1 Bilingualism and Multilingualism: Some Central Concepts

JOHN EDWARDS

Introduction

Bilingualism and multilingualism have both *de facto* existences and important places in the psychological, political, and social debates that define social and ethnic groups, communities, and regions. Very widespread phenomena, they arise for a number of well-understood reasons; in the main, however, they are also quite unremarkable phenomena, fuelled by necessity up to, but rarely beyond, appropriately useful levels of competence. They imply both heightened and lessened opportunities for interpersonal and intercultural exchange: multilingual capacities at an individual level can obviously broaden possibilities, but a world of many languages is also one in which communicative problems exist. In such a world, *lingua francas* and translation are required.[1]

While almost everyone knows at least a few words in other languages, we generally require a little more competence than that before we are willing to acknowledge bilingual or multilingual ability. Where, however, to draw the line? Where does bilingualism 'start'? And how are we to accommodate different levels of fluency? Still, there are those who we confidently put in the monolingual category. And, at the other end of this linguistic spectrum, there are those who have virtually maternal multilingual capabilities. After rigorous self-examination – of which language emerges spontaneously at times of emergency or elevated emotion, which variety is dreamt in, which is associated with the earliest memories – George Steiner (1992), for example, claimed equal fluency in English, French, and German. As in other social arenas, however, it is the grayer areas between extremes that are at once more common and more interesting.

As noted, competence in more than one language can be approached from social as well as individual perspectives, and these need not be as neatly connected as might first be thought. While it is true that a country (or any other recognizably bordered region) full of multilingual people is itself multilingual in a broad sense, it may nevertheless officially sanction only one or two varieties and thus, in another sense, be something less than multilingual. Conversely, a country may be officially bilingual or multilingual and yet most of its citizens may fall into the monolingual basket. Many states in Africa have two official languages (usually a strong indigenous variety and a widely used European one) for highly heterogeneous and multilingual populations. In Canada, too, there is official recognition of two languages, but the situation on the ground hardly resembles the linguistically rich, varied, and – above all – interpenetrating settings common in Africa. Both personal and social manifestations of bilingualism are of course important, but it should be noted that the emphases are quite different: a thoroughgoing discussion of individual bilingualism involves, for example, linguistic and psycholinguistic dimensions which figure much less prominently, if at all, at the social level where other dimensions – historical, educational, political, and so on – arise for consideration.

There are important differences between individual bilingualism and collective or social bilingualism, regardless of whether or not the latter is officially endorsed. In many settings, ancient and modern, the latter is an enduring quantity. Individual bilingualism, on the other hand, may be less permanent, often reflecting a generational way-station on the road between two monolingualisms. Thus, the classic pattern for immigrants to the United States has been bilingualism (mother tongue and English) by the second generation and English monolingualism by the third. A more enduring collective bilingualism rests upon continuing necessities which become absent among most immigrant populations. Where these involve different functions and domains of use for each language, the situation is often referred to as *diglossia*. Of course, even stability is relative. The French–English diglossia that prevailed in England after the Norman conquest eventually broke down, for example.

Arrangements of societal bilingualism vary across contexts. The passage of the Official Languages Act (1969), which legally underpins French and English in Canada, was preceded by an official investigatory commission. Paying special attention to the linguistic situations in Belgium, Finland, Switzerland, and South Africa, the commissioners closely examined the so-called 'personality' and 'territorial' principles relating to bilingualism. In South Africa, language rights are seen to inhere in individuals, wherever they may live within a state; the Belgian territorial principle, however, accords official status by region – Flemish in the north, French in the south. The commission opted for the application of the personality principle in Canada, even though official-language minorities were (and still are) small in all provinces except Quebec and New Brunswick, a fact that would seem to point towards a territorial disposition. The sensitive and sometimes volatile relationship between the two 'founding peoples,' however, was a prime consideration. The recommendation, therefore, was for federal bilingualism

and the provision of bilingual services at the provincial level – but only Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick were to become 'officially' bilingual.

Today, however, only New Brunswick has proclaimed itself bilingual. Indeed, broader hopes for Canada-wide bilingualism have faded, with the country steadily moving towards a Belgian-like territoriality: French in Quebec and English elsewhere, with a bilingual 'belt' in those regions of Ontario and, especially, New Brunswick that abut Quebec. The assimilation of francophones outside Quebec, and that province's rejection of bilingualism, reflect the importance of the political and social frameworks within which stable bilingualism occurs. Policies of social engineering in democratic states must ultimately, it seems, be reconciled with widespread popular perceptions of social reality and self-interest. When perceptions differ among powerful ethnic groups – in Canada, the anglophones, francophones, aboriginals, and 'allophones' are all central players, though no group is itself monolithic – then centrally inspired conceptions of bilingualism and diglossia are seen to be quite delicate (see Edwards 1995, 2009).

A Multilingual World

Multilingual realities arise in a number of ways. Immigrants, whether settlers or invaders, bring languages into contact and sometimes, as with imperialist and colonial expansion, it is unnecessary for many people to physically move; their language may make its presence felt through military, religious, or economic force requiring relatively small numbers of soldiers, merchants, bureaucrats, and missionaries. Some cultures have had more explicit policies here than have others – compare, for instance, the *mission civilisatrice* of the French with the more pragmatic attitude of the English (see below for discussion) – but all imperial powers have, directly or indirectly, made their languages attractive and sometimes necessary to conquered or colonized groups. The languages of expansionist regimes often become intertwined with pragmatic advantage and cultural prestige at a local level, and these factors often long outlive the original dominating influence: the continued adherence to European varieties which exists in former colonial areas is an example here.

Multilingualism can also arise as a result of political union among different linguistic groups: Switzerland incorporates German, Italian, Romansch, and French populations; Belgium unites (sometimes precariously) French and Flemish speakers; Canada has English and French 'charter' groups. In addition to this sort of political association, there are also multilingual federations based upon more arbitrary arrangements, often the result of colonial boundary marking and country creation; modern examples are found in Africa and Asia. Multilingualism is also commonly observed in border areas: two North American examples can be found along the Mexican–American border in the south, and on that between New England and Quebec in the north.

