physical sciences,"

and W 3 to one used for "translations and résumés of scientific work in other languages."

These categories suggest the path that "underdeveloped" languages must take to become adequate instruments for a modern nation. The "standardization" to which Ferguson refers applies primarily to developing the form of a language, i.e., its linguistic structure, including phonology, grammar, and lexicon. We shall call this the problem of codification. Ferguson's scale of "utilization in writing" applies rather to the functions of a language. We shall call this the problem of elaboration, a term suggested by a similar usage of Bernstein's (1962) and corresponding to Kloss's Ausbau. As the ideal goals of a standard language, codification may be defined as minimal variation in form, elaboration as maximal variation in function.

The ideal case of minimal variation in form would be a hypothetical, "pure" variety of a language having only one spelling and one pronunciation for every word, one word for every meaning, and one grammatical framework for all utterances. For purposes of efficient communication this is obviously the ideal code. If speakers and listeners have identical codes, no problems of misunderstanding can arise due to differences in language. There can be none of what communication engineers call "code noise" in the channel (Hockett 1958:331-332). This condition is best attained if the language has a high degree of stability, a quality emphasized by many writers on the subject (e.g., Havránek 1938). Stability means the slowing down or complete stoppage of linguistic change. It means the fixation forever (or for as long as possible) of a uniform norm. In practice such fixation has proved to be chimerical, since even the most stable of norms inevitably changes as generations come and go. At all times the standard is threatened by the existence of rival norms, the so-called "dialects," among its users. It is liable to interference from them and eventually to complete fragmentation by them.

Apparently opposed to the strict codification of form stands the maximal variation or elaboration of function one expects from a fully developed language. Since it is by definition the common language of a social group more complex and inclusive than those using vernaculars, its functional domains must also be complex. It must

answer to the needs of a variety of communities, classes, occupations, and interest groups. It must meet the basic test of adequacy. Any vernacular is presumably adequate at a given moment for the needs of the group that uses it. But for the needs of the much larger society of the nation it is not adequate, and it becomes necessary to supplement its resources to make it into a language. Every vernacular can at the very least add words borrowed from other languages, but usually possesses devices for making new words from its own resources as well. Writing, which provides for the virtually unlimited storage and distribution of vocabulary, is the technological device enabling a modern standard language to meet the needs of every specialty devised by its users. There are no limits to the elaboration of language except those set by the ingenuity of man.

While form and function may generally be distinguished as we have just done, there is one area in which they overlap. Elaboration of function may lead to complexity of form, and, contrariwise, unity of form may lead to rigidity of function. This area of interaction between form and function is the domain of style. A codification may be so rigid as to prevent the use of a language for other than formal purposes. Sanskrit had to yield to Prakrit, and Latin to the Romance languages, when the gap between written and spoken language became so large that only a very few people were willing to make the effort of learning them. Instead of being appropriate for "all purposes for which the language is used," the standard tends to become only one of several styles within a speech community. This can lead to what Ferguson (1959) has described as "diglossia," a sharp cleavage between "high" and "low" style. Or it may be a continuum, with only a mild degree of what I have called "schizoglossia," as in the case of English (Haugen 1962). In English there is a marked difference between the written and spoken standards of most people. In addition, there are styles within each, according to the situation. These styles, which could be called "functional dialects," provide wealth and diversity within a language and ensure that the stability or rigidity of the norm will have an element of elasticity as well. A complete language has its formal and informal styles, its regional accents, and its class or occupational jargons, which do not destroy its unity so long as they are clearly diversified in function and show a reasonable degree of solidarity with one another.

Neither codification nor elaboration is likely to proceed very far unless the community can agree on the selection of some kind of a model from which the norm can be derived. Where a new norm is to be established, the problem will be as complex as the sociolinguistic structure of the people involved. There will be little difficulty where everyone speaks virtually alike, a situation rarely found. Elsewhere it may be necessary to make some embarrassing decisions. To choose any one vernacular as a norm means to favor the group of people speaking that variety. It gives them prestige as norm-bearers and a headstart in the race for power and position. If a recognized élite already exists with a characteristic vernacular, its norm will almost inevitably prevail. But where there are socially coordinate groups of people within the community, usually distributed regionally or tribally, the choice of any one will meet with resistance from the rest. This resistance is likely to be the stronger the greater the language distance within the group. It may often be a question of solidarity versus alienation: a group that feels intense solidarity is willing to overcome great linguistic differences, while one that does not is alienated by relatively small differences. Where transitions are gradual, it may be possible to find a central dialect that mediates between extremes, one that will be the easiest to learn and most conducive to group coherence.

