



VIENNA ENGLISH WORKING PAPERS

VOLUME 7

NUMBER 1

JUNE, 1998

CONTENTS

IMPRESSUM	46
LETTER FROM THE EDITORS	1
ALFRED BAMMESBERGER Historical Linguistics and English philology: some further thoughts	3
OLGA FISCHER Grammaticalisation: unidirectional, non-reversible? The case of <i>to</i> before the infinitive in English	5
JULIA ISABEL HÜTTNER Patterns of code choice and code switching as indicators of language balance at a bilingual primary school.....	25
JENNIFER JENKINS Rethinking Phonology in Teacher Education.....	40

LETTER FROM THE EDITORS

Here it is: VIEWS 7(1) – the spring number to take along for your summer vacation! This issue contains two original papers. Julia Hüttner discusses ‘school bilingualism’ at an English/German bilingual primary school in Vienna, focusing on the role of code switching in different types of interaction; and Olga Fischer presents challenging VIEWS on whether grammaticalisation can really be regarded as a uni-directional, non-reversible process. Some of her arguments have lead to heated discussions in our editorial meetings – we would very much like to have your opinion on this matter.

We are particularly glad that you have once more responded to our call for direct and informal replies to contributions, two of which you will find in this issue: commenting on N. Ritt's contribution in VIEWS 6/2, Alfred Bammesberger voices his VIEWS on the relevance of historical linguistics, and Jennifer Jenkins discusses the status of phonology in teacher education in reply to B. Seidlhofer (see also VIEWS 6/2).

So we hope you will enjoy your summer VIEWS, and: please do not forget about your donation - we are counting on it.

The Editors

P.S: As usual, please send contributions of the reactive and/or proactive type to:



c/o

**Institut für Anglistik & Amerikanistik der Universität Wien
Universitätscampus AAKH, Spitalgasse 2, Hof 8
A – 1090 Vienna; Austria**

fax

(intern.) 43 1 4277 9424

eMail

nikolaus.ritt@univie.ac.at

W3

<http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik>

Historical Linguistics and English Philology: Some further thoughts

Alfred Bammesberger

The roots of historical linguistics as practised nowadays (Hock 1996) go back no further than the late eighteenth century: Sir William Jones' famous 1786 address hailed in a new approach which grounded language research on verifiable and falsifiable statements and distanced itself from earlier methods. Indeed throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages human beings had been interested in finding out about their language(s). But the comparative aspect was absent, therefore a truly historical perspective could not be achieved. The nineteenth century saw the development of historical and comparative linguistics as a major branch of academic work. At the end of the twentieth century historical linguistics seems to have reached an impasse. Not that there is any lack of ideas, plans or projects. But we apparently are in trouble, as can be seen from Nikolaus Ritt's 1997 paper. Since I have been in the profession for something like four decades by now I may be allowed a few comments on Ritt's beautifully written and well argued paper. The central question as to what "the use of historical linguistics" may be does certainly not allow an easy answer, because that would largely depend on one's definition of the term *use*. Economics, medicine and science are commonly thought of as being particularly "useful", because they produce tangible results. Ritt mentions law in the same list, but here I would be rather sceptical. I will certainly not insist on the many errors that were committed in the name of the law, but I have the feeling that most of the legal niceties that occupy the lawyers' minds have little practical relevance. And of course other branches of university study like political science may have their justifications and motivations, but it would be hard to point out what precisely their *use* is.

I do not wish to confront my subject with other academic approaches, however, because I fear that in the process of comparison my arguments are bound to be outweighed by what conceivable opponents may come up with. In this context I would rather argue that within the framework of English philology historical linguistics can lead to new results advantageous for all.

Historical linguistics should be just a first step. Whether this ought to be an obligatory step I do not know. Personally I hesitate very much to make any-

thing obligatory, because once a subject is obligatory we have the permanent bickering of those who want to minimize the requirements and ultimately abolish the subject as a whole; under normal circumstances they are successful. If, however, historical linguistics is one major branch *integrated* in English philology then our chances are infinitely better. Of course the subject must be made attractive. Although nobody can deny the importance of historical phonology, the primary aim of studying the regularity of sound changes (and the disruptions wrought by analogy) must always be to lead to further insights. Most of these insights concern etymology in the widest possible sense: Semantics as well as archaeology and anthropology must play their roles in historical linguistics. What we absolutely need is the active collaboration with neighbouring subjects, such as Germanic, Romance and Classics; but the ‘smaller’ subjects such as Slavic, Celtic and above all Indo-European should also be brought in. The approach must by all means be *interdisciplinary*. Historical linguistics should be concerned with the full range of the development of human activities to which language is basic and central. Therefore stylistics would be part of the subject as well as the development of writing systems. Historical linguistics should lead to cultural studies in the most encompassing sense.

Here we probably come full cycle to where we started: Before the eighteenth century human beings were for ever interested in the ‘true’ meaning of words (hence the term *etymology*, since Greek *etymos* means ‘true’). We should take up this challenge but view it from the vantage point of twentieth century scholarship: If we succeed in making the study of historical linguistics pervasively interesting within the framework of English philology, then the subject will flourish and bear fruit in the university life of Europe and beyond.

References

- Hock, Hans Henrich, Joseph, Brian D. 1996. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship. An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jones, Sir William. 1786. Third Anniversary Discourse. Printed Royal Asiatic Society 1788. Frequently reprinted, e.g. Hock 1996: 35 and 455.
- Ritt, Nikolaus. 1997. What’s the use of historical linguistics? A question, a report and an invitation. VIEWS 6 (2): 50-54

Grammaticalisation: unidirectional, non-reversible?

The case of to before the infinitive in English

Olga Fischer, Amsterdam

In the literature on grammaticalisation it is quite generally assumed that this process is unidirectional and non-reversible, and also that it is essentially a process driven by semantic or pragmatic factors with grammatical changes as it were automatically following (cf. Brinton 1988; Lehmann 1991; Traugott & Heine 1991, Hopper & Traugott 1993; Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994).¹ I have tried to show on two other occasions (cf. Fischer 1994b, 1997b) that the syntactic and semantic changes do not necessarily go in tandem, and that the assumption of grammaticalisation as a diachronic process clashes with models of change that accept that change takes place within the grammar of each speaker, i.e. that each speaker builds up his grammar afresh and does not take account of processes that have started long before he was there. I agree with Harris and Campbell (1995) that it is probably methodologically more accurate to consider grammaticalisation not as a separate mechanism or cause of change, but as a process built up out of a series of reanalyses and extensions. A process that may proceed all the way, from lexical item to affix or even zero, but as often as not may stop halfway, or may even regress to some extent. Each station in the series or the chain is dependent on synchronic circumstances and determines the direction of the change afresh. In another paper that I gave in Zurich in March 1997 at a symposium on iconicity (Fischer in press), I also tried to show that many of the processes at work during grammaticalisation are motivated by iconicity, such as analogy, metaphor, isomorphism and persistence. I do not wish to go very deeply into the iconic aspects of grammaticalisation here (I refer the interested reader to Fischer in press), but I would like to look in detail at what happened in one particular case of grammaticalisation, and determine the nature of the process, and what may have caused it, in order

¹ This is the text of an oral presentation I gave at the *13th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, held at Düsseldorf in September 1997. For a fuller and more formally worked out presentation of the topic I refer the reader to Fischer (in preparation).

to get a clearer picture of what grammaticalisation *is*. But first, before turning to this case study, I will indicate, with the help of some examples, how grammaticalisation has been generally understood. I also want to briefly show what I understand by iconicity, since this plays an important background role in the discussion that follows.

Grammaticalisation is a process whereby a lexical item, with full referential meaning, develops into a grammatical marker; this is accompanied by a reduction in or loss of phonetic substance, loss of syntactic independence and of cognitive meaning. In formal terms the reduction could be described as follows (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993:7),

content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix > (zero)

A well-known illustration of this process is adverb formation in Romance languages, e.g. in French or Italian (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993:130-31). We can roughly distinguish the following stages,

1. (Latin) *humile mente*: ‘with a humble mind’
2. a. (Old French) *humble(-)ment*: ‘in a humble(-)way’
b. *lentement*: ‘in a slow-way’
c. *humble e doucement*: ‘in a humble and gentle-way’
3. *humblement*: ‘humbly’
4. *humblement et doucement*: ‘humbly and gently’

At stage (1) the Latin feminine noun *mens* (ablative *mente*) could be used with adjectives to indicate the state of mind in/with which something was done. At a next stage, the phrase acquired a more general sense (2a), and *mente* came to be used also with adjectives not restricted to a psychological sense (2b). However, *mente* retained some of its independence in that in a conjoined adjectival phrase the morpheme did not need to be repeated (2c). Finally during stage (3), the noun fully developed into an inflexional morpheme, the only remnant of the original construction being the feminine <e> ending after the adjective, which now serves mainly as a kind of epenthetic vowel to ease pronunciation. Another illustration of a still ongoing grammaticalisation process can be given from English (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993:2-3),

1. I am going (to Haarlem) to visit my aunt
2. I am going to marry (tomorrow)
3. I am going to like it
4. It is going to rain
5. I am going to go there for sure
6. I'm gonna go

In the first example ‘go’ is used as a concrete directional verb and the infinitive consequently has a purposive function. In contexts where the finite verb and the infinitive are adjacent, the directionality of the verb could change from a locative into a temporal one, expressing futurity (2). Which meaning it has in each particular instance depends very heavily on context, e.g. the addition of *tomorrow* in (2) makes temporal directionality much more likely. Once this non-directional sense has developed the verb ‘go’ also begins to be found with infinitives which are incompatible with a purposive meaning as in (3), and from there it may spread to other structures (4-5), more and more losing its concrete directional sense. As a result of the loss of directional content, the verbal structure could also undergo loss of phonetic substance (6); in (5-6) the verbal structure has changed from full verb to (semi-)auxiliary status. It is to be noted that this particular grammaticalisation process reflects a diachronic development as well as synchronic variation (this situation is quite usual in grammaticalisation and has been called ‘layering’, cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993:123 ff.).

As I mentioned above, I believe that iconicity plays an important role in grammaticalisation processes, and may even upset some of its presumed unidirectionality. Since iconicity is used by linguists in different ways, a description of what I understand by iconicity is in order. Iconicity as a semiotic notion refers to a natural resemblance or analogy between the form of a sign (‘the signifier’, be it a letter or sound, a word, a structure of words, or even the absence of a sign) and the object or concept (‘the signified’) it refers to in the world or rather in our perception of the world. The similarity between sign and object may be due to common features inherent in both: by direct inspection of the iconic sign we may glean true information about its object. In this case we could speak of ‘imagic’ iconicity (as in a portrait or in onomatopoeia, e.g. ‘cuckoo’) and the sign is called an ‘iconic image.’ When we have a plurality of signs, the analogy may be more abstract: we then have to do with diagrammatic iconicity which is based on a *relationship* between signs that mirrors a similar relation between objects/concepts or actions (e.g. a temporal sequence of actions is reflected in the sequence of the three verbs in Caesar’s dictum “veni, vidi, vici”: in this instance, the sign – here the syntactic structure of three verbs – is an ‘iconic diagram.’) Obviously, it is primarily diagrammatic iconicity that is of great relevance to language. Both imagic and diagrammatic iconicity are not clean-cut categories but form a continuum, on which the iconic instances run from almost perfect mirroring (i.e. a semiotic relationship that is virtually independent of any individual language) to a relationship that becomes more and more suggestive and also more and more language-dependent. Isomorphism, a term also used in the discussion that follows, is an

example of diagrammatic iconicity of a rather abstract kind. It is used here in the sense used by Haiman (1980:515-16), i.e. the principle of one form (signifier) corresponding to one meaning (signified).

