BILINGUAL NAVAJO: MIXED CODES, BILINGUALISM,
AND LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate

School of The Ohio State University

By

Charlotte C. Schaengold, M.A.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
2004

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Brian Joseph, Advisor

Professor Donald Winford

Professor Keith Johnson

Approved by

_____
Advisor
Linguistics Graduate Program

ABSTRACT

Many American Indian Languages today are spoken by fewer than one hundred people, yet Navajo is still spoken by over 100,000 people and has maintained regional as well as formal and informal dialects. However, the language is changing. While the Navajo population is gradually shifting from Navajo toward English, the "tip" in the shift has not yet occurred, and enormous efforts are being made in Navajoland to slow the language's decline. One symptom in this process of shift is the fact that many young people on the Reservation now speak a non-standard variety of Navajo called "Bilingual Navajo."

This non-standard variety of Navajo is the linguistic result of the contact between speakers of English and speakers of Navajo. Similar to Michif, as described by Bakker and Papen (1988, 1994, 1997) and Media Lengua, as described by Muysken (1994, 1997, 2000), Bilingual Navajo has the structure of an American Indian language with parts of its lexicon from a European language. "Bilingual mixed languages" are defined by Winford (2003) as languages created in a bilingual speech community with the grammar of one language and the lexicon of another. My intention is to place Bilingual Navajo into the historical and theoretical framework of the bilingual mixed language, and to explain how

this language can be used in the Navajo speech community to help maintain the Navajo language.

Many young people who have difficulty with Standard Navajo are quite fluent in this mixed variety. It may be heard more on the urban edges of the Navajo Nation than in the rural center. Although this is not the most favored variety of Navajo to be heard in the Navajo Nation today, the social evaluation of Bilingual Navajo is improving, and it can be seen it as a tool for maintaining the Navajo language.

DEDICATION

Diyin GOD bá
Éí nihookáá'góó naaldlooshii danilíinii yiláahgo nanihintin;
tsídii wót'áahdi naaldeehii biláahgo dahoniidzą́ą́go ádanihile'.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

VITA

April 4, 1957...Born- Boston, Massachusetts.

1976...Kleine Goethe-Sprachdiplom.

1982...B.A. German, University of Wisconsin.

1990-1992..Instructor, Navajo Community College.

1992-1994..Graduate teaching assistant, UNM.

1995...M.A. Linguistics, University of NM.

1995-2002..Graduate teaching assistant, OSU.

2001-present...Instructor at Miami University.

PUBLICATIONS

Research Publication

1. Schaengold, Charlotte. 2003. "The Emergence of Bilingual Navajo: English and Navajo Languages in Contact Regardless of Everyone's Best Intentions" from: <u>When Languages Collide</u>, edited by Joseph, DeStefano, Jacobs, and Lehiste. OSU Press. (Chapter 12, pages 235-254).

2. Schaengold, Charlotte Christ. 1999. "Doubling Verbs in Schwyzerdütsch" OSUWPL, OSU Department of Linguistics. (pages 89-95).

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Linguistics

Historical Linguistics and Language Change, Sociolinguistics, Contact Languages, Bilingual

Mixed Languages, Navajo, American Indian Languages, Language Endangerment,

Language Maintenance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices:

TABLE OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Many American Indian Languages today are spoken by fewer than one hundred

people, yet Navajo is still spoken by over 100,000 people and has maintained regional as

well as formal and informal dialects.   However, the language is changing. While the

Navajo population is gradually shifting from Navajo toward English, the "tip" in the shift

has not yet occurred, and enormous efforts are being made in Navajoland to slow the

language's decline. One symptom in this process of shift is the fact that many young

people on the Reservation now speak a non-standard variety of Navajo called "Bilingual

Navajo."

This non-standard variety of Navajo is the linguistic result of the contact between

speakers of English and speakers of Navajo. Similar to Michif, as described by Bakker and

Papen (1988, 1994, 1997) and Media Lengua, as described by Muysken (1994, 1997,

2000), Bilingual Navajo has the structure of an American Indian language with parts of its

lexicon from a European language. "Bilingual mixed languages" are defined by Winford

(2003) as languages created in a bilingual speech community with the grammar of one

language and the lexicon of another. My intention is to place Bilingual Navajo into the

historical and theoretical framework of the bilingual mixed language, and to explain how

this language can be used in the Navajo speech community to help maintain the Navajo

language. Therefore this is a study in the tradition of the sociology of language; it is not

purely a linguistic description or a quantitative analysis, but a dissertation in the subject of language maintenance and endangerment.

Although many linguists, educators, and language activists have already studied and written about language shift among the Navajos, among them Spolsky 1970, Fuller 1982, Fishman 1991, Platero and Holm 1992, and House 2002, I present data that show some maintenance in the midst of this shift, and show how the creation of a mixed code by fluent bilinguals may be used to halt the rapid loss of Navajo in the Navajo speech community. My goal in this dissertation is to discuss shift in Navajo as little as possible, and to concentrate instead on what kinds of languages are still being used today in the Navajo Nation, with a focus on the mixed code.