These are the primary circumstances underpinning multilingual arrangements, but they are not the only ones. Cultural and educational motivations can also

expand linguistic repertoires – not only on an individual basis, but in more widespread fashion as well. Also relevant here is the degree to which a language community is open to the use of 'its' variety by others. Consider the differences between the English and the French in this regard: the latter have traditionally been much more possessive of their language and, while working hard to bring it to those unfortunate enough not to already speak it (the *mission civilisatrice*, again), have also been zealous in protecting its 'purity,' both at home and abroad. English, on the other hand, has not been treated in the same guarded way; while there are books and journals devoted to the 'new' Englishes and to 'world' English, there are few similar treatments for French. English is thus becoming 'internationalized' in a way that French is not, and an important consequence is that a language once tainted by imperialism is rapidly becoming 'ours' in many parts of the world. India provides perhaps the best example of a broadly accepted indigenized variety of English.

Classifying Multilingualism

Understanding the dynamics of multilingualism means coming to grips with many complicated linkages between languages and virtually all other areas of social life. While it is no doubt true that every language–contact situation is unique, that uniqueness arises because of the differential weightings and combinations of elements that are, themselves, recurrent across settings – and not because of the presence of elements or factors found nowhere else. This suggests the possibility of frameworks within which many settings might be assessed and compared.

Building upon the work of many other researchers, I have constructed a typological framework of language–contact settings, with particular reference to minority linguistic groups. While such a model does not cover all important instances of multilingual contact, it is certainly descriptive of a great many – simply because language contact very often involves varieties of unequal strength. To provide physical context, the framework begins with the adaptation of a geographical scheme first proposed by White (1991). It makes three basic distinctions. The first is among minority languages which are unique to one state (e.g., Breton in France), those which are non-unique but which are still subordinate in all contexts in which they occur (e.g., Basque in Spain and France), and those which are minorities in one setting but majority varieties elsewhere (French in Canada and French in France); thus, we have *unique*, *non-unique*, and *local-only* minorities. The second distinction deals with the type of connection among speakers of the same language in different states; are they *adjoining* (again, Basque in Spain and France) or *non-adjoining* (French in Canada and French in France)? Thirdly, what degree of spatial cohesion exists among speakers within a given state? Here, the terms *cohesive* (Cree in Canada) and *non-cohesive* (Spanish in the United States) can be used. In addition, the model considers these distinctions as they apply to both *immigrant* and *indigenous* groups (French and Cree in Quebec).[2]

Such a framework cannot capture all the important nuances, of course, some of which are not immediately apparent. As an example, consider the immigrant–indigenous dimension. Some have argued that only Amerindian languages – which, themselves, arrived via 'Beringia' some 12,000 years ago – are indigenous to Canada. French and English, however, have 400-year claims. While less indigenous than the 'first nations' might they be considered as more indigenous than later arrivals? How long, in other words, does it take to become indigenous? This is not an idle matter, since scholarly pleas have been made for the differential treatment of indigenous and immigrant groups. There are also problems with the cohesiveness dimension: if a language is spoken sparsely over a wide area, but also possesses a concentrated center, then it could perhaps be described as either cohesive or non-cohesive. Yet another difficulty arises when considering a language that is found in adjoining states; while each group can be classified as cohesive or non-cohesive, the degree of cohesion of its neighbor may also be important. Issues also arise concerning the adjoining/non-adjoining dichotomy itself. For Basques in France and Spain, the adjoining label seems appropriate, but what of language communities groups found in neighboring states but not in their common border areas?

Despite the complexities that bedevil even these geographical underpinnings, it is clear that information of many other types is required for fuller understanding of multilingualism. The functions and status of competing language varieties are central here, and have engaged the attention of a number of important scholars – Ferguson (1962, 1966), Stewart (1962, 1968), Haugen (1972), Haarmann (1986), Giles (see, e.g., Giles and Coupland 1991), and others. All of this existing work has been taken into account as my own comprehensive scaffolding of ecolinguistic factors has arisen. The latter builds upon three basic categories of variables: *speaker*; *language*; and *setting*. These are not, of course, watertight and mutually exclusive dimensions, but they may serve as benchmarks. A second and intertwined categorization takes into account different disciplinary perspectives (demography, sociology, linguistics, psychology, and so on). A few examples will illustrate this interweaving. Viewing settings from a demographic perspective could highlight urban–rural distinctions of importance for language maintenance or decline. Sociological attention to speaker variables might consider within- or without-group marriage. Formal linguistic analysis of different varieties could focus upon dialectal variation, and social psychology could investigate language attitudes and beliefs.

These questions – and the large number of others that arise when we plot discipline against dimension – may not be specific enough to comprise a completed and applicable typology, but they could formalize and direct our inquiries. Given that many individual case studies, however rich and many–ayered – are essentially one-off exercises, it is clear that further classification could be useful, even if it does no more than rationalize data gathering. As Ferguson (1991: 230) has noted:

It is frustrating to read a stimulating case study and find that it lacks information on what the reader regards as some crucial points . . . what I have in mind is not so

much a well developed theoretical frame of reference as something as simple as a checklist of points to be covered.

The typological approach that I have briefly sketched here has attracted the attention of other scholars. Grenoble and Whaley (1998) draw centrally upon the model, for instance, citing both strengths and weaknesses. Clyne (2003), too, points out the need for more clarity; overall, however, he looks favorably on the model's contextualization of variables, something that 'could be considered more in the methodology of future studies' (244). In their studies of Bashkir, Altai, and Kazakh speakers in the Russian republics of Bashkortostan and Altai, Yağmur and Kroon (2003, 2006) have employed the framework in conjunction with the ethnolinguistic-vitality approach of Giles and his colleagues – a model first introduced by Giles *et al.* (1977) and extensively referred to since then (for a recent example, see Ladegaard, 2006). Paulston *et al.* (2007) have cited it in their examination of 'extrinsic' linguistic minorities – that is, groups who once belonged to a majority population in a neighboring country: Russians in Latvia are a case in point. Extra and Gorter (2008) discuss the approach in the introduction to their own framework for regional minority languages in Europe. Tsunoda (2006) uses the model as the scaffolding for his chapter on endangered languages, reminding us that typological work is a useful subsection of language ecology. Vail (2006) has employed the scheme in his assessment of Northern Khmer and, while making some critical remarks, styles it 'the most robust model' (140) of both macro- and micro-level approaches to the ecology of endangered languages.

Dealing with Multilingual Realities

Although the exigencies of language contact give rise to multilingual abilities, there are obviously many occasions when limitations in such abilities necessitate some means of bridging a language gap. There are two main methods here. The first, the use of *lingua francas*, is either part of the existing multilingual picture, or necessitates an extension of it. 'Link languages' fall into three categories: so-called 'languages of wider communication,' varieties that have achieved regional or global power; pidgins, creoles, and other restricted linguistic forms whose diminished scope is at once easy to master and sufficient for communicative purposes which are, themselves, quite circumscribed; and constructed or 'artificial' languages.