After this brief excursion, I now wish to consider what exactly the nature of grammaticalisation is. One of the problems I have with the way grammaticalisation has been dealt with in the literature is that the mechanistic side of it has been overemphasised, with the result, I think, that the mechanism has become too powerful as an explanatory tool or as a description of a diachronic process of linguistic change. Thus, the following quote from Bybee et al. (1994: 298) suggests that grammaticalisation is seen as an independent process with independent explanatory value:

Thus our view of grammaticalization is much more mechanistic than functional: the relation between grammar and function is indirect and mediated by diachronic process. The processes that lead to grammaticalization occur in language use *for their own sakes*; it just happens that their cumulative effect is the development of grammar'
(italics added).

Similarly, Vincent (1995:434) talks about ‘the power of grammaticalisation as an agent of change’, which suggests that grammaticalisation has explanatory value, that it has independent force. Finally, Heine et al. (1991b:9) write that ‘Meillet followed Bopp rather than Humboldt in using grammaticalization as *an explanatory parameter* in historical linguistics’ (italics added), and the authors themselves seem to follow this line too (see 1991b:11).

Let us first look at the way the process has been described in the literature. Grammaticalisation is generally seen as a *gradual* diachronic process which is characterised as *unidirectional*, i.e. it always shows the ‘evolution of substance from the more specific to the more general and abstract’ (Bybee et al. 1994:13). The unidirectionality applies on all levels, the semantic, the syntactic and the phonological. Almost without exception, the process is seen as *semantically driven*, with bleaching of meaning playing a primary role. (This is not true for all linguists, notably Hopper and Traugott (1993) believe that bleaching only plays a role in the later stages of grammaticalisation.) Rubba (1994:81), for instance, describes it as primarily a process of semantic change. Bybee et al. (1994:17-18) even suggest that we can reconstruct the path of grammaticalisation with the help of the ‘hypothesis that semantic change is predictable’. The notion of graduality implies that grammaticalisation is seen as ‘an evolutionary continuum. Any attempt at segmenting it into discrete units must remain arbitrary to some extent’ (Heine and Reh 1984:15, and see also Heine et al. (1991b:68, 165 and passim). In this light it is not surprising to read that the mechanisms at work in and the causes of grammaticalisation are also seen as basically semantic/pragmatic in nature. For most linguists writing on grammaticalisation, the main mechanisms involved are metaphoric and me-

tonymic in nature.² Metaphoric change can be related to analogy, it is a type of paradigmatic change whereby a word-sign used for a concrete object (i.e. the word *back* as part of the body) can be reinterpreted on a more abstract level as an indication of ‘location’ (because of some element that these concepts have in common), and then further interpreted along the metaphorical axis as an indication of ‘time’. Metonymic change can be related to re-analysis, and functions on the syntagmatic plane. It takes place mainly via the ‘semanticization of conversational inferences’ (Hopper and Traugott 1993:84). A good example of metonymic change is the case of *to be going to* discussed above. Another example discussed by Hopper and Traugott (1994:85) is the change in OE *hwile* ‘while’; the meaning of temporal simultaneity may change into a causal meaning because in many cases ‘the conditions specified in the subordinate clause [i.e. the clause introduced by *while*] serve not only as the temporal frame of reference for those in the main clause, but also as the grounds for the situation’.

As far as the *cause* of grammaticalisation is concerned, this is usually seen as being pragmatic in nature. Bybee et al. (1994:300) write: ‘the push for grammaticalization ... originates ... in the tendency to infer as much as possible from the input, and in the necessity of interpreting items in context.’ They show that grammaticalisation occurs in cycles or is self-propelling. The process of grammaticalisation (loss of concrete form) itself leads to a search for new expressive means to indicate the same function, and when the new expression has again grammaticalised, the search for a new concrete expression begins again. Likewise Hopper and Traugott (1993:86) concur with Heine et al. (1991a:150-51) that ‘grammaticalization can be interpreted as the result of a process which has **problem-solving** as its main goal’. It is the result of a ‘search for ways to regulate communication and negotiate speaker-hearer interaction’ (1993:86).

Although I would agree with the views just now discussed, i.e. that re-analysis and analogy, or metonymic and metaphorical processes, are important in language change, and also that grammaticalisation may be caused by the

² Bybee et al. (1994:289ff.) recognise three other mechanisms of semantic change that play a role in grammaticalisation (it is quite clear that for them the mechanisms of semantic change are more or less equivalent to the mechanisms found in grammaticalisation, see p.282), i.e. (3) generalisation, (4) harmony and (5) absorption of contextual meaning. It is clear from their description that all three mechanisms are essentially metonymic in nature, with metaphor playing a subsidiary role. Indeed they conclude (p.297): ‘The most important point that can be made from the discussion of mechanisms of change is that context is all-important.’

need for expressivity and routinisation, I still cannot see that there is room for a separate or ‘independent’ process of grammaticalisation. Where most linguists see a unidirectional process from concrete to abstract, a process that cannot be cut up into segments, I can only see a more or less accidental concurrence. The processes underlying grammaticalisation may lead one way as well as another, i.e. there is no necessary link between one segment of the chain of grammaticalisation and another.³

I also think that grammaticalisation processes themselves can only be discovered with hindsight, which means that if we have a preconceived notion of what grammaticalisation *is*, we will indeed discover mainly those processes that have run a full or ‘fullish’ course, and we will not realise that there may be many cases where the path of grammaticalisation proceeded differently. So it may only *seem* that grammaticalisation usually follows the same channel. Aborted and reversed processes are very difficult to find when one looks backwards in this way.⁴ So the similarities in known cases of grammaticalisation may have led to an overemphasis on a common core, and through that the idea may have arisen that grammaticalisation is an explanatory parameter in itself. To my mind it is the subprocesses that *explain* the change. I agree with linguists such as Lightfoot (1979, 1991) and Joseph (1992) that, logically, diachronic processes cannot exist because diachronic grammars do not exist. Each speaker makes up his own grammar afresh on the basis of data surrounding him, and on the basis of his general cognitive abilities or strategies (or, so one wishes, on the basis of some innate Language Acquisition Device). So why should a grammaticalisation process necessarily run from *a* to *b*, to *c* etc.? Why should there be unidirectionality? With Harris and Campbell (1995:20, 336ff.) (and see also Fischer 1997b) I would tend to accept that grammaticalisation has no independent status, no explanatory value in itself. It was when I looked at the so-called grammaticalisation of *have to* in English from a possessive

³ Heine et al. (1991a) indeed refer to the process as a ‘chain’.

⁴ It is interesting to note that Bruyn (1995), who was looking at the developments taking place in a pidgin becoming a creole (where it is believed that grammaticalisation plays an important role), and so, as it were looking for grammaticalisation evidence from another perspective (not on the basis of selected cases from many languages as is usually done, but on the basis of full data from one language where the process might be expected to apply according to the hypothesis), found very few cases where grammaticalisation ran its full course. She found that language contact (especially substratum influence) often caused divergence (p. 241 ff.), or early abortion (p.53ff), or that sometimes a development was much more abrupt than is usual in grammaticalisation cases (pp.237-39). Her investigation shows that it is important at each stage to take into account the synchronic circumstances, which will ultimately (and freshly) decide what will happen.

verb to a modal auxiliary (see Fischer 1994b) that I began to realise that not all grammaticalisation change is driven semantically, and that unexpected, language specific factors may play a role. I think it pays to look at any hypothetical grammaticalisation process in detail, next to taking the wider, typological bird's eye view. Here, therefore, I would like to consider the case of infinitival *to* in English.

The case of infinitival *to*

There is a widespread belief that the development of the original preposition *to* before the infinitive into a meaningless infinitival marker follows a well-known grammaticalisation channel. This is clear from Haspelmath's (1989) study, the essence of which is expressed in his title, 'From purposive to infinitive - a universal path of grammaticalization'. Haspelmath shows that in many languages in the world the allative preposition – *to* in English –, which expresses location, or rather the goal of motion, also comes to express goal or purpose more abstractly; and that in combination with the infinitive, the preposition begins to lose its original purposive function, ending up as a purely grammatical element to indicate that the verbal form is an infinitive. This interpretation of the development is already seen in Jespersen (and cf. also Mustanoja 1960:514),

In ... the *to*-infinitive, *to* had at first its ordinary prepositional meaning of direction, as still in "he goes to fetch it"; ... But gradually an enormous extension of the application of this *to*-infinitive has taken place: the meaning of the preposition has been weakened and in some cases totally extinguished, so that now the *to*-infinitive must be considered the normal English infinitive, the naked infinitive being reserved for comparatively few employments, which are the solitary survivals of the old use of the infinitive. This development is not confined to English: we find it more or less in all the Gothic languages, though with this preposition only in the West Gothic branch (G. *zu*, Dutch *te*), while Gothic has *du*, and Scandinavian *at* (...) (Jespersen 1927:10-11)

It seems to me that the expectations raised by the fact that this seems to be a frequent grammaticalisation pattern, has led us too much to see the English case as following the well-trodden path. I think it pays to look more closely at the linguistic details. I have compared the development of the infinitive marker in Dutch and English⁵ and come to the conclusion that *to* and cognate *te* have

⁵ For more details, also on the comparative development of *zu* in German, see Fischer (1997a). This article takes a different approach in that it considers the degrees of grammaticalisation of *to*, *zu* and *te* only from the point of view of the parameters of grammaticalisation distinguished by Lehmann (1985).

not grammaticalised in the same way. On the contrary, it looks as if *to* has been stopped early in its development and has even regressed in some respect. I think this could be characterised as a process of what Frans Plank (1979) has called *Ikonisierung*, a moving away from the symbolic pole back to the iconic one. I will first briefly explain what I mean by these two poles. It is well-known that in language there is competition between iconic and economic motivation (cf. Haiman 1983) or between the need for clarity and the need for processing speed. General erosion leads to the loss of expressivity and consequently to a constant need for new linguistic expressions. One could say therefore that language moves or is situated along an axis with two poles: an iconic, concrete pole at one end, and a symbolic (or perhaps ‘arbitrary’ or ‘conventional’ is a less confusing term here), abstract one at the other. In grammaticalisation, elements move along this axis, from concrete to abstract. One could also refer to the iconic pole as original and creative and to the symbolic as derivative and mechanistic.