There has been some evidence of a mixed code since bilingualism with English became the norm, perhaps since the 1960's or 1970's, as the prevalent code switching behavior observed at that time among school children has now become conventionalized in a bilingual mixed language. The Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971 *Navajo Reading Study* mentions "interesting" uses of borrowed English verbs with a Navajo auxiliary verb; Canfield 1980 claims that mixed-verb usage data "show autonomous properties not found in Navajo or English [which] cannot be attributed to borrowing" (1980:219). The 1987 Young and Morgan Dictionary refers to the "distinct trend on the part of bilingual speakers to mix the languages...children and Navajo radio announcers, as well as bilingual speakers generally tend to insert words and phrases from English into their Navajo language discourse, especially if the person or audience to whom they are speaking is bilingual" (1987:7). A description of children's language in *The Journal of Navajo Education* 1989 calls the mixed code "Lexically Extended Navajo." The authors describe it as "a special style used by bilingual Navajo speakers...characterized by Navajo syntax, [with] some English words in addition to the Navajo lexicon." At that time they did not view it as a threat to or substitute for Standard Navajo, rather they claimed: "While it is possible that

2

LEN may be employed by some children who have not yet mastered the appropriate Navajo vocabulary to avoid the English words, we have significant evidence of its use by fluent bilingual speakers to convince us that this is a productive bilingual register" (Foster et al.1989:15). Brandt (1982) comments on the value of local radio for providing information regarding language change: "Radio programs in native languages provide a valuable source of information and also show the adaptation of items of English and Spanish origin to the linguistic structure" (1982:35). Radio announcers may refer to the mixed code as "Broadcast Navajo," distinguishing "newer" Navajo from the Standard code: "When you use the 'formal' Navajo with the big vocabulary, it takes about twice as long to say something than with the 'newer' Navajo" (Peterson 1997:217). The fact that the "big vocabulary" is an issue for radio announcers suggests that the Navajo language is indeed suffering attrition, at least in the lexicon. Navajo words describing newly-acquired Anglo items tend to be long and descriptive, a radio announcer may find it more time-efficient to utter an English term for a point in basketball rather than describing it in Navajo. Even an everyday word like 'chair' is represented by the Navajo descriptive term 'bik'i'dah'asdáhí' meaning 'the thing upon which one sits' (Foster et al.1989:16).

With a grammar of Navajo and a lexicon of an increasing number of English words, this language variety is on its way to full status as a bilingual mixed code, as exemplified by other mixtures of American Indian[1] and European languages, such as Media Lengua, Michif, and Mednyj Aleut. Bilingual mixed codes are described and defined by Thomason 1996, Myers-Scotton 2002, and Winford 2003 as codes arising in a bilingual speech community as mixtures of the two languages, with the components of each language, i.e. the grammar and the lexicon, preserved separate and intact. I place Bilingual Navajo into this historical and theoretical framework, and discuss and document its role in Navajo language maintenance. Although there has been some structural change involved in the formation of this bilingual mixed language, the grammar is basically Navajo rather than English. e.g.:

3

1. Everydayísh nániłtééh doo?   'will you bring him/her every day?'

   every day.Q. 2nd.sing.bring.3rd. fut.   (Foster et al. 1989:16)

2. Da' Roy bisister?   'do you mean Roy's sister?'

   Q.part. Roy 3rd.poss.sister   (Foster et al. 1989:16)

3. Nancy bich'į' show ánílééh!   'show it to Nancy!'

   Nancy 3rd.to show 2nd.make or prepare   (Canfield 1980:219)

4. Hait'éigo doo dust anáhół'įį da   'how come you never dust?'

   why.sub. neg. dust 2nd.iterative.make neg.   (Canfield 1980:219)

1. Overview

In order to place the current language situation into its historical context, the initial contact between Navajos and American English speakers is described. Next, I give brief descriptions of Navajo English and Standard Navajo, providing some background information about the input languages contributing to the mixed code. Bilingual Navajo is described to be the result of code switching phenomena among fluent bilinguals, and then analyzed in terms of structural change in Navajo. Other kinds of code switching data in the Navajo community are compared with the mixed code, and the results of a survey done at Diné College in Shiprock, New Mexico are analyzed to show the social evaluation of the mixed code in the community.

I discuss other situations of languages in contact, and describe social scenarios and theories about the kinds of social and linguistic outcomes that be expected from each kind of contact, with emphasis on the theories describing bilingual mixed codes. Structural changes in the bilingual mixed languages are analyzed, with particular emphasis on Media Lengua, Michif, and Bilingual Navajo. The discussion is then narrowed down to the linguistic results of bilingual language contact, especially in American Indian speech communities. This places Bilingual Navajo in its socio-historical and linguistic framework. The structure of other, better-known bilingual mixed codes, particularly Media Lengua and

Michif, are compared with Bilingual Navajo in terms of structure, history, and use in the community.