There are many historical examples of existing languages becoming important *lingua francas* – not, of course, because of any intrinsic qualities setting them above other varieties, but because of the power and prestige of their speakers. Greek and Latin are the classical examples, but French, Italian, Arabic, and – today – English have all played bridging roles. In the second category are pidgins, whose limited vocabularies and grammars are sufficient for basic communication. (Pidgins are, then, a rather good example of a much more general tendency, the development of multiple fluencies up to, but not beyond, the requirements of day-to-day use.)

If the social contacts that give rise to pidgins remain, themselves, of a rudimentary nature, then those pidgins may have considerable longevity; if contact situations persist, however, and become more complicated, pidgins may evolve into creoles. The developments here stem from the need for richer and more expressive forms, and these, in turn, often arise because nobody's mother tongue (a pidgin) is in the process of becoming somebody's mother tongue (a creole).

Constructed languages provide a third potential bridge across linguistic divides. Although there have been a great many schemes over the centuries, the best known and the most successful example is Ludwig Zamenhof's Esperanto, first published in 1887. In most cases, the initial desire of the 'language makers' has been to produce an easily learned auxiliary medium that possesses a sort of neutrality unavailable to powerful 'natural' languages, tied as they are to important groups and burdened by specific histories. But Zamenhof and others like him have also believed that constructed link languages, untainted by imperialist pasts, might contribute to some 'trans-national' identity, and thus to global harmony. Although there are several important reasons for the lack of acceptance of constructed languages, a basic problem is this: Esperanto (for example) might be more appealing if there were a significant community of speakers one could join. Without such a community, however, motivating potential learners to take the plunge is difficult – yet how else will a speech community come into being? (Fuller details on constructed languages like Esperanto may be found in Edwards 2010a.)

The other great bridging method is translation. Apart from an almost useless word-for-word exercise, every act of translation involves interpretation and judgment. For this reason, it has sometimes been supposed that 'true' translation is impossible; however, although a perfect version which captures *every* nuance and allusion is rather unlikely – and becomes more so as the material to be translated becomes less prosaic – we have nonetheless translated, for practical purposes, throughout history. (Seeing translation as interpretation also links, incidentally, cross-language exercises with communications within the same language. That is, even the simplest of conversations between two speakers of the same language involves interpretation, and is analogous to 'reading between the lines' in written language.) If, as is generally the case, the aim is to adhere to what the well-known classical translator, Émile Rieu, once called the 'law of equivalent effect' (see Tancock 1954: 15), then the greatest threats to accurate translation appear at opposite ends of the literary continuum. At the 'lower' end, the non-standard language of the streets, heavy with ever-changing slang and obscenity, poses real problems; at the 'higher', poetic or philosophical productions lay traps in their use of metaphor, allusion, or dense, abstract reasoning.

The Definition and Measurement of Personal Fluencies

Early in his partnership with Watson, Sherlock Holmes explained his ignorance of many things by saying that the brain was like an attic, that one should fill it

wisely according to one's needs, and that 'it is a mistake to think that that little room has elastic walls and can distend to any extent' (Conan Doyle 1966: 12). But while there are limits, Holmes grievously underestimated them; he could easily have remedied his ignorance of literature and astronomy without displacing his knowledge of poisons or the many varieties of cigarette ash. I mention this because the notion of some finite or 'containerized' language competence bedeviled the language literature for some time. At its simplest, the suggestion was that what you gain on the swings of one language you lose on the roundabouts of the other. All that we know about brain function and capacity, however, completely under-cuts this idea – but it still has currency beyond the academic cloisters. Many parents interested in immersion education for their children, for example, need reassurance on the point.

As may be imagined, it is easy to find definitions of bilingualism that reflect widely divergent responses to the question of *degree* with which I opened this chapter. Some views acknowledged bilingualism only where two well-developed and roughly equal fluencies were found; Bloomfield (1933) provided an example here. Some, like Weinreich (1953) were content to remain vague in matters of degree. And still others (e.g. Haugen 1953) have suggested that linguistic reper-toire expansion begins with the ability to produce complete and meaningful utterances in a second language. Roughly speaking, earlier definitions were more restrictive, while later ones have made room for greater variation in competence. But this more liberal view proves to be as unsatisfactory as its more narrowly conceived predecessors. This is simply because any attempt to come to grips with bilingual competences – whether for purposes of educational best practice, or for attempts to relate those competences to other aspects of personal or social life, or simply to more fully open another window on language and cognition – must obviously start from definable levels or degrees.

Several specific complications can be briefly touched upon here. Bilingualism and multilingualism, for example, clearly represent extensions along more than one language dimension. Given the four basic skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), and given further subdivisions so as to take into account divergent possibilities under headings like vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation, we soon arrive at a considerable number of important elements. They will all figure in the assessment of language competence, but it does not follow that strength in one means strength in another:

> a pupil may be able to understand spoken English and Welsh, speak English fluently but Welsh only haltingly, read in Welsh with a reading age of six and in English with a reading age of eight, write poorly in English and not at all in Welsh. Is that pupil bilingual? (Baker 1988: 2)

Surely the broad answer here is yes – but equally surely, any attempt to depart from such a generality will prove problematic.

Many tests have been used to measure bilingualism, including rating scales and tests of fluency, flexibility, and dominance. The first of these can involve inter-

views, language-usage measures, and self-assessment procedures, and these personal reports have a lot to recommend them. Their strengths, however, rest upon the ability (and willingness) to self-report accurately, and a roughly equivalent sense across informants of what competence means. Such matters cannot be taken for granted, and the inaccuracies of census language information provide an illustrative example of the difficulties in relying upon self-assessment. Apparently more objective tests of fluency and flexibility are also far from perfect predictors of either performance or competence, and can be quite inadequate in assessing patterns of relative dominance. Factors such as attitude, age, gender, intelligence, memory, inter-linguistic distance, and context of testing are all potentially confounding.