I believe indeed that the forces behind the development of *to* have been to a large extent iconic (with ‘persistence’ and analogy or isomorphism playing an important role, see for more detail Fischer, in press), although there were some syntactic factors too, which I will come back to below. The main iconic factor indeed is isomorphism. I am using the term here, as used by Haiman (1980), meaning the existence of a one-to-one relation between signans and signatum, similar to von Humboldt’s principle of one form-one meaning. One can see that through the grammaticalisation of *to*, the original isomorphic or one-to-one relation between the signans and the signatum (as given in (1a)),

(1) Structural stages in the grammaticalisation of *to*

(a)	α	(b)	β	(c)	α	β
	x		xy		x	y

(α = the signans *to*; β = the reduced signans of *to*;

x= signatum ‘goal’; y= signatum ‘infinitival marker’)

is disturbed (as shown in (1b)). Through grammaticalisation, the sign *to* acquires two signata: the first is the original prepositional purposive ‘to,’ and the second the semantically empty, infinitive marking element ‘to’. The result is then an asymmetric, non-isomorphic situation as shown in (1b). This lack of isomorphism can be amended in two ways. The usual way according to the grammaticalisation hypothesis is for the new signatum to acquire its own distinctive linguistic form. This may be obtained through the phonetic reduction of *to* (this is another iconic principle, the ‘quantity principle’, see Givón 1995: 49), which would then coexist with the full form *to* (stage (1c)). This development is most clear in Dutch, which has infinitival *te*, next to the earlier particle

toe. But in Middle English, too, we find occasional *te* spellings or other spellings indicating the phonetic reduction of *to*.⁶ So with stage (1c) we have a new stable isomorphic relation. The other solution for the asymmetry of (1b) is to go back to the earlier symmetry (i.e. 1a). This also makes the relation isomorphic again, and it is more strongly iconic than (1c) because here the sign *to* is linked back up with its original meaning, i.e. it is re-iconicised, going back to the iconic pole (in Fischer in preparation, I argue that this process, usually called persistence, is also iconic in nature). So my suggestion is that diachronically English *to* moved back to stage (1a), while Dutch *te* moved on to stage (1c). In what follows, I will have a look at the (comparative) facts, and also offer some suggestions as to why English *to* re-iconicised, both in terms of isomorphism and persistence.

It seems that at first, in the late Old English, early Middle English period, *to* developed very much like Dutch *te*. Evidence for this can be found in the following facts:

(2) The grammaticalisation of *to* in its early stages

- i strengthening of *to* by *for*
- ii phonetic reduction of *to*
- iii loss of semantic integrity
- iv occurrence of *to*-infinitive after prepositions other than *for*

ad 2i

First we find the need for an additional preposition (*for*) to emphasise the goal function of the *to*-infinitive. This use of *for* is attested from 1066 onwards (see Mustanoja 1960:514) and steadily increases in the Middle English period until 1500 (see table 1). A similar development can be seen in Middle Dutch, where *om(me) te* begins to occur quite frequently (see Stoett 1909:§283) and becomes more and more regular for the expression of purpose (see Gerritsen 1987:143-47), becoming obligatory in many positions in Modern Dutch and remaining there whenever purpose or direction is intended.

⁶ See e.g. *King Horn* (Hall 1901:25), *te lyue*, and signs of reduction in forms such as *tobinde* (*Havelok*, Smithers 1987:56), *tobe* (Rolle, *Psalter*, Bramley 1884:380), and *tavenge* (*Caxton*, *Reynard*, Blake 1970:54). All these instances are from late Middle English, none have been found in earlier or later periods in the corpus I used (the Helsinki Corpus).

ad 2ii

The phonetic reduction of *to* to *te* can be found in Middle English, as shown in table 1. In Middle Dutch we already only find the reduced form, but this can be reduced even further to a single phoneme *t* attached to the infinitive (Stoett 1909 §283 gives the form *tsine* for *te sine* ‘to be’). I have found a few bound forms in the Helsinki corpus too, all from the later Middle English period (examples are given in note 6).

	1150-1250	-1350	-1420	-1500	-1570	-1640	-1710
forto	1	29	46	46	1	0	0
forte	87	15	1	0	0	0	0
for to	14	91	323	251	41	7	5
for te	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
(te, t', to-	36	3	1	2	1	0	0)

Table 1: the frequency of *for to* in the Middle English and early Modern English periods, based on the Helsinki corpus (taken from Fischer 1997a)

ad 2iii

This concerns the loss of the semantic integrity of *to*. We see the occasional use of the *to*-infinitive in Middle English in structures where it cannot possibly be goal-oriented, i.e. in positions where the plain infinitive and the present participle (which express simultaneity rather than purpose) had been the rule in Old English (cf. Fischer 1996:119-121). The following is an example from a fourteenth century text, where *to wepe* clearly expresses a state not a purpose,

(3)

And in my barm ther lith to wepe/ Thi child and myn ...

And in my bosom there lies weeping thy child and mine

(Macauley 1900-1901, Gower, *Conf.Am.* III 302)

In Middle Dutch, too, the usual forms in these constructions were the plain infinitive and the present participle (but a coordinated construction is also quite often found, cf. Stoett 1909:§§10, 281). But here, too, the *te* infinitive, which becomes the rule in later Dutch (cf. the examples in (4)), begins to make headway,

(4)

Hij lag te slapen

He lay to sleep / ‘He lay sleeping’

Zij stond te wachten

She stood to wait / ‘She stood waiting’

ad 2iv

We see the occasional occurrence in Middle English of a *to*-infinitive preceded by another preposition which also governs the infinitive, making clear that *to* can no longer be prepositional. According to Visser (1969:§976), this structure does not occur in Old English, and is very rare again in later English. Most of his examples are from the period 1200 to 1500. Some illustrations are given in (5),

(5)

- a *bliss of herte that comp of God to lovie*
the happiness of heart that comes from to love God / ‘from loving God’
 (Morris 1965, *Ayenbite* 93)
- b *7 himm birþb ȝeornenn a33 batt an,/ Hiss Drihhtinn wel to cwemenn/ ... Wibb messess 7 wibb beness/ 7 wibb to letenn swingenn himm /*
and it behoves him to always desire that one (thing), to please his Lord well ... with masses and prayers and with to let scourge himself (‘and by having himself scourged’)
 (Holt 1878, *Orm.* 6358-62)

In Middle Dutch, and more frequently in early Modern Dutch, the *te*-infinitive begins to occur too after other prepositions, such as *van* ‘of’, *met* ‘with’, *na* ‘after’, and especially *sonder* ‘without’, and these constructions can still be found in Present-day Dutch, especially in colloquial speech (see Stoett 1909:§§282-83; Overdiep 1935:§§354-358). Some seventeenth century instances are given in (6),

(6)

- a *Hy starf, niet sonder seer beclaeght te wesen, den 8sten April*
He died, not without to be (‘being’) deeply lamented, the 8th of April
 (van Mander, Overdiep 1935:420)
- b *... sal ick eindigen naer mijn groetenisse aen alle de vrinten
 ghedaen te hebben*
... I will end after to have (‘having’) given my greetings to all my friends
 (Reig.77/16, Overdiep 1935:421)

So the initial stages in Middle English look like a regular grammaticalisation process. However, towards the end of the Middle English period the trend seems to reverse. All the structures discussed in (2i-iv) above seem to disappear. Table 1 makes quite clear that the strengthening of the *to*-infinitive with *for*, disappears quite suddenly – at least from the Standard language – in the early Modern period. I believe that the reason for this is that *to* went back to its original meaning, again strongly expressing goal or direction (there is some difference with Old English usage, I will come back to that below). But apart from the disappearance of the grammaticalisation characteristics enumerated in

(2), there are also new developments that indicate the renewed, semantic independence of *to* before the infinitive:⁷

(7) New developments involving *to*

- i appearance of split infinitives
- ii absence of 'reduction of scope'
- iii no loss of semantic integrity

ad 7i

The first split infinitives are attested in the fourteenth century (see Mustanoja 1960:515; Visser §977; Fischer 1992a:329-30).⁸

(8)

*Blessid be þou lord off hevyn .../That suche grace hath sent to his /Synfull men
for to þus lede /In paradice* (Cursor Mundi, Morris 1876, Laud Ms 18440-44)

This shows that the grammaticalisation of *to* is disturbed in that the usual process would have been for grammaticalised *to* to become more and more 'bonded' to the infinitive, in accordance with one of the grammaticalisation parameters distinguished by Lehmann (1985).

ad 7ii

Another phenomenon showing ongoing grammaticalisation, also mentioned by Lehmann, is the reduction of scope, which is absent in English. In Dutch, on the other hand, there is reduction of scope: when two infinitives are coordi-

⁷ Some of the editors of VIEWS raised the question here whether the developments mentioned under (7) are not 'independent syntactic developments which only happen to affect the way in which the infinitive marker can be placed more or less accidentally.' This is of course a question of interpretation. I do not believe they are independent because they take place at more or less the same time, and because the same developments did not take place in either Dutch or German. These developments are indeed closely tied up with the process of grammaticalisation (as described in more detail in Fischer 1997a). The same editors mention as a possible counter-example the case of the split genitive as in *the teacher of music's room*, which according to them is not a case of de-grammaticalisation. I think it is interesting to observe in this connection that Janda (1980) has indeed suggested that it is a case of de-grammaticalisation (the genitive *-s* being reinterpreted as a possessive pronoun).

⁸ There are also cases of split infinitives found in early Middle English but these are of a different type, they involve infinitives preceded by the negative particle or by a personal pronoun. Presumably (cf. van Kemenade 1987) these particles/pronouns are still clitics, which explains their position next to the infinitive which was becoming more verbal around this time.

nated in Modern Dutch, it is the rule for both infinitives to be marked by *te*, if the first one is so marked (for some idiomatic exceptions see Fischer 1996:112-13). In other words the scope of *te* has been reduced to its immediate constituent. This is not the case in English where the first *to* can have both infinitives as its scope, as the literal English translation of the non-acceptable Dutch example in (9) shows,

(9)

- a **Je kunt deze shampoo gebruiken om je haar mee te wassen en je kleren schoonmaken.*
- b *You can use this shampoo to wash your hair and clean your clothes.*

ad 7iii

Another of Lehmann's parameters, 'the loss of integrity', is relevant here too. It is clear that in Dutch, *te* has gradually lost its semantic integrity, i.e. it has become de-iconicised, and no longer expresses 'goal' or 'direction'; this is now expressed obligatorily by *om te*. One result of this semantic loss in Dutch was already mentioned under (2iii) above. Another one is the appearance of the *te*-infinitive with a future auxiliary in Dutch. Overdiep (1935:§336) shows that they are quite regular already in early Modern Dutch. This again is a clear contrast with English where such a future infinitive simply never develops, neither in Middle English when *shall* and *will* could still be used in infinitival form, nor later with the new future auxiliary *to be going to*. Overdiep also mentions that *zullen* is especially common when the matrix verb itself is not inherently future directed, so after a verb like *say*. The reason for this difference may be clear by now. *To* itself expressed future and therefore had no need for a future auxiliary, whereas Dutch *te* no longer carried future meaning; it had become empty of referential meaning, and therefore the Dutch infinitive may need reinforcement.