Another important issue in describing bilingual mixed codes is the conflict between purity and survival in a language. Often it seems that efforts at purism in a language in a minority situation may actually endanger the language more, rather than preserving it. The formation of a bilingual mixed code, while not preserving the most conservative variants available in a threatened language, may yet give it a better chance at survival than trying to maintain a puristic variety for all speakers.

All American Indian languages spoken in North America are endangered, though Navajo is one of the least endangered among them. I explain Fishman's and Dixon's scales for evaluating the degree of language endangerment, and provide analyses of their applicability to Navajo demographics and language maintenance. RLS (Reversing Language Shift) efforts are presented, as well as the opinions of several linguists about the morality and responsibility involved in language planning efforts of this kind. I conclude with hopeful comments about the future of the Navajo language.

1.a. Methods:

Thanks to support from the OSU Linguistics Department, I spent a month living with a Navajo family in Farmington, NM, for parts of the months of May and June, 2002. During that time I examined the mixed code exclusively; I talked to many Navajo speakers about Bilingual Navajo in particular and Navajo-English code switching and language shift in general, I also taped many hours of local Navajo radio (KNDN 960 AM), and administered a survey in Navajo Language and Culture classes at Diné College, with written permission from the Dean of Instruction and the chairman of the Center for Diné Studies.[2] I have used the data gathered during that month as well as impressions formed while living in Shiprock from 1989 to 1992 in developing my thesis and learning to understand the Navajo language situation. During the time I lived in the Navajo Nation I was involved with

the local community in several ways. I studied Navajo Language and culture at the tribal college, then called "Navajo Community College," and realized fairly soon that the language I was learning in class was not precisely the same as what was spoken outside of class. I also had the privilege to teach Linguistics for the Navajo Language Teacher's Certification Program during the Summers of 1991 and 1992. My students were all fluent Navajo speakers already working as teachers in local area schools; to be certified as Navajo Language teachers they were required to take four semesters of Navajo literacy, several Navajo pedagogy classes, and one each of Navajo History, Navajo Culture, Navajo Philosophy, and Linguistics. When we discussed Sociolinguistics and various related issues I brought up this "other" variety of Navajo; although we didn't analyze it in class, the teachers/students were familiar with the non-standard variety of their language. I was also involved in activities at the schools and several churches and participated in volunteer activities involving interaction with the community. I have remained in touch with the Diné Studies faculty at the college, both while living in Albuquerque, NM and from here in Cincinnati, and have continued to work with them at various times on language maintenance projects. I continued to consult native Navajo speakers back in New Mexico for corroboration of the data throughout the writing of this dissertation.

1.b. Presentation of the issues

When speakers from communities of different languages come into contact with each other, communication can only take place when one or both communities accommodate to the language of the other in some way. The field of contact linguistics describes kinds of contact between groups and the effects the contact has on the languages spoken. The most studied types of languages formed in contact are pidgins and creoles, however there is a third type of languages arising from "broken" or "interrupted" transmission: the bilingual mixed codes, which have been identified as "bilingual mixtures that (unlike pidgins and creoles) must have been created by bilinguals" (Thomason 1997:1). This type of language

6

is formed in bilingual speech communities; borrowing from one language to the other is prevalent, which affects the lexicon, and the fact that the speakers are bilingual may affect the grammar. That the internal grammar of a language is slightly different for monolingual and bilingual speakers of the same language has been demonstrated among Estonian-English bilinguals, and observed among bilingual speakers of English and Yiddish, Norwegian, and German (Lehiste 1988:15-16).

The creators of the code described are Navajos who are bilingual in Navajo and English, people who use it are said to be speaking "bilingual," and the language itself is thus called "Bilingual Navajo," though I have also heard it referred to as "Vernacular Navajo." The languages spoken in the Navajo Nation are Navajo, Navajo English, and Bilingual Navajo, and bilingual speakers may change from one to another according to situation and interlocutor. Although there are still monolingual speakers of Navajo in the Navajo Nation, there are also monolingual speakers of English, and bilingual speakers of different kinds. Not all speakers of Bilingual Navajo fully control Standard Navajo, and not all fully bilingual speakers of Navajo and English speak the bilingual code. A demographic table of types of speakers in the area follows:

Speaker Types
I. Navajo only
II. Navajo and English
III. Navajo, English, and Bilingual Navajo
IV. English and Bilingual Navajo
V. English only

Figure 1: Speaker Types

Code switching of the sort seen among Navajos which has produced the mixed language has been described by Winford as being closely associated with "the emergence of 'fossilized' mixed codes among bilinguals caught between two languages and their cultures" (2003:168). Foster et al. comment that speakers using this code "may serve the purpose of marking its speakers as people with a foot in both cultures, or as Navajos well-educated in the Anglo system" (!989:16). In this way this multilingual social situation is

7

not a neutral issue for the inhabitants of the Navajo Nation; the history of contact between English and Navajo speakers has affected the attitudes about each code in use. Therefore, it is a social as well as a linguistic matter.