Even if we were able to gauge bilingual or multilingual capacities with some accuracy, there would remain problems of adequate labeling, for it is hardly to be expected that measured individuals would neatly fall into a small number of categories of ability. There even remains confusion as to what term ought to be applied to those much sought-after individuals whose bilingual capacities are great: they have been described as *balanced bilinguals*, *ambilinguals,* and *equilinguals*, among other terms. The first has become the most common, and its use need not imply solely Steiner-like perfection; even a rougher equivalence of fluencies, however, still implies a category in which most bilingual or multilingual individuals cannot be placed. The capabilities of most of those who may reasonably be styled as 'bilingual' fall well below any line of equivalence.

There are other important matters to be considered. A useful distinction, for instance, can be drawn between *receptive* (or passive) and *productive* (or active) bilingualism; the difference here is between those who understand a language – either spoken or written – but cannot produce it themselves, and those who can do both. *Additive* or *subtractive* tendencies must also be reckoned with: does learning a new language represent a repertoire expansion or a replacement of the earlier variety? Outcomes here tend to reflect different social pressures and needs. Additive bilingualism generally occurs where both languages continue to be useful and valued; the subtractive variety, on the other hand, typically reflects a setting in which one language is more dominant, where one is on the ascendant and the other is waning. Yet another common distinction is that between *primary* and *secondary* bilingualism, between a dual competence acquired naturally through contextual demands, and one where systematic and formal instruction has occurred. These are not watertight compartments, of course. One might, for example, develop a fluent conversational grasp of a language in a relatively informal way, and only later feel the need to add some formal literacy skills. This would, incidentally, recapture the process by which a mother tongue is developed, and it is noteworthy that more enlightened school curricula have tried to reflect this in their second-language programs. Still, it is not difficult to appreciate that there are some important and socially relevant differences between those who become bilingual informally (often, to add to the point, relatively early in life) and those whose second competence is more self-consciously acquired. Compare those English–Gaelic bilinguals in Ireland or Scotland whose fluencies result from

growing up in a particular location, with those who, in Dublin, Glasgow, or Edinburgh, have more formally set themselves (or been set) to become bilingual. Lumping these two groups together, under a single 'bilingual' rubric might be quite inappropriate at personal levels and, as well, might give a rather inaccurate picture of the state of health of Irish and Scots Gaelic.

Some have attempted to capture the last distinction by referring to 'élite' and 'folk' bilingualism. The former has typically involved two (or more) prestigious languages, and often had as much to do with social-status marking as it did with a thirst for knowledge and cultural boundary crossing. In earlier times, not to have known Latin or Greek or French in addition to one's vernacular would have been unthinkable for educated people – but often unthinkable, perhaps, in the same way that it would have been unthinkable not to have had servants. 'Folk' bilingualism, on the other hand, is generally suggestive of a more informal and necessity-driven expansion. But a moment's reflection will reveal that both varieties may be driven by necessity – different forms and levels of necessity, to be sure. Similarly, neither need be a capability learned at the maternal knee, nor is formal instructional always an 'élite' marker. The language-learning activities of immigrants might well be seen to fall under the 'folk' heading – after all, they are motivated by mundane but usually pressing considerations – but they (or their children) typically learn the new language at school. Formal education per se, then, seems not enough to elicit the élite label. Indeed, there are many real-life mixtures that should caution us against inaccurate and simplistic categorization. For example, before the passage of legislation strengthening the position of French at school, it was very common for Italians in Montreal to maintain Italian at home, to learn French *dans les rues*, and to put their children into English-medium schools. Trilingualism was the result of this interesting mixture of approaches; see Edwards (2010b).

The Bilingual or Multilingual Individual

The fact that a majority of the world's population, a great many of whom are poorly educated, have at least some level of multilingual competence surely indicates that language repertoire expansion is not a particularly rare feat. And yet, especially within dominant linguistic groups, it is common to find references to the difficulties involved or to the peculiar lack of language talents supposedly possessed. Today, for example, anglophones often complain that they have no aptitude for foreign-language learning. This may be accompanied by expressions of envy for those multilingual Africans, Asians, and Europeans, and sometimes (more subtly) by a linguistic smugness reflecting a deeply held conviction that, after all, it is those clever 'others' who don't know English who will have to accommodate. All such attitudes, of course, reveal more about social dominance and convention than they do about aptitude.

The literature on the specifics of second-language acquisition, both 'natural' and school-based, reveals that – with sufficient motivation and opportunity – all

normally intelligent people can at least become functional in another variety. This is not to deny that there may exist individuals who have a greater innate or acquired aptitude: a good 'ear' may be helpful, as well as a good memory and a capacity for self-initiated application. Beyond these, adaptability and genuine interest in other cultures are no doubt important; an important difference between purely 'instrumental' and more thoroughgoing 'integrative' motivations has been frequently discussed in the literature (Edwards 2010c). All of these qualities (with, in some cases, the exception of the last) are of general value, however, and do not form a package uniquely implicated in language learning (see Butler, chapter 5, this volume, for review).

Almost everyone, then, has the capacity to expand their linguistic repertoire, and evidence from both the laboratory and the street tells us that doing so exacts no cognitive price. But what of the notion that bilingualism can *increase* intellectual scope? While some have demurred – in the seventeenth century, for example, Samuel Butler suggested that 'the more languages a man can speak, his talent has but sprung the greater leak' (Hazlitt 1901: 92) – the historically common view was that personalities somehow expand with extra language competence. In the modern era, however, we find scholars beginning to associate bilingualism with lowered intelligence. Much of this early social-scientific work was conducted in America, at a time of great concern with the flood of immigrants from Europe (roughly, 1900–1920). The intelligence tests of the time were very culture-specific, and non-white, non-English-speaking, non-northern-European, non-educated individuals fared poorly. In this unenlightened climate, measured intelligence was seen to correlate strongly with competence in English, and Florence Goodenough –an important educational psychologist who worked with Lewis Terman, the developer of the Stanford–Binet intelligence test – actually wrote that 'the use of a foreign language in the home is one of the chief factors in producing mental retardation' (1926: 393).

Later research tended to show essentially no relationship between intelligence and bilingualism, and this work was more carefully done than the earlier studies. Controlling for age, social class, gender, and so on became standard procedure, and the lack of such control was increasingly seen to have produced the negative associations found in previous work. A further turning-point came in the early 1960s, when findings showing a *positive* relationship between intelligence and bilingualism began to appear. In Montreal, Peal and Lambert (1962) examined ten-year-old middle-class bilingual and monolingual children; all of the former were assessed as having equal proficiency in French and English. The bilinguals were found to outperform their monolingual counterparts on both verbal and non-verbal intelligence tests. The authors were obliged to note, however, that their study could not determine directionality: do more intelligent children become bilingual, or does bilingualism enhance intellectual development?