The loss of the purposive meaning of *te* has also widened the possibility of using non-agentive subjects with a *te*-infinitive in Dutch (showing grammaticalisation along the 'animacy' hierarchy, cf. Hopper and Traugott 1993:157). With a verb like *dreigen* 'threaten', the use of a non-agentive or an expletive *it* subject (i.e. with the verb being used epistemically) is quite common in Dutch, while it is more awkward in English, because of the stronger purpose meaning of *to*,

(10)

- a Het dreigde te gaan regenen, toen ik het huis **verliet**
?It threatened to rain, when I left the house

Traugott (1993) notes that occurrences with expletive *it* are very rare in her corpora but that they do occur. It is interesting to note that all ten informants that I questioned, except one, do not like this sentence. They would much prefer, *It threatened rain* or *Rain threatened* or *It looked like rain*, and they find it also more acceptable with a progressive verbal form. Obviously it is not a construction they would comfortably use themselves. Traugott also notes (1993:187) that although inanimate subjects with *threaten* occur, there is usually ‘something about the subject that leads to an expectation of the proposition coming into being’; in other words, there is a strong tendency still present to ascribe some agentive function to the subject. Similarly (10b) can be non-agentive in Dutch,

- (10)
- b *Hij dreigde van zijn fiets te vallen*
*He threatened to fall off his bike

All my informants except one agree that (10b) is only possible in English if the subject wanted to injure himself and thus inflict pain on someone who cared for him. The epistemic meaning is the usual interpretation of this sentence in Dutch. When the subject has to be interpreted as agentive, the preferred construction would be with a finite clause: *Hij dreigde dat hij*

The same situation holds when *dreigen* is followed by a passive infinitive, making an agentive function of the matrix subject, which is also the subject of the infinitive, impossible (cf. Traugott 1995:34: ‘the passive demotes the inference that the subject ... is volitional or responsible with respect to the purposive clause’). (11) then, is a perfectly possible sentence in Dutch, but unacceptable in English,

- (11)
- Hij dreigde ontslagen te worden*
* He threatened to be fired

And a construction like (12) is ambiguous in Dutch, but not in English,

- (12)
- Hij dreigde haar te doden*
There was a danger that he would kill her
He threatened to kill her

English has only the second, agentive interpretation. The reason for these differences is the fact, as I mentioned above, that *to* in English is still more strongly purposeful and therefore by default as it were one expects a controlling agent. It should be mentioned here that *threaten/dreigen* is not the only verb that shows this difference in usage between Dutch and English. Traugott (1993) also discusses the behaviour of the verb *to promise*, which in Dutch can

be used non-agentively more easily than in English. In Fischer (1997a: 271-73) I also point out that in English *to*-infinitives regularly occur with the categories of verbs that Haspelmath (1989) has described as ‘irrealis directive’ and ‘irrealis potential’, but not with the categories ‘realis non-factive’ and ‘realis-factive’. The latter two categories contain clearly non-directional verbs, and it is interesting that in Dutch and German these last two categories do take *te/zu* infinitives much more easily than in English. Thus a verb like *affirm* does not take a *to*-infinitive in English, but its Dutch semantic equivalent *verzekeren* does (for more details see Fischer 1997a).

A final difference between Dutch and English is the formation of new modal auxiliaries in English consisting of a matrix verb that has semantically inherent future reference and the *to* element that belongs to the infinitive following the verb, as in *to be going to/gonna*, *to want to/wanna*, *to have (got) to/gotta* etc. Plank (1984:338-39) notes that these verbs are unlike auxiliaries in that they occur with *to*, but notes at the same time that these same auxiliaries ‘allow the conjunction [i.e. *to*] to be reduced and contracted in informal speech’ even when this is not fast speech, and before pauses, indicating that this *to* has grammaticalised and become as it were affixed to the matrix verb. This amalgamation is possible because both *to* and the matrix verb express future modality. (So it seems *to* can become further grammaticalised in English *only* when it coincides with another future-bearing element.⁹) In Dutch, however, this development has not taken place, because there was no meaningful ‘future’ or purposeful *te* for the matrix verb to attach to. In fact, whenever we do get a (semi-)auxiliary followed by a *te*-infinitive, it is clear that *te* goes with the infinitive. This is shown in the position of the adverb in examples such as the following,

(13)

- a *Ik zit nu te denken / *Ik zit te nu denken*
I sit now to think / I sit to now think
'I am thinking now'
- b *Het dreigt thans te mislukken / *Het dreigt te thans mislukken*
It threatens now to fail / It threatens to now fail
'there is a possibility that it will fail'

⁹ The importance of *to* for the development of these new modals is also emphasised by Hopper and Traugott (1993: 81), where they write, ‘The contiguity with *to* in the purposive sense must have been a major factor in the development of the future meaning in *be going to* as an auxiliary’. A full discussion follows on pp. 81-83.

In linguistically similar cases in English, the adverb can occur between *to* and the infinitive, showing that *to* and the infinitive do not form a cluster. That *to* in fact forms a cluster with the matrix verb is shown by cases in which matrix verb and *to* can be contracted as in the second example of (14)

(14)

- I want to immediately go there
- I wanna go there immediately

Now the question must be asked, what has caused the reversal in the grammaticalisation of *to*? I believe this is due to the grammatical circumstances under which *to* developed. In one respect English came to differ radically from Dutch, and this influenced the use and interpretation of *to*. In early Middle English the infinitive became much more strongly verbal than in Dutch (for instance, Dutch infinitives can be preceded by a possessive pronoun or an article, which is impossible in English: for more details see Fischer and van der Leek 1981:319). This verbal nature of the infinitive was strengthened by the fact that *to*-infinitives started to replace *that*-clauses on a grand scale in the Middle English period (cf. the rough statistics in Manabe 1989, and more specifically Los 1998); that is, they replaced clauses which have a tense-domain separate from the tense expressed in the matrix clause (cf. Fischer 1997c). This caused the element *to*, which originally expressed ‘goal’ or direction, to function as a kind of shift-of-tense element. What I mean is, *to* came to express a ‘break’ in time, a movement away from the time of the main clause; i.e. it again expressed ‘direction’. It is indeed only in English that we later (the first examples date from the late Middle English period) see the development of two different kinds of infinitival complements after perception verbs, where *to* becomes crucial in expressing a shift in tense,

(15)

- a *it thoghte hem gret pite/ To se so worthi on as sche,/ With such a child as ther was bore,/ So sodeinly to be forlore*

‘it seemed to them a great pity to see so worthy a woman as she was to be destroyed together with the child that was born to her’

(Macaulay 1900-1901, Gower, *Conf.Am.* II, 1239-42)

- b *for certeynly, this wot I wel,’ he seyde,/ ‘That foresight of divine purveyaunce/ Hath seyn alwey me to forgon Criseyde,’*

‘for certainly, this I know well, he said, that the foresight of divine providence has always seen that I would lose Criseyde’¹⁰

(Benson 1988, Chaucer *T&C* IV, 960-62)

¹⁰ For more details on how this rather difficult example (of which there are three in Chaucer) should be interpreted, see Fischer 1995:10-11.

In both cases the *to*-infinitive refers to something happening in the future. The construction contrasts with the usual complement structure of physical perception verbs, which until then had only allowed a bare infinitive, expressing the simultaneous occurrence of what had been seen, heard or felt, as in *I saw her cross(ing) the street*. In Present-day English, this *to*-infinitive after perception verbs now no longer expresses future time, but it still expresses a shift in tense, making the experience indirect, as in (16),

(16)

Alex saw Julia to have been in a hurry when she dressed (because she was wearing her T-shirt inside out) (the example is from van der Leek 1992:13)

The type of construction shown under (15) was further strengthened by the influx of Latin-type accusative and infinitive constructions (aci) (as in (17)), which again appear in the late Middle English period, i.e. when *to* ‘reverted’, showing similar ‘breaks’ in tense between matrix verb and infinitive,

(17)

I expect him to be home on time

These Latin-type AcI constructions always have a *to*-infinitive in English. (For more details on this development, see Fischer 1992b, 1994a.). It seems that we can conclude that special syntactic circumstances as it were forced infinitival *to* to become more isomorphic again with the preposition *to*.

A brief conclusion

I have tried to show that grammaticalisation processes do not always run the same course, that there may be differences between similar languages, that the process may indeed be reverted, and that this relates to the specific grammatical circumstances that a language finds itself in. In other words, grammaticalisation need not be a process driven purely semantically, whereby the grammatical changes are the result solely of semantic change. The way the process developed in the case of *to* was (co-)determined by syntactic factors, specific to English, and by universal iconic constraints or patterns such as persistence and isomorphism.

References

- Benson, Larry D. (gen.ed.) (1988), *The Riverside Chaucer* (3rd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Blake, Norman F. (ed.) (1970), *The History of Reynard the Fox*, Translated from the Dutch Original by William Caxton. EETS 263. London: Oxford University Press.

- Bramley, H.R. (ed.) (1884), *The Psalter or Psalms of David and Certain Canticles*. With a Translation and Exposition in English by Richard Rolle of Hampole. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brinton, Laurel J. (1988), *The Development of English Aspectual Systems. Aspectualizers and Post-Verbal Particles*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruyn, Adrienne, (1995), *Grammaticalization in Creoles: The Development of Determiners and Relative Clauses in Sranan* (Studies in Language and Language Use 21), Amsterdam: IFOTT and Dordrecht: ICG Printing.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca (1994), *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fischer, Olga (1992a), ‘Syntax’, in Norman Blake (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Volume II. 1066-1476. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 207-408.
- (1992b), ‘Syntactic Change and Borrowing: The Case of the Accusative and Infinitive Construction in English’ in Dieter Stein and Marinel Gerritsen (eds.) *Internal and External Factors in Syntactic change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.. 17-88.
- (1994a), ‘The fortunes of the Latin-type accusative and infinitive construction in Dutch and English compared’, in Toril Swan et al. (eds.), *Language change and language structure. Older Germanic languages in a comparative perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 91-133
- (1994b), ‘The development of quasi-auxiliaries in English and changes in word order’. *Neophilologus* 78, 137-164.
- (1995), ‘The distinction between to and bare infinitival compliments in late Middle English’, *Diachronica* 12:1-30.
- (1996), ‘The status of to in Old English to-infinitives: A reply to Kageyama’, *Lingua* 99:107-133.
- (1997a), ‘The grammaticalisation of infinitival to in English compared with German and Dutch, in R. Hickey and S. Puppel (eds), *Language History and Linguistic Modelling*. A Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th Birthday. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 265-280.
- (1997b) ‘On the status of grammaticalisation and the diachronic dimension in explanation’ *TPS* 95: 149-187.
- (1997c) ‘Verbal complementation in Early Middle English: How do the infinitives fit in?’, in Derek Britton (ed.) *English Historical Linguistics 1994*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 247-70.
- (in press) ‘On the role played by iconicity in grammaticalisation processes’, in Max Nanny and Olga Fischer (eds), *Form Mimicing Meaning: Iconicity in Language and Literature*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Fischer, Olga and Frederike van der Leek (1981), ‘Optional vs radical re-analysis: mechanisms of syntactic change’, *Lingua* 55: 301-350.
- Gerritsen, Marinel (1987), *Syntaktische Verandering in Kontrolezinnen, een Sociolinguistische Studie van het Brugs van de 13e tot de 17e Eeuw*. PhD diss. Univ. of Leiden. Dordrecht:ICG Printing.
- Givón, Talmy (1995), ‘Isomorphism in the grammatical code: cognitive and biological considerations’, in Raffaele Simone (ed.), *Iconicity in Language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 47-76.