Each language in use will be briefly described in terms of its structure; Bilingual Navajo will be explained more thoroughly in terms of history, structure, and use in society. This language can be defined as an "intertwined" bilingual code (Bakker 2000, Winford 2003), with lexicon from English embedded in a Navajo language grammatical frame. The bilingual mixed code was formed by fluent bilinguals borrowing elements of English into Standard Navajo; as the grammar of the Navajo bilingual speakers changed to accommodate their knowledge of English, the grammar of the "matrix language"[3] changed accordingly, and the grammar of Bilingual Navajo is slightly different from that of Standard Navajo. The structural changes are not extreme, however, and the grammar of Bilingual Navajo is certainly much closer to that of Standard Navajo than to that of English.

1.c. Origins of Bilingual Navajo

Bilingual Navajo apparently had its origins in the boarding school population of Navajo children in the early and mid-twentieth century, many of whom were sent to school against their will and often against the will of their parents, and housed in institutions where they were punished for speaking their native language. Some children actually lost their native language, many more used it secretly, filling in English words where their native vocabulary failed them. Back home those children could use this code to communicate with other boarding school students, where it became a solidarity code for bilingual Navajos. Thomason describes this as one of the defining characteristics of a bilingual mixed code: they are all "in-group languages, used within the community as a sign of solidarity and not understood by outsiders" (1997:6).

Navajo used to be characterized as one of those American Indian languages whose speakers didn't borrow words from other languages, but preferred to coin new ones of their

own (Young and Morgan 1987), and indeed there are readily available terms in Navajo for "Anglo" things like radio, computer, washing machine, etc. Now, however, English borrowings in the language are ubiquitous. In the century and a half since the first contact with the dominant culture of the "Bilagáana"[4] or "Americans," the enormous changes in the social system have had their effect on the Navajo language.

While there are relatively few Navajo children learning Navajo as their first language nowadays, Navajo is heard and spoken among Navajo adults at home and in public. Bilingual Navajo teenagers reported in a 1999 study that they use more Navajo with their siblings and adult family members as they get older (Lee and McLaughlin 2001:32). As Navajo is recognized as an "adult" language, and children desire to learn it, either to talk to adults or sound like adults themselves, the bilingual code plays a large role. Parents use Navajo to speak with other parents at the grocery store, adults speak of their prayer lives in Navajo at church on the weekends. If children do not really learn the Standard, Bilingual Navajo may eventually become the "adult" code in Navajoland. Completely giving up now on Navajo means non-communication with the grandmother and great-grandmother generation, and also means giving up on a distinctive linguistic means of contrastive self-identification. The social use determines if a language is being maintained or not; the best scenario for maintenance would be if young mothers all spoke Navajo to their children, and children continued to interact with their friends and relatives in Navajo. This ideal scenario does not reflect reality today, however. But as long as the adults in the community all still speak some variety of Navajo with each other, there is still language survival.

This complicated language situation has come about as the result of contact between the English-speaking and Navajo speech communities. In the perception of many Navajos the relationship between English and Navajo languages parallels the political relationship of conqueror and conquered. The language contact situation can thus be described for the most part as one of language conquest, rather than of peaceful coexistence. Neither the

contact bilingual variety of Navajo nor the Navajo-influenced variety of English spoken in the Navajo Nation has been highly valued and considered worthy of much study and description up to this time; selected aspects of this non-standard variety of English as well as the bilingual mixed English-Navajo code will be described here. Theoretical information regarding contact languages in general and the formation of bilingual mixed codes in particular is given, and "Bilingual Navajo" is placed into this theoretical and socio-historical context.

2. Background

The geographical location of the Navajo Nation is within the current boundaries of the United States, but many Navajos consider themselves to be a separate people oppressed by the dominant Anglo[5] culture and economy, as well as United States citizens. It is a community with a population of approximately 220,000 (Grimes 1996 *Ethnologue*) in the four-corners region of New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Colorado.

The Navajos themselves are relatively recent arrivals to the Southwest area of what is now the United States, having migrated from Alaska and Northwest Canada. They, along with the Apaches, are members of the Southern or Apachean branch of the Athabaskan language family, named for a river and lake of the same name in inland Western Canada (Powell 1991:128). There are also Northern Athabaskan languages, still spoken in inland areas of Western Canada and Alaska, and Pacific Athabaskan languages, only marginally still spoken in Northern California, Oregon, and Washington State (Mithun 1999:346-356). The archeological evidence for Navajos in the Southwest attests to their arrival as recently as in the late 1400's or early 1500's (Iverson 1981:3), though it is popularly believed they may have arrived earlier. The Navajos settled in the Southwest among various tribes of Pueblo Indians who speak languages mainly from the Kiowa-Tanoan, Uto-Aztecan, and Yuman language families (Brandt 1982:28). Initial contacts between Navajos and the

Pueblo Indians were followed by contact with Europeans, first with Spanish-speaking Mexicans, only much later followed by contact with English speakers.