There are some important difficulties involved in attempting to show a relationship – positive or negative – between bilingualism and cognitive development, mental flexibility, and intelligence. In Peal and Lambert's study, for instance, the unique reliance upon 'balanced' bilinguals may be thought to limit generalizability.

There are broader problems, too. The adequate representativeness of samples is a general difficulty, a specific variant of which is the problem of equating home backgrounds simply by controlling for gross measures of socioeconomic status. We have already noted the vagaries of bilingual definition, and these also apply to the accurate measurement of intelligence. And, as Peal and Lambert's own caution reminds us, most investigations produce correlations – and correlation need not imply causation.

There is very recent evidence suggesting that particular strengths are associated with bilingual competence, and the work of Bialystok and her colleagues is important here. Bialystok (2009) suggests, for example, that bilingualism is associated with improved cognitive functioning; a later paper (2010) finds that bilingual children solve certain tasks more quickly than do monolinguals, particularly those involving the processing of complex stimuli. Moreno *et al.* (2010) have extended such findings from children to adults and, indeed, Bialystok's most recent work is concerned to investigate bilingualism across the lifespan. The idea that expanded competence may ameliorate the symptoms of Alzheimer's disease has, unsurprisingly, attracted considerable media attention (see Bates 2010): here, Bialystok argues that bilinguals' larger 'cognitive reserves' provide an advantage. Despite these sorts of results – and noting that Bialystok herself points to limitations and uncertainties, as well as to areas in which the performance of bilinguals is *not* better than that of their monolingual counterparts – it remains fair to say that strong conclusions about bilingualism and cognition are not warranted. It *is* clear that repertoire expansion does not lead to decreased or weakened capacities and, more positively, that it represents a useful addition to overall personal capacity.

The most obvious bilingual benefit is of course language choice, but it is also common to find linguistic alteration occurring within one segment of speech. Weinreich (1953) considered such 'code-switching' as cross-language *interference*, but an abundance of studies has shown that switching may occur for emphasis, because the *mot juste* is found more readily in one language than in another, or because of a complicated network of perceptions of the speech situation, topic and content, the linguistic skills of interlocutors, degrees of intimacy and formality, and so on. The more neutral *transference* seems an more apt designation of behavior here; sometimes, as Poplack's (1980) title has it, a speaker may 'start a sentence in English *y terminó en español*'. Beyond this rather straightforward language switch, there are several types of language transfer typically found in bilingual and multilingual speech. (For a somewhat different use of the terms *code-switching* and *transference* or *transfer*, see Ritchie and Bhatia, chapter 15, this volume.)

If a Brussels French speaker uses the Dutch *vogelpik* for a game of darts, for example, rather than the standard French *fléchettes*, this is an example of lexical transfer; *vogelpik* here constitutes a 'loanword' since it is a borrowing used in unchanged form. (If it were to be given a French pronunciation, this might suggest an attempt to bring it more closely into the maternal fold.) Another type of lexical transfer involves translation, as when the English *skyscraper* becomes the French *gratte-ciel*; these words are called 'calques' (i.e. copies). Morphological transfers occur when loanwords are rather more fully embraced by the receiving language:

the Dutch *heilbot* (halibut) becomes *un elbot* in French. Syntactic transfer is revealed in such phrases as 'She's a nice girl, isn't it,' where the tag-words are slightly inappropriate in English but clearly reflect a more all-purpose phrase in another variety. Phonological transfer and 'foreign' accents are both common and obvious, as are the subtle variations in stress and intonation that constitute prosodic transfer.

While some of these features are more clearly matters of choice than are others, they all represent some sort of borrowing. The degree to which the borrowed element is integrated (or can be integrated) into the other code may be of considerable interest for studies of group contact, of relative linguistic prestige, of the perceived or actual ease with which different languages deal with given topics. Borrowings may be on a 'nonce' basis or may represent more established practice, but the latter grows from the former and presumably reflects stronger and more widespread need. However, a further subdivision has been suggested for these established borrowings; some are indeed necessary – words filling lexical gaps in the other language, for example – but some seem gratuitous, since an equivalent item already exists. The motivation here is most often perceived status and prestige, and common examples include the use of foreign words or phrases. It is one thing, then, to refer to *das Web-Design* or *der Cursor*, and perhaps another to employ *der Trend*, or *der Team* or *der Cash-Flow*. More pointedly, consider packets of Japanese sweets labeled 'Meltykiss Chocolate,' or 'Men's Pocky Chocolate.' To focus on the oddity of usage here is to miss the point – which is that any such oddity is meaningless. Very few of the purchasers of these sweets will decipher these English words, and they will neither know nor care that 'meltykiss' or 'pocky' chocolate would probably not be a popular treat in London or New York.

Perspectives on Theory and Practice

There are some classic accounts in the literature of children being brought up bilingually (e.g. Ronjat 1913; Leopold 1939–49; see Wang, chapter 22, this volume, for review), and it seems clear that the practice need involve few risks. Where negative consequences have been observed, these are almost always due to social, personal, cultural, or other factors – and not to the bilingualism process itself. Indeed, most observers point to the advantages of an early-acquired bilingual competence; these tend to reflect, above all, the relative ease of early learning and the higher levels of fluency and vocabulary that often result. There is something to this, but arguments that the young brain is more 'plastic' or receptive than the older one have sometimes led to an overemphasis upon early acquisition. Older learners have cognitive experience lacking in small children and, providing the motivation is sufficient, can be better learners. If we could combine the maturity and articulated necessity of the older with the impressionability, imitativeness, spontaneity, and unselfconsciousness of the younger, we would surely have a recipe for rapid and proficient bilingual acquisition.

There are many formal methods for teaching languages; very generally, older ones tended to stress the memorization of grammatical rules and vocabulary, in the service of literary study; little attention was given to spoken language. In more contemporary school settings this has changed, although even high-tech language laboratories sometimes merely individualize older approaches, rather than signaling a change of course towards more conversational competence. Still, while it remains difficult for the classroom to become a representation of the street, the tendency has steadily been towards more and more conversation. Students are encouraged to speak before learning formal grammar, and the use of the maternal variety is often kept to a minimum; the idea is to have second-language acquisition resemble as far as possible first-language learning. Immersion classrooms provide the most recent and most important embodiment of this principle. It is in this contemporary context that the most useful theoretical perspectives have emerged; see Edwards (2010c).