- Haiman, John (1980), 'The Iconicity of Grammar: Isomorphism and Motivation', *Language* 56: 515-540.
- (1983), 'Iconic and economic motivation', *Language* 59, 781-819.
- Hall, J. (1901), *King Horn. A Middle English Romance*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Harris, Alice and Lyle Campbell (1995), *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin (1989), 'From purposive to infinitive – a universal path of grammaticalization', *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10: 287-310.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi and Friederike Hünnemeyer (1991a), 'From cognition to grammar: evidence from African languages', in Elisabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), Vol. I, 149-188.
- (1991b), *Grammaticalization. A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd and Mechthild Reh (1984), *Grammaticalization and Reanalysis in African Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Holt, R. (ed.) (1878), *The Ormulum*. Vols. I and II. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Holyoak, Keith J. and Paul Thagard. 1995. *Mental Leaps. Analogy in Creative Thought*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hopper, Paul and Traugott, Elizabeth C. (1993), *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janda, Richard D. (1980) 'On the decline of declensional systems: The overall loss of OE nominal case inflections and the ME reanalysis of -es as his, in Elizabeth Traugott et al. (eds) *Papers from the 4th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 243-52.
- Jespersen, Otto (1927), *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Part III Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Joseph, Brian D. (1992), 'Diachronic explanation: putting speakers back into the picture', in Garry W. Davis and Gregory K. Iverson (eds.), *Explanation in Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.123-144.
- Kemenade, Ans van (1987), Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kytö, Merja (1991), *Manual to the Diachronic Part of 'The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts': Coding Conventions and Lists of Source Texts*. University of Helsinki, Helsinki.
- Leek, Frederike van der (1992), 'Significant syntax: The case of exceptional passives'. *Dutch Working Papers in English Language and Linguistics* 27: 1-28.
- Lehmann, Christian (1985), 'Grammaticalization: synchronic variation and diachronic change', *Lingua e Stile* 20: 303-318.
- (1991), 'Grammaticalization and related changes in contemporary German', in Traugott and Heine (eds), vol. II, 493-535.
- Lightfoot, David W. (1979), *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1991), *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.

- Los, Bettelou (1998), 'The rise of the to-infinitive as verb complement', *English language and Linguistics* 2,1.
- Macaulay, G.C. (1900-1901), *The English Works of John Gower*. Vols I & II. (EETS e.s. 81,82). London: Oxford University Press.
- Manabe, K. (1989), *The Syntactic and Stylistic Development of the Infinitive in Middle English*. Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press.
- Morris, Richard (1876), *Cursor Mundi. Four Versions*. Part III. eets o.s. 62. London: Oxford University Press.
- (1965) with Pamela Gradon (eds.), Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt or Remorse of Conscience. Vol.I (re-issue of 1866 text). eets o.s. 23. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. (1960), *A Middle English syntax*. Part I. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Overdiep, G.S. (1935), *Zeventiende Eeuwse Syntaxis*. Groningen: Wolters
- Plank, Frans (1979), 'Ikonisierung und De-Ikonisierung als Prinzipien des Sprachwandels', *Sprachwissenschaft* 4:121-158.
- (1984), 'The Modals Story Retold.' *Studies in Language* 8: 305-364.
- Rubba, Jo (1994), 'Grammaticalization as semantic change: A case study of preposition development', in William Pagliuca (ed.) *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.81-102.
- Smithers, G.V. (1987), *Havelok*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stoett, Frederik A. (1909), *Middelnederlandsche spraakkunst. Syntaxis*. The Hague: Ni-jhoff. [2nd ed.]
- Traugott, Elisabeth C. (1993), 'Subjectification and the development of epistemic meaning: the case of promise and threaten', in Toril Swan and Olaf Jansen Westvik (eds.), *Modality in Germanic Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 185-210.
- (1995), 'Subjectification in grammaticalization', in Dieter Stein and Susan Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation in Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 31-54.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. and Heine, Bernd (1991), (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Vols I and II, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Vincent, Nigel (1995), 'Exaptation and grammaticalization', in Henning Andersen (ed.) *Historical Linguistics 1993*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.433-445.
- Visser, Fredericus Th. (1963-73), *An historical syntax of the English language*. Vols. I-IIIb. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Patterns of code choice and code switching as indicators of language balance at a bilingual primary school

Julia Isabel Hüttner

In this paper, an analysis of the patterns of code choice and codeswitching at an English/German bilingual primary school will be used to establish the success of this educational programme in meeting its aim of a balanced use of both languages.

By focusing on the language behaviour of speakers who have acquired their bilingualism through schooling, rather than because of to their linguistic background, attention is given to the rising importance of “school bilingualism”. Most often, such bilingualism involves language minority pupils who acquire the majority language in mainstream education. An increasing number of pupils, however, become bilingual by being involved in educational programmes where one or several languages apart from the pupils’ L1 are taught to a high degree of perfection. Frequently, the target language is used as a medium of instruction, similar to the strategies of the Canadian immersion schools. (cf. Romaine 1995: 245-246; Baker 1996: 174-177; 180-184)

These educational programmes aim at satisfying a demand for proficiency in another majority language, which is increasingly being valued as an asset on the employment market. The high prestige of English as a “useful” foreign language in Austria is reflected in the existence of several programmes providing instruction through the medium of English. In the sector of state schools, these include most importantly the projects *Vienna Bilingual Schooling*, *Englisch als Arbeitssprache* (English as a Working Language) and the bilingual schools *LISA* (Linz International School Auhof) and *GIBS* (Graz International Bilingual School).

Despite the rising number of such bilingual educational programmes, some of the related linguistic issues seem to be addressed and researched only to a limited extent. This applies for instance to questions regarding the functions of codeswitching as well as to aspects of the integration in the curriculum and in classroom interactions of the two (or more) languages involved in bilingual schooling.

As will be shown, a closer analysis of such linguistic issues can, however, help to highlight shortcomings and difficulties of individual bilingual educational programmes, and might in turn be used as a basis for further improvements of these programmes.

1. Theoretical Background

As bilingual speakers have access to two linguistic codes, speech patterns involving both codes occur frequently. In any bilingual setting, speakers constantly have to make decisions regarding the choice of appropriate linguistic codes for specific situations. With changing types of interaction, the linguistic codes used by participants might also change. Furthermore, two codes can be used continuously in a particular situation. In both of these situations code-switching occurs, that is to say “more than one language [is used] in the course of a single communicative episode.” (Heller 1988:1)

The theoretical model used for the analysis of the data on code choice and codeswitching presented in this paper is the markedness model proposed by Carol Myers-Scotton. (cf. Myers-Scotton 1995)

This sociolinguistic model aims at establishing which code choices are expected in certain speaker constellations, i.e. constitute unmarked code choices, as well as describing and explaining code choices that are unexpected, i.e. marked. Most importantly, the markedness model shows how speakers attach social meaning to particular code choices and use codeswitching as a communicative tool. Underlying this model is the assumption that the notion of markedness as well as the correct interpretation and socially significant use of it are part of a bilingual speaker’s communicative competence. (cf. Myers-Scotton 1995: 79; 81-83)

A code choice in the framework of the markedness model might consist of individual linguistic codes or of continual codeswitching, that is to say of a speech pattern where two codes are constantly mixed and no special social meaning is attached to each individual switch. (cf. Myers-Scotton 1995: 114-131)

The unmarked code choice is identified by being the most frequent one, and also the one by which speakers confirm the validity of the social roles and relationships associated with the current interaction. Marked code choices, on the other hand, signify a change in the social distance perceived between speakers, and thus might show a move towards greater solidarity or, on the contrary, to greater distance and thus to authority or power. (Myers-Scotton 1995: 81; 131-132)

Within the context of an educational situation, such as the one described in this paper, discourse-related functions of codeswitching can also be observed, especially in teacher talk. These are best analysed within the framework of Auer's discourse-analytic model. (cf. Auer 1984) However, these functions are not directly linked to this paper's focus on language balance and therefore will not be further discussed here.

2. The Setting of the Project -The VBPS

The Vienna Bilingual Primary School¹ (hereafter VBPS) is one of five primary schools in Vienna included in the wider educational project Vienna Bilingual Schooling. This programme aims at establishing English and German as equal media of instruction and will eventually offer bilingual education from nursery school up to higher levels of secondary school. The pupils at the VBPS are between six and ten years old. Four German and two English native speakers are employed as teachers at the VBPS.

Pupils include German native speakers and children who speak English as their L1 or - according to the school authorities' rather vague definition - "on account of their family background". (Gröpel et al. 1997: 41; my translation) Furthermore, equal numbers of English and German native speakers should be present in a class. The pupils of each class are divided into a German and an English group according to their L1.

This division into language groups is relevant in language teaching of the L1 as well as the L2 of the pupils. Reading and writing are taught only in the children's L1 for the first two years by a teacher who is a native speaker of that language. In the third year, explicit foreign language teaching starts. Pupils of one language group are taught their target language by a teacher whose mother tongue it is. At the same time, L1 education in reading and writing is continued.

For all other subjects, children of both language groups stay together in one class and are taught bilingually. This can either take the form of team-teaching involving a German- and an English-speaking teacher, or of the German-speaking teacher using English as well as German in class. As there are more German- than English-speaking teachers at the school, the latter form of bilingual teaching is frequent.

The VBPS can thus be classified as a bilingual programme based on partial immersion, relying on children acquiring their target language by being ex-

¹ Situated in Selma Lagerlöf-Gasse 20, 1100 Vienna.

posed to it on a day to day basis as a medium of instruction, which is combined with explicit foreign language teaching. The school itself claims that the “German speaking pupils will learn English easily from their English speaking peers” and that “[s]imilarly English speaking pupils will learn German easily”, thus focusing on the importance of pupils’ learning their target languages from their peers (school’s leaflet, reprinted in Hüttner 1997: 177). There are, however, no exact definitions as to the precise levels of L2 proficiency the school wishes its pupils to acquire. The only guideline given by the school authorities is that

the pupils should acquire skills in a second language which could hardly be imparted in regular foreign language teaching at school.

(Gröpel et al. 1997: 37; my translation)

3. The Data

The relevant data for this project were collected in two sessions, one in June 1996 and the second in March 1997. Apart from the teachers, only pupils attending the third and fourth forms of the VBPS were used as informants, in order to ensure a higher degree of bilingualism than might be expected of children in their first two years of bilingual schooling.

The data are made up of four parts. Firstly, there are about twelve hours of recordings of classroom interactions, involving blocks of several lessons and intervals. This part of the data shows some general patterns of code choice and gives excellent examples of the linguistic input on the part of the teachers.

The second and largest part of the data consists of test series in which the unmarked code choice in interactions between pupils was established. In order to do this, pairs of children had to solve a map task. This involved giving both children maps with a few landmarks on them. One of the maps featured a path which the pupil was supposed to describe in such a precise way that the other child could draw it in on his or her map. As the children were not allowed to show each other their maps and as the landmarks were not identical on both maps, a need to communicate existed. The most important issue of these test series was to establish the unmarked code choice in intergroup interactions involving mixed pairs of pupils, that is to say those pairs with one child of the German and one of the English group. This series involved fourteen pairs of pupils.