<u>2.a. First contact</u>

The first contact between Navajos and English speaking people involving large numbers of Navajos occurred during the "Long Walk" in the 1860's, when the United States Army forcibly marched most of the remaining population of the conquered Navajo tribe to Fort Sumner, New Mexico, in the hope that Navajos could be converted to a mainstream agricultural lifestyle. The attempt failed, many Navajos died, and in 1868 they were sent back by the US government to approximately the same area from which they had come (Iverson 1981:10). After this first encounter, learning English was, understandably, not favored by most Navajos.

With the first Indian boarding schools in the 1880's came the first large-scale acquisition of English among the Navajo population. At first only lame children and orphans were sent to school, or children "over whom no one would weep in case something happened to them" (Iverson 1981:11), but as school attendance became compulsory by order of the United States Government after 1887, many Navajo children were taken from their parents and sent to schools far away from home (Pavlik 1990:89). From the early 1900's up until World War II, more boarding schools were built on and off the Reservation and children were sent away, though many families managed to hide their children from the authorities. At these schools speaking English was required and speaking Navajo was a punishable offense (Iverson 1981:16). "Boarding school Navajo" is popularly believed to be the original source of the bilingual code; this code was spoken on the sly by bilingual children at these schools, and spoken back at home among these same children, who didn't receive the typical kind of adult language feedback and input in their own language during most of the year, since they heard Standard Navajo only when they were home on vacation. Although it was the explicit policy of the boarding schools to force the children to only use

English, many students continued to speak Navajo with each other as much as possible (Ben Barney, quoted in House 2002:19).

Leap (1993) suggests that boarding school students returning home speaking English created "a distinctive shift in the language profile of their home communities" (1993:145). He also speaks of language change resulting from the boarding students' bilingualism: "For many Indian communities, there was probably a period when speakers constructed a foundation for English proficiency by integrating newly acquired English skills into the grammars of the languages-Indian or otherwise-that they already spoke" (1993:146). This integration was probably the basis for the formation of the bilingual mixed code, and the process by which the structure of Navajo is being changed.

During WWII many Navajo men served as soldiers in the US military services, and others served in a civilian capacity in the war effort (Holms, Holms, and Spolsky 1971:2). Defending the land from a common enemy brought English-speaking Americans and Navajos together; the Navajo code-talkers are perhaps the most famous examples of this mutual endeavor. At this time learning English became recognized as a valuable tool for finding gainful employment.

3. Shift from Navajo to English

At present the Navajo speech community is undergoing language shift: while most Navajos over 60 years of age are monolingual in Navajo, many school-aged children are considered by the schools to be monolingual in English (Holm and Platero 1992-1993). In this population there are monolingual speakers of both Navajo and the Navajo variety of English as well as the majority of adults who are bilingual, more or less fluent in both codes. Many of these bilinguals are also speakers of the intermediate bilingual mixed language. The English components of "Bilingual Navajo" are so thoroughly nativized that monolingual English speakers cannot tell the difference between the mixed or "bilingual" code and Standard Navajo on the other end of the language shift, elderly monolingual

12

Navajos cannot really understand this non-standard version of Navajo, either, and hear only the English.[6] "If you keep your words, you can imagine that you have kept your language; if you replace all your words and keep your grammar intact, you cannot imagine that you have kept your language" (Thomason 2001:208).

According to Kroskrity (1982) theirs is apparently a fairly typical assessment of the language situation; he found similar analyses among Arizona Tewa speakers commenting on a mixture of Tewa and English spoken by the young people in that speech community: "A direct examination of the contact between English and Arizona Tewa has proven instructive [in regard to at least three issues]. First, it clearly demonstrates the differences between the folk and analytical perspectives as they pertain to the salience of linguistic phenomena. In contrast to linguists, who tend to equate a language with its grammar, non-linguist members of speech communities appear to regard a language as cosubstantial with its lexicon" (1982:58).

In 1949 fewer than half of all Navajo children had been to school, but by 1955 almost 90% of Navajo children were attending school. In 1969 a study was initiated by Bernard Spolsky to find out how many Navajo children knew some English when they started school. He found that 25% of the children were being spoken to in English by their parents. At that time it was estimated that two-thirds of the "parent-aged" population (between 20 and 40 years of age) had had some schooling in English; the group of children studied in 1969 was the first generation of children in school whose parents had also gone to school. He correlated going to school with learning English, and learning English with giving up on Navajo (Spolsky 1970). In 1971, however, it was noted that over 2/3 of six-year-olds came to school unable to do first grade work in English (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:3). Later studies have shown that those who are fluent in their tribal language also perform better, rather than worse, in English (Leap 1981:229), and Spolsky's pessimistic predictions about giving up on Navajo have not proven accurate.