Most approaches to second-language acquisition reject a simplistic behaviorist model and endorse a cognitive conception in which (as in first-language learning) rules are formulated and tested. Learning occurs in a series of non-random stages, each of which is characterized by a sort of interlanguage. Theories within social psychology have paid particular attention to motivational features, and this makes a good deal of sense. If we agree that language is a social activity, and if we accept that almost everyone is cognitively capable of learning second (and subsequent) varieties, then it follows that the force of the situation, and the attitudes it provokes in potential learners, are central. A well-known and evolving framework for second-language learning is that of Gardner, whose work here extends from the late 1960s (see Gardner and Lambert 1972) to the present (Gardner 2010). He has consistently attempted to link the social context, and the cultural beliefs within it, to individual learner capacities – including, of course, motivational levels – and the formal/informal settings in which the language is to be learned. Throughout, he stresses the influence of integrative motivation upon positive outcomes. Clément's model (see Noels and Clément 1998) embeds individual motivations still more deeply in the social setting and has particular relevance for those language learners who are also minority-group members, and whose first language is threatened by the forces of those speaking the second. In the formulations of Giles and his colleagues (see Giles and Coupland 1991), language learning is considered as an intergroup process, with more attention given to assimilative tendencies and apprehensions, to the preservation of ethnic-group boundaries and identities. Spolsky's 'general theory' (1989) attempts to bring together all aspects of language learning, and assumes learning to be an interactive and socially contextualized process. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009) provide an excellent treatment, in eighteen chapters, by all the important current researchers in the field. Beyond the introductory and concluding sections, the two editors also contribute substantive chapters themselves; additionally, there are noteworthy pieces by MacIntyre, Clément, Kormos, Segalowitz, Noels, and many others. An important work, one that embeds discussions of attitude and motivation in the wider language literature is the 1,000-page encyclopedic

book by Ellis (2008). Roughly speaking, then, we can see the steadily more nuanced emphasis upon social and motivational features. (See Butler, chapter 5, this volume, for further discussion.)

Application and prediction are the acid test in all such theoretical models, and some have suggested that they have done little more than codify and formalize what has been known for a long time. Nonetheless, they all scotch the myth that some people, or some groups, have no 'head' for languages and that second-language aptitude is a rare commodity usually best seen in non-anglophones. Instead, they stress the power of the setting and, within it, the desires, needs, attitudes, and motivations of ordinary people: the social factors impinging upon language learning are, quite simply, the most important ones. We should also bear in mind that, for those many millions who develop bilingual or multilingual fluencies in the informal realm of daily life, simple necessity is the great motivator and the great determiner of how far this competence develops. It can dwarf all other features and, in particular, can ride roughshod over personal attitudes and motivation. Most historical changes in language use have a bilingual element, and most owe much more to socioeconomic and political exigencies than they do to attitude. The adoption of English by the Irish population, for example, was not generally accompanied by favorable or 'integrative' attitudes. There may have been a grudging instrumentality at work, but it certainly was not of the type which pushes students to study French or German in the hopes of joining the diplomatic service.

Language and Identity

Language clearly intertwines powerfully with conceptions and definitions of allegiance and 'belonging.' It possesses more than instrumental value; it is the vehicle of tradition and culture, and the medium of group narrative. Issues of psychology and sociology, of symbol and subjectivity, become important whenever we observe language in society. When more than one language is involved, then, we should expect ramifications in terms of identity and 'groupness.'

Much of interest here rests upon the degree to which bilinguals possess either two (theoretically) separately identifiable systems of language – from each of which they can draw, as circumstances warrant – or some more intertwined linguistic and, perhaps, cognitive duality. As Hamers and Blanc (2000) point out, we are far from having compelling empirical data here. There is a difficult circularity at work, one that confounds all scientific attempts to link the observable to the intangible: the ambiguous or unclear results of the relatively few studies of the non-verbal repertoires (for example) of bilinguals do not provide clear indications of likely underlying mechanisms; on the other hand, plausible variations in rational accounts of these mechanisms make the interpretation of subtle behavioral differences hard to assess. Whether we are interested in verbal communication, its paralinguistic accompaniments, or the broader reaches of personality traits generally, we find very little experimental evidence. It is interesting that, in their

massive study of bilingualism, Baker and Jones (1998) give only six pages (out of more than 750) to a section on personality.

Consider, for instance, the 'popular' (and, sometimes, academic) view that bilinguals must have some sort of split mentality – two individuals in one, as it were. Grosjean (1982) and others have reported that bilinguals sometimes feel, themselves, that language choice draws out, and draws upon, different personalities. But, as Baker and Jones (1998) and Hamers and Blanc (2000) note, the evidence here is anecdotal at best. Indeed, we could go a bit further, and point to the large logical and rational difficulties which some two-in-one arrangement would create. There is certainly, however, evidence that language choice may implicate different *aspects* of the personality: bilinguals responding to interviews and questionnaires are liable to give slightly different pictures of themselves, depending upon the language used. They may make different responses to objective or projective probes, responses may be more emotional through one variety (typically, but not inevitably, their maternal language – see Martinovich and Altarriba, chapter 12, this volume), they may more strongly affirm their sense of ethnic identity in one language than in another, and so on (see, for example, studies by Ervin, Guttfreund, Bond, and others, usefully summarized in Hamers and Blanc 2000). The fact that different social settings and variations in language–affect linkages lead to different patterns of self-presentation clearly does not imply separate personalities, although it does suggest an enhanced repertoire of possibility.

People belong to many groups, and all of them – all, at least, that have boundaries possessing some degree of permanence – have characteristics which mark their identity. This marking is, of course, more or less visible at the level of the individual member. The implication is that each of us may carry the tribal markings of many groups, that our 'group identity' is itself a mosaic rather than a monolith. Still, it is clear that, where language issues are central, the pivotal group is the ethnocultural community: overlaps of importance may occur because of simultaneous membership in gender, socioeconomic, educational, occupational, and many other categories, but the base here is an ethnic one.