For the third part of the data, pupils were asked to tell me² something about their hobbies, their favourite games or toys, or about their activities during their

² The researcher herself grew up in a bilingual English-German family.

holidays, using only their respective target languages. These target language interviews were given to thirty-nine pupils.

Finally, questionnaires were given out to pupils and teachers. Pupils were asked about the languages they use with members of their families, with friends and during leisure activities. Furthermore, their language preferences, their self-assessed language abilities and their attitudes towards codeswitching were elicited. Teachers were questioned on their attitudes towards bilingual education and towards codeswitching.

4. The Results

4.1. Language Background of Pupils

Initial class observation already indicated that the linguistic situation of the VBPS is far more complex than the official description would lead one to believe. This was confirmed by an analysis of pupils' questionnaires on language use. These questionnaires were given out to 42 pupils. The general picture emerging is that of a homogeneous German-speaking group of pupils amounting to about 50%, which is complemented by a linguistically very heterogeneous "English" group. The languages apart from English and German quoted by the pupils include Arabic, Hindi, Urdu, Malayalam, Turkish, Korean, Russian, and one language defined as "Nigerian" by the pupil involved.

In interactions with family members and friends, a maximum of 18% of all pupils use only or mainly English. The rest of the "English" group consists of some children who use two languages equally, others who use English, German and another language equally, and finally of a group of children who mainly use a language other than English or German in interactions with family and friends.

This pattern of a homogeneous German-speaking group confronted by a linguistically heterogeneous "English" group is represented in all responses of the questionnaire related to actual language use.

4.2. Unmarked Code Choices

4.2.1. Pupil-Pupil Intergroup Interactions

In order to establish the unmarked code choice in intergroup interactions among pupils, the test series involving map task dialogues was used. Linguistically mixed pairs of pupils were given free choice regarding which language they used in solving the map task. To ensure that I conveyed no preference for

either language, instructions were given in both languages in random order, and equal numbers of the landmarks were labelled in German and in English.

Contrary to my original assumption that both English and German would be used in these interactions and that a fair amount of codeswitching would occur, German was by far the most frequent code choice. All in all, 83% of intergroup interactions were conducted entirely in German. For the remaining 17% of interactions, pupils chose English with codeswitches into German. It is noteworthy, however, that in those instances when English was used, the pupils frequently commented on this choice and related it to the low proficiency in German of the English-speaking child. This can be exemplified by the statement of one child of the German group, after having been told that there was free language choice in this task:

- (1) S1 (German group): Englisch is' besser, für sie. [i.e. the pupil from the English group]³

This pattern of choosing English only as a concession to the low proficiency of one of the speakers supports the status of German as the unmarked code choice. By commenting on the unusual code choice, speakers show that they would choose German if it were at all feasible. Thus, they convey their wish of maintaining the social significance of the unmarked code choice. This type of code choice can be subsumed under the *virtuousity maxim* formulated by Myers-Scotton as

Switch to whatever code is necessary to carry on the conversation/accommodate the participation of all speakers present. (Myers-Scotton 1995: 148)

An analysis of the data from the classroom recordings confirms that German is the unmarked choice for all intergroup interactions among pupils, and that the few instances where English was chosen can be explained according to the *virtuousity maxim*.

4.2.2. Teacher-Teacher and Teacher-Pupil Interactions

The unmarked code choice for teacher-teacher interactions, as well as for teacher talk in bilingual sessions, is continual codeswitching. That is to say, the

³ The following abbreviations are used in the transcripts:

S (and number): pupil

TE (and number): English-speaking teacher

J: interviewer

TG (and number): German-speaking teacher

(X): inaudible passages on tape

Translations of the examples quoted are given in the Appendix.

same code is chosen by teachers for interactions among themselves, for instance during intervals, and for interactions with pupils during bilingual sessions.

Continual codeswitching is characterised by a constant mingling of two codes within one utterance, frequently within individual clauses. No special social meaning is attached to any individual switch. (cf. Myers-Scotton 1995: 117)

The integration of two codes can be seen as a means of encoding different aspects of one's identity or of the social relationship speakers wish to exist between themselves and their interlocutors. Therefore, it is vital for the occurrence of this particular kind of codeswitching that both codes are evaluated positively by the speakers. As a positive attitude towards both English and German is held by teachers at the VBPS, a pattern of continual codeswitching could be expected for interactions among themselves. The fact that this pattern also occurred in team-teaching sessions as well as in bilingual instruction provided by individual teachers was, however, unexpected, as this type of codeswitching is frequently regarded as very informal or even "incorrect" language use by bilingual speakers themselves. The use of continual codeswitching in teacher talk might be seen as an indication of a degree of insecurity as to how the two languages of the curriculum should best be integrated in bilingual teaching. (cf. Myers-Scotton 1995: 117-131)

At the VBPS, a rather rare type of continual codeswitching could be observed in the pattern of teachers using only their L1 in mixed language interactions, both during intervals and in team-teaching sessions. Such a language behaviour seems to take into account that teachers' receptive skills in their L2 are usually higher than the productive skills. An example of this speech pattern would be the following extract from a music lesson:

(2)

TE1: That's good!

TG1: DER ERSTE DER'S RICHTIG GEMACHT HAT.

TE1: You know why, he's a bass and when he starts the song, that starts the tone.

TG1: JA, ABER BEI IHM WAR'S AUCH NOCH NICHT SO.

In many interactions among teachers, these strict language boundaries according to speakers were no longer maintained, and switches occurred within one speaker's utterance. The following extract is taken from a discussion about the show to be staged by the pupils at the end of term and serves to exemplify this speech pattern.

(3)

TG2: ICH WOLLT' MIR GERN EINE CHOREOGRAPHIE ZUM DINGS ÜBERLEGEN, ZUM EARTH SONG DIE BEWEGUNGEN. WIR HABEN DA SCHON EIN BISSCHEN ANGEFANGEN, DAS WAR GANZ LIEB. ICH MEIN', WEISST EH, "What about sunshine", NICHT, HABEN DIE MÄDCHEN WAS DAZU ERFUNDEN. DIE WOLLTEN SICH DAS AUSSUCHEN, ZUM SCHULSCHLUSS.

TE1: Mhm.

TG2: And the second one might be the hammer, DASS WIR NICHTS NEUES
TE1: ZUM VERABSCHIEDEN.

TG2: JA, MHM. VIELLEICHT KÖNNEN WIR DA AUCH IRGENDWELCHE RHYTHMISCHEN BEWEGUNGEN (X) and the boys watched UND DIE MÄDCHEN HABEN DRAUSSEN AUSPROBIERT UND DAS WAR RECHT LIEB.

TE1: Shall I go and get the guitar?

This pattern of continual switching between German and English as the unmarked code choice was present also in teacher input during bilingual lessons, that is to say during team-teaching sessions or lessons with a German-speaking teacher addressing the whole class. A brief example of one of the German-speaking teachers would be the following:

(4)

TG2: We can continue next week.

S1: GEH'N WIR IN DEN GARTEN?

TG2: Next week please bring a plastic bag for your drawings and for your art things, DASS WIR EURE SCHÖNEN KÜNSTLERARBEITEN MITGEBEN KÖNNEN.

In summary, some form of continual codeswitching is the norm for both teacher-teacher interactions as well as for teacher input in all lessons apart from (most) language lessons.

4.3. Target language exercises

In these exercises, pupils were asked to talk briefly about their hobbies or their activities during the holidays, using only their target languages. The aim was to find out whether and to what extent pupils were at all able and willing to comply with the demand of only using their target language. Furthermore, I was interested in establishing what amount of codeswitching occurred under the pressure of using the L2. The underlying assumption in the evaluation of these exercises is that a non-compliance with the task requirements, that is to say

pupils' switching back to their L1s or even only using their L1s, signifies a lack of competence in their target languages.⁴

I would like to stress at this point that the amount of codeswitching is the only aspect of these exercises that was analysed quantitatively. Thus, the statistical information provided here regards the actual code choices made by the pupils, that is to say the degree of their compliance with the task requirement. Further evaluations of individual examples, regarding for instance pupils' fluency or their use of complex syntax, do not form part of the quantitatively analysed data.

A wide range of L2 abilities could be observed within the individual language groups, ranging from very high levels of L2 proficiency to lower achievements than were to be expected at a bilingual school. The most striking example of this was the fact that in both groups a certain number of children refused to use their target language and only used their L1. In the German group, this behaviour was found in 5% of all children, and in the English group in 5.9%. It has to be mentioned, however, that a few of the children of the English group had come to live in Austria only a few months before the recordings took place, which explains their lack of proficiency in German.

In percentages, the following code choices were made by children of the German group when asked to use only their target language English:

5%	German without switching
20%	German with switching
15%	English without switching
45%	English with switching
15%	roughly the same amount of English and German

In a more general evaluation of the target language exercises, however, other aspects, such as the length and the complexity of pupils' answers, also have to be taken into account. If pupils master long and complex utterances well, performances with a few instances of codeswitching into the L1 can still be considered as showing a high degree of L2 achievement.

The following example shows a fairly poor performance, although at least a minimal attempt was made by the pupil to adapt to the target language requirement. Similar to many other weak performances, the pupil not only switched back to her L1, but also tended to give rather brief and simple answers when using her L2. The other pupil present (S2) translated two of my

⁴ As pupils were very co-operative during these exercises, I do not think that reluctance to use the L2 played any significant role in pupils' non-compliance with the task requirements.

English questions into German, as well as correcting S1's last statement. The tendency of more proficient pupils trying to help their peers by translating teachers' instructions was observed also in classroom interactions.

(5)

- J: [Pupil's name], can you tell me something about your hobbies in English?
 S2: WAS SIND DEINE HOBBIES, MUSST DU IHR AUF ENGLISCH SAGEN.
 S1: Skiing, running, bicycle ride.
 J: Where do you go running?
 S1: Wienerberg.
 J: On your own or with friends?
 S1: MIT friends (XX) FREUNDIN.
 J: What are you going to do for your Easter holidays?
 S1: Holidays.
 S2: WAS MACHST DU IN DEN OSTERFERIEN?
 S1: I am home and my FREUNDIN [name] is coming to us and we playing and she ÜBERNACHTEN there holidays.
 S2: (X)
 J: Mh?
 S2: His friend goes in the holidays to him and he sleeps in the night by him.

There were, however, also more encouraging examples, involving little or no switching into German and generally longer and more fluent answers.

(6)

- S1: NAJA, playing Volleyball and I like to play because it's fun and you know, I was playing guitar before, but I don't like it anymore and, and because my teacher was a little bit.....
 J: strange?
 S1: Yeah, and now I learn by my father and [both pupils giggle] and I play Volleyball in Budo Centre and yeah that's it.
 J: What are you going to do for Easter?
 S1: On Monday I am going to sleep with my little brother by my grandmother and then (XX)
 J: But you're staying in Vienna?
 S1: Yes, I think, NAJA, my OMA is, my grandmother is living in NIEDERÖSTERREICH, Lower Austria.