Many American Indian Languages today are spoken by fewer than one hundred people (Krauss 1992:5), yet the Navajo language is still spoken by almost 150,000 people (Grimes 1996) and has been maintained with a variety of regional as well as formal and informal dialects. Most of the 7,616 monolingual speakers of Navajo mentioned in the *Ethnologue* (Grimes 1996) are elderly, though 124 monolingual Navajo Head Start children were identified in a 1992 preschool study (Platero 2001:95). Each succeeding generation of Navajos is exposed to more English than the one before.

While the bilingual Navajo population is gradually shifting toward English, the "tip" in the shift has not yet occurred, and enormous efforts are being made in the Navajo Nation to slow the language's decline. One symptom in this process of shift is the fact that many young people on the Reservation now speak the non-standard variety of Navajo called "Bilingual Navajo."

The non-standard variety of Navajo is spoken according to its own rules of grammar, though those rules differ from standard English or Navajo rules of grammar. Many young people who have difficulty with Standard Navajo are quite fluent in this variety. At this point in time there are still many Bilingual Navajo speakers, as well as many bilingual speakers of both English and Navajo. Although not all fluent speakers of Navajo and English use the bilingual language, there are speakers who control all three codes: English, Navajo, and Bilingual Navajo. The mixed code seems to be spoken more by the young people than by the elderly, and in less formal situations more than in formal ones. It may be heard more on the urban edges of the Reservation than in the rural center, and on local Navajo radio more than on the official Navajo Nation radio station.

According to some studies by educators, the Navajo population has already almost shifted to English in this generation of children; there are, however, a few communities in which all the families are dedicated to preserving the culture and language, and their children all speak Navajo. A 1992 study of children in Head Start programs and kindergartens

found that relatively few children spoke Navajo fluently (Holm and Platero, 1992-1993). They did find that 87% of five-year olds possessed at least a passive knowledge of Navajo, and fifty-two percent spoke Navajo, but only 31% were actually fluent speakers of the language (Francis 1996/1997:35).

The language situation described by these researchers may be too pessimistic, though; the shift may not have progressed as far as the study would claim. Although they are rare, there are some Head Start programs in which all the children speak Navajo. The results of this study should also not be taken to imply that the Navajo children all speak Standard English; this is not found to be true when the same children attend public school and are tested for English skills one or two years later. For example, in 1992 only 30% of first-graders in the Shiprock, NM school system had passed the minimum English proficiency skill level testing for first grade, which was the highest percentage of passing students ever recorded in the school system. Leap asserts that, "the fact that an Indian student has English fluency does not guarantee the student's having English proficiency (Leap 1982:103). If a fluent speaker of English does not demonstrate "proficiency," it must be surmised that the student is speaking something other than Standard English.

It may be that the Navajo language testers in the Holm and Platero 1992-1993 preschool study were perhaps harsh in their evaluation of the children's Navajo, and over-generous in their evaluation of the children's English. As fluent Navajo speakers themselves, the testers may have compared the children's command of Navajo with their own proficiency, rather than with a set of norms acceptable for bilingual children of kindergarten age; on the other hand, they judged the children's command of English perhaps too optimistically. The students must be fluent in some code, since they all speak and play with each other; it may be that the Head Start children tested spoke Bilingual Navajo, which was not evaluated as "good" Navajo by the Navajo teachers, but is also not recognized as any kind of English by standard public school norms. At one time such

children might have been labeled "semilingual" since they seemed to be fluent in neither code; however this is a concept now considered invalid (Slate 2001:402). Foster et al. point out in their description of Navajo children's language that: "children have much more complex linguistics systems than can be seen from any narrow observational tool" (1989:17). The language situation is shifting, but it may be that the speakers of Navajo are shifting not so much towards English as to the bilingual code. The favorable finding that 87% of Navajo five-year-olds have a passive knowledge of Navajo means that a complete shift towards English has not yet occurred.

As members of a speech community continue to communicate in a code understandable only to them, it must be acknowledged that such a code exists, and is worthy of linguistic description. Although Bilingual Navajo is definitely a different code from that which the Navajo grandparent generation and great-grandparent generation still speak, it cannot be said to be a variety of English, or any language other than Navajo. By describing the code and acknowledging it as a valid language, support is added to the enormous efforts aimed at maintaining Navajo. Although the formation of the bilingual code is a symptom of shift, the fact that the bilingual code is being maintained means that the shift is not progressing as rapidly as it might. While this code does not represent the "Standard" or "Finest" Navajo, it is a viable means of Navajo communication and worthy of support and encouragement. It is also structurally much more similar to Navajo than to English, and speakers of this code often continue to understand Standard Navajo.