The point at issue, then, is the significance of a bilingualism which links an individual to more than one ethnocultural community. How does it feel, we might ask, to have a foot in more than one camp? Is it this that could lead to that dubious conception of psychological duality? Or is such duality the origin of the expanded acuity and awareness that some have claimed for bilinguals? The short answers to these sorts of questions are all positive, or potentially positive, in a world where complicated patterns of social relations are made more intricate still by a very wide (theoretically infinite, in fact) range of linguistic capabilities. Of course, a great deal of bilingualism has very little emotional significance: the purely instrumental fluencies needed to conduct simple business transactions do not, after all, represent much of an excursion from one's ethnic base camp. This is probably a rather larger category than is often thought. For example, breadth of multiple fluencies does not, per se, imply emotional or psychological depth; it may, more simply, reflect the exigencies of a complicated public life. On the other hand, it is certainly possible to hold dual (or multiple) allegiances, involving different-

language groups, in the absence of personal bilingualism. The attachment felt by the English-speaking Irish or Welsh to a culture and an ancestry whose language they no longer possess is a psychologically real one, and demonstrates the continuing power of what is intangible and symbolic.

It is those many bilinguals and multilinguals whose competence is more deep-seated and whose abilities go beyond a prosaic instrumentality that comprise the category of interest when considering the relationship between bilingualism and identity. It is surely the case that the deeper the linguistic and cultural burrowing into another community the greater the impact upon identity. This in turn suggests that those whose bilingual competence is nurtured early will, other things being equal, have a firmer foot in the two (or more) camps. One camp will usually have psychological and emotional primacy. But there are some cases in which bilingual or multilingual capacities, linked to their several cultural bases, develop so early and/or so deeply that a primary allegiance is hard to discover. Steiner (1992), mentioned in the opening paragraph, is by his own account maternally and perfectly trilingual. Further, he has suggested that such 'primary' multilingualism is an integral state of affairs in itself. There has been virtually no research on the consequences for identity of multilingual tapestries so closely woven, but one imagines that there are subtleties here that go far beyond simple additive relationships. Since, as we have seen, it is difficult to define and assess perfectly and fully balanced bilingualism, even polyglots like Steiner might fall short under the most rigorous examination; nonetheless, more attention to deep-seated multiple fluencies is indicated.

As we move towards the bilingualism of more ordinary individuals, we move more obviously towards the idea of a unitary identity – woven from several strands, to be sure, but inevitably influenced by one language and culture more than by others. But, if we move from the Steiners (and Conrads, Nabokovs, Kunderas, Stoppards, and all the rest), whose literary power, and the ability to reflect in meaningful ways upon its multifaceted origin, are simply unavailable to most people, we must not imagine that we have moved away from enlarged identities per se. It is both the obligation and the fulfillment of intellectual life, after all, to express what less articulate souls may somehow feel or possess. When we consider that the language competences of most bilinguals are shallower than those of the Steiners of the world – broader, sometimes, but rarely as deep – and that neither the capacity nor the inclination to think much about identity is a widely distributed quantity, we realize again what important questions remain to be asked, what research, more psychological than linguistic, still needs to be undertaken. The intellectuals can look after themselves here: Steiner (1975) has written famously about the 'extraterritoriality' of multilingual writers; Ilan Stavans argues that monolingualism is a form of oppression (see Kellman 2000); others, from Goethe to Eliot, have argued over the ability – particularly the poet's ability – to be fully expressive beyond the *muttersprache*. We need more and fuller reports from less elevated quarters, too.

As it is, we rely largely upon inference to support the contention that it is the identity components, the symbols of the tribe, that energize languages beyond

their instrumental existences. One large and obvious example here is the powerful association between language and nationalism. Since the latter is, among other things, a pronounced and often mobilizing sense of groupness, it follows that any language component will be carefully delineated. And so, historically, it is. The language in which you do your shopping, and which (if you thought much about it) is also the variety in which your group's tradition is inscribed, can become a symbol of your oppressed state, a rallying-point, a banner under which to assemble the troops. Would people be so ready to sacrifice for something that was of purely mundane importance? We might regret that circumstances encourage us to put aside a familiar tool, and learn to use another – but we go to war over histories, not hammers.

Beyond the bridging (discussed above) that multilingualism necessitates, the contact of different languages and groups can also generate moat-building in the service of identity protection. An interesting form of this defensive strategy is linguistic prescriptivism or purism which, given free rein, would often lead to proscription. Concern about the 'contamination' of one language by another, about infiltration and borrowing and about the bullying of small languages by larger ones is an historically longstanding worry; the desire to keep one's language 'pure' has been strong, at least since the time of the decline of Latin in Europe, the rise of standardized vernaculars, the development of printing, and the growth of literacy. Linguistic standardization does, of course, require some prescriptivism, and the classic instruments here have been academies and dictionaries. The first institution devoted specifically to language was the *Accademia della crusca* of Florence, given royal blessing in 1572. The *Académie française* was established in 1634, and the *Real Academia Española* followed in 1713. Many more such bodies followed: in fact, language academies (or similar entities) are very much the rule.[3] Beyond the needs of standardization, however, we often find the initial prescriptivist impulses becoming more blatantly protective ones. At a purely linguistic level, this seems both unrealistic and undesirable. After all, languages have always borrowed from one another, and history reveals that attempts to erect walls between them generally turn out to be misguided and fruitless. It is the powerful link between language and identity that is crucial here, however – prescriptivism writ large is more a psychosocial matter than a linguistic one.

Returning to multilingual rubrics, the important associations of a particular language with a particular base camp are made clearer when we think about translation. This is an exercise driven by obvious necessity and, if language were not invested with emotion and association, its operation would be unremarkable. While employing them, we might applaud those whose expertise allows them the access denied the rest of us, but we would rarely be suspicious. And yet the old proverb says *traduttori, traditori*. We would hardly equate translation with treason unless we feared that 'hoarded dreams, patents of life are being taken across the frontier' (Steiner 1992: 244). And what are these 'patents of life,' if not the psychological collections of past and present that are felt to belong to ourselves alone? An informal Whorfianism tells us that every language interprets and presents the world in a somewhat different way, that the unique wellsprings

of group consciousness, traditions, beliefs, and values are intimately related to a given variety. Translation may thus mean the revealing of deep matters to others, and cannot be taken lightly. The translator, the one whose multilingual facility permits the straddling of boundaries, is a necessary quisling. But necessity is not invariably associated with comfort, and not even their employers care very much for traitors.