The range of achievements in the target language exercises was similar for children of the English group. There was, however, a decided difference in the percentages for the various code choices.

A clear majority of children (70.6%) spoke German without codeswitching and thus fulfilled the required language choice. This result provides a striking contrast to the small number (15%) of children of the German group who spoke English without switching to German.

For the rest of the informants of the English group the language choices were as follows:

17.6%	German with codeswitching
5.9%	English with codeswitching
5.9%	English without codeswitching
0%	same amount of English and German

Similarly to the German group, examples of weak performances frequently included short and simple answers. It is worth noting, however, that many children of the English group seemed more willing to continue using German, despite obvious difficulties in comprehension or production. The following extract will show an instance when meaningful communication could only be maintained by switching to English. After the difficulty in communication had been solved, however, the pupil switched back to German.

(7)

- J: GEHST DU MIT FREUNDEN SCHWIMMEN ODER MIT DER SCHULE?
- S: MIT DIE PAPA
- J: UND WIE OFT GEHST' SCHWIMMEN?
- S: WAS!
- J: WIE OFT GEHST DU SCHWIMMEN?
- S: GUT.
- J: How often do you go swimming
- S: Not a lot, NICHT VIEL.

Some of the examples of German as a target language showed levels of proficiency that were native-like. In many cases, these achievements can also be related to the children being confronted with German in their home-environment, for instance by speaking German with one of their parents. Thus, it cannot be determined to what extent VBPS schooling can take credit for these levels of achievement.

5. Conclusion

The analysis of my data shows two patterns of language use within the VBPS which are problematic with regard to the school's aim concerning a balance of both languages. Firstly, German is by far the dominant language in interactions involving pupils from both language groups, amounting to 83% of all interactions. Moreover, the target language exercises provided highly unequal results for the two language groups. Whereas only 15% of children of the German group complied wholly with the injunction of speaking their target language

English, 70.6% of children of the English group spoke German without code-switching when required to do so.

There are several factors that might explain this dominance. As there are four German-speaking and only two English-speaking teachers at the VBPS, there is an imbalance in the amount of native speaker input in the two languages. Moreover, two subjects, religious instruction and crafts, are taught solely in German, while there are no non-language subjects that are taught only in English. The second factor that might contribute to the dominance of German is the linguistic heterogeneity of the “English” group. As few pupils have a monolingually English family background, German offers itself as a lingua franca for all pupils. Finally, there is no large and homogeneous English language minority living in Vienna. Thus, German is by far the most important means of communication for pupils outside the school environment.

The second major point that emerged from the analysis of the data was the use of continual codeswitching as the unmarked choice for teacher-teacher interactions, as well as for teacher input during the bilingual lessons. Neither this use of codeswitching nor any other means of integrating the two languages in class, however, appears to have been the subject of any explicit policy of the VBPS, which is also apparent in the limited awareness of codeswitching among teachers. Thus, none of the English-speaking teachers were aware of ever codeswitching in class, and the German-speaking teachers related their own switching partly to problems of L2 competence and partly viewed it as a feature of L2 instruction.

Although continual codeswitching is a frequently used code choice in bilingual interactions, its value as a means of providing L2 instruction is doubtful. The risk is that pupils might wait until the information they require is provided in their L1, thus failing to acquire sufficient linguistic competence in English. Furthermore, as there is no large German/English bilingual community in Vienna, continual codeswitching is of very limited communicative value outside the school environment.

These two aspects of language use at the VBPS might make it difficult for German-speaking children to achieve high levels of competence in their target language English. As the VBPS is still at an experimental stage, several improvements might be suggested.

First of all, the position of the English language within the school ought to be strengthened. This would involve employing more English native speakers as teachers, so that at least equal numbers of German- and English-speaking teachers are represented among the staff. To increase the chance of pupils using English among themselves, an increase in size of the English groups in each class could be considered. Furthermore, some courses might be selected for

monolingual instruction in English to counterbalance the classes that are taught monolingually in German. All these strategies seem vital for the school's long-term success considering that the overwhelming importance of German outside school cannot be altered.

The difficulty of integrating both English and German in bilingual teacher input would probably decrease with a higher number of English native speakers as teachers. Baker (1996: 234) recommends the maintenance of strict language boundaries for successfully acquiring bilingualism at school. A separation of languages according to person would probably be easiest to implement at the VBPS, provided there are enough English-speaking teachers. This would ensure only high-quality native speaker input and release the German-speaking teachers from the difficult task of providing bilingual instruction by themselves.

All these improvements aiming at a greater balance of the two languages at school should increase the levels of L2 proficiency acquired by German-speaking pupils.

It has to be remembered, however, that the success of the VBPS relies on the presence of many English-speaking pupils, and that the number of English native speakers in Vienna is very small. Due to these factors, a clear limit is set to the feasible size of this educational experiment, and with five primary schools, the limit seems to have been reached. If there is further demand for educational programmes that give Austrian children the chance of acquiring high levels of competence in English, other options, for instance schools based on full immersion, would also have to be taken into account.

Appendix: Translations of the quoted examples⁵

(1)

S1 (German group): ENGLISH IS BETTER, FOR *HER*, (i.e. the girl of the English group)

(2)

TE1: That's good!

TG1: THE FIRST ONE WHO'S DONE IT CORRECTLY.

TE1: You know why, he's a bass and when he starts the song, that starts the tone.

TG1: YES, BUT IT ALSO WASN'T LIKE THAT WITH HIM.

(3)

TG2: I'D LIKE TO WORK OUT A CHOREOGRAPHY FOR THINGUMMY, FOR THE Earth Song SOME MOVEMENTS. WE'VE ALREADY STARTED A BIT, THAT WAS REALLY NICE. I MEAN, YOU KNOW, "What about sunshine", WELL,

⁵ Passages in capital letters are translations of originally German passages.

THE GIRLS THOUGHT OUT SOMETHING FOR IT. THEY WANTED TO CHOOSE THAT FOR THE END OF TERM.

TE1: Mhm.

TG2: And the second one might be the hammer, SO THAT WE DON'T DO ANYTHING NEW

TE1: TO SAY GOOD-BYE.

TG2: WELL, YES. MAYBE WE CAN ALSO DO SOME RHYTHMIC MOVEMENTS THEN (X) and the boys watched AND THE GIRLS TRIED IT OUT OUTSIDE AND THAT WAS QUITE NICE.

TE1: Shall I go and get the guitar?

(4)

TG2: We can continue next week.

S1: CAN WE GO INTO THE GARDEN?

TG2: Next week please bring a plastic bag for your drawings and for your art things, SO THAT WE CAN GIVE YOU YOUR BEAUTIFUL WORKS OF ART TO TAKE WITH YOU.

(5)

J: [Pupil's name], can you tell me something about your hobbies in English?

S2: WHAT ARE YOUR HOBBIES, YOU'VE GOT TO TELL HER IN ENGLISH.

S1: Skiing, running, bicycle ride.

J: Where do you go running?

S1: Wienerberg.

J: On your own or with friends?

S1: WITH friends (XX) FRIEND.

J: What are you going to do for your Easter holidays?

S1: Holidays.

S2: WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO IN THE EASTER HOLIDAYS?

S1: I am home and my FRIEND [name] is coming to us and we playing and she STAYING OVER NIGHT there holidays.

S2: (X)

J: Mh?

S2: His friend goes in the holidays to him and he sleeps in the night by him.

(6)

S1: WELL, playing Volleyball and I like to play because it's fun and, you know, I was playing guitar before, but I don't like it any more and, and because my teacher was a little bit.....

J: strange?

S1: Yeah, and now I learn by my father and [both pupils giggle] and I play Volleyball in Budo Centre and yeah that's it.

J: What are you going to do for Easter?

S1: On Monday I am going to sleep with my little brother by my grandmother and then (XX)

J: But you're staying in Vienna?

S1: Yes, I think, WELL, my GRANNY is, my grandmother is living in LOWER AUSTRIA, Lower Austria.

(7)

J: DO YOU GO SWIMMING WITH FRIENDS OR WITH SCHOOL?

S: WITH PAPA.

J: AND HOW OFTEN D'YOU GO SWIMMING?

S: WHAT!

J: HOW OFTEN DO YOU GO SWIMMING?

S: WELL.

J: How often do you go swimming?

S: Not a lot, NOT A LOT.

References

Auer, J.C.P. 1984: *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Baker, Colin. 1996². *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gröpel,Wolfgang; Dallinger, Michaela and Christiane Wendelberger.1997. *Schulversuche an allgemeinbildenden Wiener Schulen im Schuljahr 1996/97*. Vienna: Stadtschulrat für Wien.

Heller, Monica. 1988. *Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin, NY, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hüttner, Julia Isabel. 1997. *Patterns of Code Choice and Codeswitching in a Bilingual Primary School Setting*. Diplomarbeit Institut für Anglistik: Universität Wien.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1995². *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Peltzer-Karpf, Annemarie; Neumann, Astrid and Renate Zangl. 1994. *Vienna Bilingual Schooling: Psycho-und Pragmalinguistische Begleitstudie*. Vienna and Graz.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1995². *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 1984. *Bilingualism or Not. The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rethinking Phonology in Teacher Education.

A response to Barbara Seidlhofer ('Rethinking Teacher Education: Setting an Agenda for Applied Linguistics', VIEWS 6/1)

Jennifer Jenkins, King's College London

In writing about the implications for teacher education of changes in the role of English, Barbara Seidlhofer has raised some timely issues. The spread of English around the world in recent years inevitably calls into question current practices in teacher education regarding both the way language is described to teachers, and the 'communicative' teaching methods which are so often prescribed to them. Barbara Seidlhofer outlines a number of important research questions which urgently need addressing in order that we may develop and implement a pedagogy for English as an international language (EIL). Wisely, she acknowledges that her questions add up to "a rather grand scheme ... which can keep many applied linguists busy for a long time" (p.61).

I would like briefly to take up just two of these questions in relation to my own particular area of interest: teacher education for the teaching of pronunciation:

1. Which implications for teaching result from the fact that most communication in English worldwide now takes place among non-native speakers¹ (NNSSs)?
2. What education do teachers need to help them fulfil their educational role?

In particular, how can university departments modify their teacher education programmes to adapt to changing conditions and meet new requirements?

¹ I am referring throughout to NNSs of approximately an upper-intermediate level of proficiency, rather than to fluent bilinguals such as NNS teacher educators and (most) NNS classroom teachers of English.

1. NNS-NNS communication: the rule rather than the exception

The implications of this development for pronunciation teaching are immense, although the fact probably has yet to be appreciated by the vast majority of teacher educators around the world. In Britain, pronunciation continues to be marginalised in teacher education. Where it is granted more than a tiny proportion of classroom time, whether on teacher training (*sic*) courses such as the Cambridge Certificate and Diploma in English Language Teaching (respectively CELTA and DELTA), or on university masters' courses in English language teaching, applied linguistics and the like, pronunciation tends to follow long-established, traditional routes (the only exception being an occasional reference to David Brazil's 'Discourse Intonation').