4. Language maintenance

Although there are some few notable programs in the school systems in which the children must learn speaking, reading, and writing in Navajo first, before doing any schoolwork in English, e.g.: the Rough Rock Demonstration School and the Rock Point School, both in rural AZ (Hale 2001:199-200), and the Fort Defiance Immersion Program (Arviso and Holm 2001), for almost all Navajo children English is the primary school

language. Many parents seem to support this agenda; it was only one generation ago that speaking Navajo was seen as an obstacle to any sort of formal education and material success. Parental choice is sometimes seen as a weakness for the Navajo Language programs in schools (Arviso and Holm 2001:212). According to Arviso and Holm, making the availability of Navajo language instruction in the schools optional denies the children the opportunity to learn the language later: "By the time they come to want to talk Navajo it will be -for most of them- too late" (2001:212). As much as Navajo parents desire for their children to maintain the ancestral language, their wish for them to be able to succeed in school and support themselves financially is understandably seen as even more important at this time.

The original intent of Navajo-medium curricula in the schools was to provide mother-tongue education in the primary grades, however now that many children learn English as their mother-tongue, the role that Navajo education plays in the schools has changed. The school curriculum must now present a method of teaching the parents' first language to the children as a second language. This type of switch, of primary language to secondary, and secondary language to primary, is viewed by Sasse as the first sign that a language is threatened, yet he does not see the situation as irreversible, and cites examples of languages which have reached this point undergo revitalization under the proper social environments (Sasse 1992:21).

Some Navajo families seem to maintain Navajo cultural norms without fluent use of the Navajo language. The proper respect for the elderly and clan relationships with other Navajos can apparently be maintained without the Navajo language itself. Although there are notable exceptions, in general, Navajo parents also have much less of a sense of the urgency of the language's survival situation than do the linguists involved in Navajo language maintenance. There is an opinion expressed by some Navajos that the Navajo language will survive, regardless of whether they continue to speak it or not. Although complacency most

certainly plays a role in the formation of this attitude, and many people would rather leave Navajo language maintenance to someone else, so they can teach English to their own children, there is also somehow a prevailing opinion that "the language will take care of itself" (House 2002:53).

Within the Navajo school systems, however, there are many teachers zealously trying to halt the shift of Navajo to English. Navajo language activists have worked toward having Navajo Language programs instituted in all public schools in the Navajo Nation, and at least in Arizona they have succeeded; Navajo language instruction was made available in all of grades 1 - 12 by 2000 (Arviso and Holm 2001:213). A tribal mandate of 1982 states that Navajo language instruction would be given to all children of all ages on the Navajo Nation, however the necessary funding for those programs was not made available to the schools (Slate 2001:392). The tribal college (Diné College of Shiprock, NM and Tsaile, AZ) requires students to take classes in the language and culture in order to graduate. The most prestigious tribal scholarships given to high school graduates, the "Manuelito Scholarships" now require students to have taken at least two semesters of high school Navajo and two semesters of Navajo government and culture to be eligible (Arviso and Holm 2001:214). Although the record of success stories of maintenance among American Indian languages is dismal, maintenance of Navajo may yet be possible, as it is still spoken in the community and there are increasing programs at all levels supporting it (see further discussion in Chapter 8).

Chapter 1: Endnotes

[1] The descendants of the original inhabitants of this continent have been called "Indigenous Americans," "Native Americans," "First Americans," and other less appropriate names. I am relying here on the Navajo Nation norm and using the word "Indians."

[22] Permission letters as well as IRB Protocol information included with survey, in Appendix B.

[3] Myers-Scotton 1993. A "matrix language" is the one into which words are transferred; the "embedded language" is the language from which the words are taken.

[4] from Spanish "(A)mericano."

[5] "Anglo" here refers to the English-speaking non-Indian, non-Hispanic population, and what are seen as the worst values associated with it, such as materialism, greed for power, and disregard for family and friends.

[6] "Standard Navajo" is Navajo the way the elderly speak the language. Although geographically-based differences in dialect are accepted by all, only the most conservative variety available is considered "good" Navajo.

CHAPTER 2

INPUT LANGUAGES

1. Description of Standard Navajo

        While there are volumes of descriptive work on the Navajo language, the bare

minimum of a very brief description of Navajo is in order here so the comparisons with

 Bilingual Navajo can be understood in context. Navajo is structured quite differently from

 English;[1] just a few structural features are given here for background.

         Navajo is a member of the Southern or Apachean branch of the Athabaskan

language family, which is mostly represented by languages spoken in Canada and Alaska,

but also spoken by a few groups in the Pacific Northwest (see chapter 1). Like many other

American Indian languages, Navajo is classified as a "polysynthetic" language, meaning

that many meaningful units are compounded together to form a single word. Although

there is only minimal noun incorporation in Navajo, mostly involving culturally significant

nouns such as fire and water, many other elements can be incorporated inside the "verb-

word," including the subject and object of the verb, along with the aspect, mode, direction,

transitivity, etc.

        Navajo has noun and verb word classes, as well as postpositions and "particles"

which include adverbials, pronouns of various kinds, interrogatives, demonstrative, locative,

and negation markers, interjections, and enclitics signifying subordination and relativization,

and others which encode nominalization and adverbialization. Most descriptors

corresponding to English adjectives are described as neuter verbs, which are inflected for

person and number but neither transitivity nor aspect. There is also a very small separate

class of adjectival suffixes which may be attached to nouns with meaning corresponding to

the class of adjectives in English.