Where this is impossible, it may be necessary to resort to the construction of a new standard. To some extent this has happened naturally in the rise of the traditional norms; it has been the aim of many language reformers to duplicate the effect in new ones. For related dialects one can apply principles of linguistic reconstruction to make a hypothetical mother tongue for them all. Or one can be guided by some actual or supposed mother tongue, which exists in older, traditional writings. Or one can combine those forms that have the widest usage, in the hope that they will most easily win general acceptance. These three procedures—the comparative, the archaizing, and the statistical—may easily clash, to make decisions difficult. In countries where there are actually different languages, amounting in some African nations to more than a hundred, it will be necessary either to recognize multiple norms or to introduce an alien norm, which will usually be an international language like English or French.

Finally, a standard language, if it is not to be dismissed as dead, must have a body of users. Acceptance of the norm, even by a small but influential group, is part of the life of the language. Any learning requires the expenditure of time and effort, and it must somehow contribute to the well-being of the learners if they are not to shirk their lessons. A standard language that is the instrument of an authority, such as a government, can offer its users material rewards in the form of power and position. One that is the instrument of a religious fellowship, such as a church, can also offer its users rewards in the hereafter. National languages have offered membership in the nation, an identity that gives one entrée into a new kind of group, which is not just kinship, or government, or religion, but a novel and peculiarly modern brew of all three. The kind of significance attributed to language in this context has little to do with its value as an instrument of thought or persuasion. It is primarily symbolic, a matter of the prestige (or lack of it) that attaches to specific forms or varieties of language by virtue of identifying the social status of their users (Labov 1964). Mastery of the standard language will naturally have a higher value if it admits one to the councils of the mighty. If it does not, the inducement to learn it, except perhaps passively, may be very low; if social status is fixed by other criteria, it is conceivable that centuries could pass without a population's adopting it (Gumperz 1962, 1964). But in our industrialized and democratic age there are obvious reasons for the rapid spread of standard languages and for their importance in the school systems of every nation.

The four aspects of language development that we have now isolated as crucial features in taking the step from "dialect" to "language," from vernacular to standard, are as follows: (1) selection of norm, (2) codification of form, (3) elaboration of function, and (4) acceptance by the community. The first two refer primarily to the form, the last two to the function of language. The first and the last are concerned with society, the second and third with language. They form a matrix within which it should be possible to discuss all the major problems of language and dialect in the life of a nation:

	<u>Form</u>	<u>Function</u>
<u>Society</u>	Selection	Acceptance
<u>Language</u>	Codification	Elaboration

NOTE

This paper was written as a contribution to the work of the Seminar on Sociolinguistics, held at the Indiana University Linguistic Institute in the summer of 1964, under the direction of Charles A. Ferguson. It has profited from extensive discussion with the members of the Seminar.

REFERENCES

- Bernstein, Basil. 1962. Linguistic codes, hesitation phenomena and intelligence. Language and Speech 5:31-46.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. Language. New York, Holt.
- Bright, William, and A. K. Ramunujan. 1964. Sociolinguistic variation and language change. Proceedings, IX International Congress of Linguists. The Hague, Mouton. Pp. 1107-1114.
- Brun, Auguste. 1946. Parlers régionaux: France dialectale et unité française. Paris, Toulouse: Didier.
- Buck, C. D. 1916. Language and the sentiment of nationality. American Political Science Review 10:44-69.
- Clivio, Gianrenzo. 1964. Piedmontese: a short basic course. Mimeographed ed. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D. C.
- Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française. 1932. Paris, 8th ed.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. Diglossia. Word 15:325-340.
- _____. 1962. The language factor in national development. Anthropological Linguistics 4, 1:23-27.
- Fishman, Joshua. 1964. Language maintenance—language shift as a field of inquiry. Linguistics 9:32-70.
- Gumperz, John. 1962. Types of linguistic communities. Anthropological Linguistics 4, 1:28-40.
- _____. 1964. Hindi-Punjabi code switching in Delhi. Proceedings, IX International Congress of Linguists. The Hague, Mouton. Pp. 1115-1124.
- Hatzfeld, A., and A. Darmesteter. 1920. Dictionnaire général de la langue française. Paris, 6. ed.
- Haugen, Einar. 1962. Schizoglossia and the linguistic norm. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics. Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. No. 15, 63-69. [In this volume, pp. 148-58.]