On the other hand, in countries where English is a foreign language, such as Poland, Russia and, of course, Austria, pronunciation is generally given far greater priority in teacher education. Nevertheless, it seems that NNS teacher educators collude with their British counterparts - possibly as a result of non-native diffidence in the 'accent domain' - in following traditional approaches to phonology education. The goal of these approaches is, by and large, the as-close-as-is-humanly-possible approximation of a NS accent, usually Received Pronunciation (RP) or General American (GA). These are felt to be in some way 'better' than a local, e.g. Austrian-English, accent which - by implication - is in some way 'deviant'.

The arguments against the use of a minority (even in NS terms) accent as the pedagogic goal for a world lingua franca have been rehearsed by a number of writers (see, for example, Macaulay 1988, Brown 1991, Dalton & Seidlhofer 1994, Jenkins 1998 and forthcoming). The main objection is that the focus remains on phonological intelligibility and acceptability for small groups of educated British and American NS receivers (the EFL position), while scant attention is paid to the factors involved in intelligibility - let alone acceptability - for other NNS receivers (the EIL position).

The lack of research conducted hitherto into NNS-NNS communication is, itself, a symptom of the low significance attached to this type of interaction by many of those engaged in applied linguistic research. Nevertheless, from the data we do have, important differences from NS-NNS communication are beginning to emerge. In the field of phonology, my own data indicate that those items with a potential to cause unintelligibility for a NNS receiver do not necessarily have the same potential to cause unintelligibility for a NS receiver, and vice versa.

Why, then, are pronunciation features which favour NS receivers given such precedence on phonology courses for teachers all over the world? Why should their learners be expected to struggle to acquire certain phonological features productively if they are unlikely to engage in NS-NNS interaction?

The obvious answers pronunciation-wise to the first of Barbara Seidlhofer's questions that I have taken up are thus (a) that the primary need for the vast majority of learners of English, is for their pronunciation to be intelligible to other NNSs rather than to some 'superior', abstract native speaker of English and (b) that future research should focus on how this might be achieved. Research findings are only now beginning to filter through (see next section). More extensive research into pronunciation in NNS-NNS communication will enable us to narrow down still further the phonological features most likely to promote (or at least, not impede) intelligibility in NNS-NNS interaction. In addition, it will undoubtedly provide us with important information on the almost untouched question of accent acceptability in EIL. Teacher educators need, in turn, to take such research findings into account and adapt their phonology courses to render them relevant for EIL. This brings us to the second question.

2. Adapting teacher education to meet changing conditions

In order for English language teachers to be able to deal appropriately with pronunciation for EIL, their phonology courses need to include (1) a radical reprioritising of the various elements of pronunciation along with a reconsideration of pronunciation models and (2) a solid grounding in sociolinguistics and social psychology in so far as these relate to the phonological acquisition of an international language. Some teacher education courses around the world already include aspects of (2), but I am aware of very few indeed that are concerned in any way with (1).

My own data (Jenkins 1995) indicate that the most salient pronunciation items for phonological intelligibility for an NNS receiver are:

- the majority of consonant sounds (but not voiceless and voiced *th* as in *thin* and *this* respectively, for which substitutions such as /t/ and /d/ seem to be unproblematic)
- the preservation of vowel quantity distinctions such as the short vowel sound in *hat* as contrasted with the long sound in *heart*
- the preservation of word- and syllable-initial consonant clusters
- sufficient lengthening and correct placement of nuclear (tonic) stress, particularly when it is used contrastively. Thus, in the sentence "I smoke more than you do", a Taiwanese-English speaker's placement of the nucleus on

the word "do" rather than on "you" rendered the sentence unintelligible to his Italian-English interlocutor.

On the other hand, for NS receivers, segmentals (vowel and consonant sounds) are deemed to be far less salient for phonological intelligibility than suprasegmentals (word stress, rhythm, features of connected speech, intonation). Thus, the only clear area of EFL-EIL intelligibility overlap is that of one feature of the intonation system: nuclear stress. To complicate matters further, some of those phonological features thought to contribute to NS-receiver intelligibility appear actually to detract from intelligibility for NNS receivers. I am referring here to certain features of connected speech: elision, assimilation, liaison, intrusion and, above all, weak forms. These features are traditionally explained as resulting from a desire to preserve the so-called 'stress-timed' rhythm of English speech, ie. a more-or-less regular beat regardless of the number of intervening syllables. In fact, the existence of English stress-timing is extremely doubtful (see Cauldwell 1996), though that is a separate story. The main point is that these *assimilatory* features of speech cause intelligibility problems for NNSs in conversation with NSs. By contrast, the more clearly articulated *dissimilatory* features that NNSs (whether consciously or subconsciously) prefer to use, tend to have the opposite effect. This may go some way to explaining the not infrequently reported phenomenon of NNS-NNS conversations proceeding smoothly and intelligibly until a NS joins in - with nobody being able to understand a word he/she says.

Taking all these factors into account, I recommend the following changes to phonology courses for teachers:

(1) Reprioritising/rethinking pronunciation models

Instead of ploughing mechanically through the whole of English phonology and (outside Britain) phonetics without comment on international relevance, teacher educators could be expected to indicate and prioritise a core set of features thought to be crucial for intelligibility in EIL. I have outlined above the general areas in which such a core phonology is emerging, and the issue is discussed in far greater detail elsewhere (Jenkins 1995 and forthcoming²). The EIL core will undoubtedly include not only features of British and American

² I should perhaps apologise for repeatedly citing my own research: I am unaware of other substantial work that has been carried out in this field, but would be delighted to hear from readers who can correct me on this point.

pronunciation (e.g. American rhotic /r/, but British unflapped intervocalic /t/), but also NNS features such as substitutions of *th*.

In addition to equipping teachers with a knowledge of the different pronunciation priorities in EIL as opposed to EFL, teacher phonology education will also have to tackle in a new and more complex way the issue of pronunciation models. Crucial in this regard, will be the establishing of the difference between a model and a norm.

According to Dalton and Seidlhofer (1994:27),

If we treat RP and/or General American as a norm, we connect them strongly with ideas of correctness. The norm is invariable and has to be imitated independently of any considerations of language use. The aim, however unrealistic, is 100 per cent attainment of the norm, which is regarded as an end in itself.

They contrast this with the treating of RP and/or General American as models, in which case, “we use them as points of reference and models for guidance. We decide to approximate to them more or less according to the demands of a specific situation”.

As soon as we move away from the idea of RP or General American (GA) as norms, we allow for the possibility that, even while these accents may continue to provide models in the sense of reference points, they may no longer represent most learners’ (albeit unrealistic) goals. Who, then, is best placed to present learners with an accent towards which they can aim (and stand a chance of achieving)? Surely a fluent bilingual speaker of English, probably, though not essentially, someone sharing their learners’ own first language. In monolingual classrooms outside the UK and USA, the use of a local accent of English as the goal of learning will enhance the authority of the local teacher, while learners will more easily identify with an accent which ‘legitimately’ contains features of their first language.

Future teacher education for EIL will need to provide NS and NNS teachers alike with help in acquiring those skills which will enable them to balance the teaching of an EIL core phonology with the teaching of a NS accent as point of reference (where relevant).

(2) The sociolinguistics and social psychology of EIL phonology

As far as sociolinguistics is concerned, all those who teach pronunciation for international uses of English need to be educated in the facts of language variation. In particular they need to be made aware that:

- phonological variation is the rule rather than the exception.
- such variation does not equal incorrectness (though see James 1998 Chapter 2 on the resulting problems for error analysis).

- there is nothing intrinsically wrong with an accent which does not conform to one particular NS standard (e.g. RP), because English used internationally is not the property of its NSs (Widdowson 1994).
- conversely, RP and GA are not in any way intrinsically superior to other accents, but the prestige accents respectively in Britain and America by pure chance.
- NNS regional accents are entitled to parity with NS regional accents where English is used as an international lingua franca.
- exposure to a wide range of NNS regional accents is an essential part of learning EIL.

Moving to social psychology, teachers need educating in relation to

- the close links between one's first language (L1) accent and group identity, and the damage which can be done by insisting that learners attempt to abandon all traces of their L1 accent.
- the ways in which speakers adjust their pronunciation in order to bring it closer to that of an addressee, either for affective reasons (to be liked) or for communicational efficiency (to be understood). In particular, NNSs engaged in EIL seem, under certain conditions, to bring their pronunciation mutually closer to the EIL core. Teacher education should include the factors involved in contriving classroom situations to encourage such convergence, e.g. through the ways of pairing and grouping learners.

It goes without saying that all the above applies to NS teachers as much as it does to NNS teachers. And just as the former have tended to be advantaged in relation to EFL, so they are likely to be disadvantaged in relation to EIL. I have already discussed the problem of NSs' use of assimilatory phonological features in EIL contexts. As a Japanese lady living in Paris points out, it is time that NSs realised that "the English they speak at home is not always an internationally acceptable English" and that they should take pains to make themselves understood in international settings (Mikie Kiyoi, *English Today* 51, 13/3:17, July 1997). It seems that for English to serve the dual role proposed by Barbara Seidlhofer, of "access to a lingua franca and ...fostering language awareness" (p.55), EIL should be taught "from early schooling onwards" not only to NNSs of English but also to its NSs. English language teacher education thus requires rethinking for L1 English teaching just as much as for L2.

EIL seems set to stay with us as the primary context of English language use for many years to come. This means that it is crucial for debates such as that initiated by Barbara Seidlhofer to take place and keep running. I finish by reiterating her plea for responses and further contributions.

References

- Brown A. 1991, *Pronunciation Models*, Singapore: Singapore University Press
- Caudwell R. 1996, ‘Stress-timing: observations, beliefs, and evidence’, *Eger Journal of English Studies* vol 1
- Dalton C. & B. Seidlhofer 1994, ‘Is pronunciation teaching desirable? Is it feasible?’ in T. Sebbage & S. Sebbage (eds.) *Proceedings of the 4th International NELLE Conference*, Hamburg:NELLE
- James C. 1998, *Errors in Language Learning and Use*, London: Longman
- Jenkins J. 1995, Variation in Phonological Error in Interlanguage Talk, unpublished doctoral thesis, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Jenkins J. 1998, ‘Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an International Language?’, *ELT Journal* 52/2:119-126
- Jenkins J. forthcoming, *The Phonology of English as an International Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Macaulay R. 1998, ‘RP R.I.P.’, *Applied Linguistics* 9/2:115-124
- Widdowson H.G. 1994, ‘The ownership of English’, *TESOL Quarterly* 28/2:377-89

IMPRESSUM:

EIGENTÜMER, HERAUSGEBER & VERLEGER: VIEWS, c/o Institut für Anglistik & Amerikanistik der Universität Wien, Universitätscampus AAKH, Spitalgasse 2-4, A - 1090 Wien, Austria. **FÜR DEN INHALT VERANTWORTLICH:** Ute Smit. **REDAKTION:** Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Bryan Jenner, Gunther Kaltenböck, Arthur Mettinger, Hans Platzer, Nikolaus Ritt, Herbert Schendl, Barbara Seidlhofer, Ute Smit, H.G. Widdowson. Alle: c/o Institut für Anglistik & Amerikanistik der Universität Wien, Universitätscampus AAKH, Spitalgasse 2, Hof 8, A - 1090 Wien. **HERSTELLUNG:** VIEWS.