For monolingual majority-group members in their own 'mainstream' settings, the instrumentality and the symbolism of language are not split and, for most such individuals, the language–identity linkage is not problematic: indeed, it is seldom considered. Minority-group members, however, rarely have this luxury; for them, matters of language and culture are often more immediate. Now, while it is true that no simple equation exists between bilingualism and minority-group membership, it is also true that many bilinguals are found in the ranks of 'smaller' or threatened societies. The implication is that a link will often exist between bilingualism and a heightened awareness of, and concern for, identity. Specific linguistic manifestations include attempts at language maintenance or revival, the use of language in ethnic or nationalist struggles, the efforts to sustain at least some domains in the face of external influence, and so on. A more general consequence is that the position and the responses of minority groups focus attention on the possibility – and, in many instances, the inevitability – of a split between the communicative and the symbolic functions of language: you may have to live and work in a new language, a medium that is not the carrier of your culture or the vehicle of your literature.

In these sorts of settings we see, in fact, an extended value to the study of bilingualism and identity. First, the attitudes and actions of bilinguals in situations of risk and transition have a special poignancy and visibility: identities, like everything else, are thrown into sharper relief when threats are perceived. Second, these same attitudes and actions can galvanize others, and can remind a larger and often unreflective society that matters of language and identity are not relevant for those multilingual 'ethnics' and 'minorities' alone. The study of bilingualism and multilingualism, with all its many ramifications and technicalities, is clearly an intrinsically important sociolinguistic area, but it can also illuminate much larger patches of social life. The importance of being multilingual is, above all, social and psychological rather than linguistic. Beyond types, categories, methods, and processes is the essential animating tension of identity.

NOTES

2 Given present space limitations, I do not reproduce the tabular sketches that accompany the much fuller description of this typological exercise; these may be found in Edwards (2010a).
3 Conspicuous by its absence is any comparable English-language institution. There was certainly interest in one, dating at least from the time of the establishment of the continental bodies. The English requirements for language standardization were met by lexicographers – essentially one-man academies: Samuel Johnson in England and Noah Webster in America.

REFERENCES

Baker, C. (1988). *Key Issues in Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. and Jones, S. (1998). *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bates, D. (2010). Learn another language to help protect yourself from Alzheimer's disease. *Daily Mail*, October 13.

Bialystok, E. (2009). Bilingualism: The good, the bad and the indifferent. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 12: 3–11.

Bialystok, E. (2010). Global-local and trail-making tasks by monolingual and bilingual children. *Developmental Psychology* 46: 93–105.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt.

Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conan Doyle, A. (1966). A study in scarlet. In *The Complete Sherlock Holmes Long Stories*. London: John Murray.

Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (eds.) (2009). *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Edwards, J. (1995). *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin.

Edwards, J. (2004). Foundations of bilingualism. In T. Bhatia and W. Ritchie (eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. 7–31. Oxford: Blackwell.

Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, J. (2010a). *Minority Languages and Group Identity: Cases and Categories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Edwards, J. (2010b). The treason of translation? Bilingualism, linguistic borders and identity. In H. Tonkin and M. Frank (eds.), *The Translator as Mediator of Cultures*. 89–105. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Edwards, J. (2010c). *Language Diversity in the Classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, Rod (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Extra, G. and Gorter, D. (2008). The constellation of languages in Europe: An inclusive approach. In G. Extra and D. Gorter (eds.), *Multilingual Europe: Facts and Policies*. 3–60. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ferguson, C. (1962). The language factor in national development. In F. Rice (ed.), *Study of the Role of Second Languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*. 8–14. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Ferguson, C. (1966). National sociolinguistic profile formulas. In W. Bright (ed.), *Sociolinguistics*. 309–24. The Hague: Mouton.

Ferguson, C. (1991). Diglossia revisited. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 10: 214–34.

Gardner, R. (2010). *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Gardner, R. and Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R., and Taylor, D. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. 307–48. London: Academic Press.

Giles, H. and Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Goodenough, F. (1926). Racial differences in the intelligence of school childen. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 9: 388–97.

Grenoble, L. and Whaley, L. (1998). Toward a typology of language endangerment. In L. Grenoble and L. Whaley (eds), *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. 22–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Haarmann, H. (1986). *Language in Ethnicity: A View of Basic Ecological Relations*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hamers, J. and Blanc, M. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Haugen, E. (1972). The ecology of language. In A. Dil (ed.), *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen*, 325–39. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hazlitt, W. (1901). *Table-Talk: Essays on Men and Manners*. London: Oxford University Press.

Kellman, S. (2000). *The Translingual Imagination*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ladegaard, H. (2006). 'I like the Americans . . . but I certainly don't aim for an American accent': Language attitudes, vitality and foreign language learning in Denmark. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 27: 91–108.

Leopold, W. (1939–49). *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child* (4 volumes). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Moreno, S., Bialystok, E., Wodniecka, Z., and Alain, C. (2010). Conflict resolution in sentence processing by bilinguals. *Journal of Neurolinguistics* 23: 564–79.

Noels, K. and Clément, R. (1998). Language in education. In J. Edwards (ed.), *Language in Canada*. 102–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paulston, C., Haragos, S., Lifrieri, V., and Martelle, W. (2007). Some thoughts on extrinsic linguistic minorities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 28: 385–99.

Peal, E. and Lambert, W. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs* 76: 1–23.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English *y terminó en español*. *Linguistics* 18: 581–616.

Ronjat, J. (1913). *Le développement du langage observé chez un enfant bilingue*. Paris: Champion.

Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for Second-Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steiner, G. (1975). *Extraterritorial: Papers on Literature and the Language Revolution*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Steiner, G. (1992). *After Babel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stewart, W. (1962). An outline of linguistic typology for describing multilingualism. In F. Rice (ed.), *Study of the Role of Second Languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*. 15–25. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Stewart, W. (1968). A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism. In J. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. 531–45. The Hague: Mouton.

Tancock, L. (1954). Introduction to *Germinal* (Émile Zola). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Tsunoda, T. (2006). *Language Endangerment and Language Revitalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vail, P. (2006). Can a language of a million speakers be endangered? Language shift and apathy among Northern Khmer speakers in Thailand. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 178: 135–47.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

White, P. (1991). Geographical aspects of minority language situations in Italy. In C. Williams (ed.), *Linguistic Minorities, Society and Territory*. 44–65. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Yağmur, K. and Kroon, S. (2003). Ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions and language revitalisation in Bashkortostan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 24: 319–36.

Yağmur, K. and Kroon, S. (2006). Objective and subjective data on Altai and Kazakh ethnolinguistic vitality in the Russian Federation Republic of Altai. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 27: 241–58.

Zamenhof, L. (1887). *Международный языкъ предисловие и полный учебникъ (por Rusoj)*. [*International Language: Preface and Complete Textbook (for Russians).*] Warsaw: Kelter.