<u>1.a.. Phonology</u>

Navajo has sets of unaspirated, aspirated, and ejective consonants in the alveolar and

velar regions, and an unaspirated bilabial stop. There are voiced and voiceless alveolar and

palatal fricatives, with corresponding voiced, voiceless, and ejective affricates. In addition to

the aspirated, unaspirated and ejective velar consonants, there are also a labialized aspirated

and a palatalized unaspirated velar stop. There are a voiced lateral liquid and a voiceless

lateral fricative, and aspirated, unaspirated, and ejective laterally-released alveolar stops,

accounted for here for simplicity's sake as affricates. There are bilabial and alveolar nasals.

There are a voiceless [h] and voiceless [hw] as well as a phonemic glottal stop, written in

standard orthography as an apostrophe ['].

<u>Navajo Consonant Inventory (standard orthography from Young and Morgan 1987 pg. xiii)</u>

stops	**bilabial**	**alveolar**	**velar**	
voiceless				
unaspirated	b	d	g, gw	
aspirated		t	k, kw	
glottalized		t'	k'	'
fricatives				
voiced		z, zh	gh(y), gh(w),	
voiceless	hw	s, sh		h
laterals				
voiced liquid		l		
voiceless fricative		ł		
nasals				
voiced	m	n		
affricates				
voiceless				
unaspirated		dz, j, dl		
aspirated		ts, ch, tł		
glottalized		ts', ch', tł'		

Figure 2: Navajo Consonant Inventory

"X" is used in writing instead of "h" after "s" and "h" to avoid confusion with the "sh" digraph. Phonologically the stop consonants seem to contrast more along the lines of "means of articulation" than by place of articulation (McDonough 1996:ppc).

Young and Morgan Standard Orthography compared to IPA (differences in bold)

stops b, d, g   b, d, g
            t, k   t, k
            t', k'   t', k'

fricatives
voiced   z, **zh, gh**   z, **z, '**
voiceless **hw** s, **sh**   **h·, s,   s**

laterals
voiced liquid   l   l
voiceless fricative   ł   ł

nasals
bilabial   m   m
alveolar   n   n

affricates
(voiceless)
unaspirated   dz, **j**, dl dz, **d z,** dl
aspirated   **ts, ch**, tł   **c,   c,.** tł
glottalized   **ts', ch'**, tł'   **c', c'**, tł'

Figure 3: IPA Consonant Chart

Navajo vowels contrast in length and pitch as well as position in the mouth, and correspond approximately with English i, e, o, and a. The vowels are written below in the standard orthography, which corresponds to the IPA system except for the following: length is indicated by a doubled vowel, and high tone is indicated with an acute accent, e.g.: high-tone nasalized [i] is written: į́. In addition to the diphthongs listed below, there are also vowel clusters resulting from contraction. They are represented by the same characters as the diphthongs, in addition there are: ao, aoo, ąi, and ąii (Y.& M.1987:xii).

Navajo Vowel Inventory (Young and Morgan 1987:xii)

oral

short	i, e	a	o
long	ii, ee	aa	oo

nasal

short	į, ę	ą	ǫ
long	įį, ęę	ąą	ǫǫ

diphthongs

short	ei	ai	oi
long	eii	aii	oii

Figure 4: Navajo Vowel Inventory

1.b. Morphology

Prefixes and suffixes on the verb have the functions of describing theme, mode, person, etc., as noted above. Within the verb-word there can be found both derivational and inflectional morphemes. Attached to the end of the verb-word may be directional, locational, nominalizing, and subordinating enclitics. The verb in Navajo is, in other words, morphologically very complicated. The Navajo noun, in contrast, is fairly simple. Adverbs and "particles" are also fairly simple in form, and the postpositions have only the postpositional stem morpheme and the personal pronoun morpheme.

1.b.i. Nouns

Nouns are not generally marked for number, the few exceptions are plural markers on kinship terms and words for other human beings, e.g.:

1.a. hooghan   'home'   hooghan   'homes'

   b. béégashii   'cow'   béégashii   'cows'

   c. shinálí   'my paternal grandparent'   shinálí**ké**   'my pat.

grandparents'

   d. ashkii   'boy'   ashii**ké**   'boys'

Nouns can be inflected for possession with a personal pronoun prefix. Some nouns are obligatorily possessed; most of these are kinship terms for relatives and terms for body parts, e.g.:

2. non-obligatory possession:

a.	chidí	'car'		**shi**chidí	'my car'
b.	naaltsoos	'book'		**ni**naaltsoos	'your book'

obligatory possession:

c.	**shi**gaan	'my arm'		**shi**lah	'my opposite-sex sibling'
d.	**ni**jaa'	'your ear'		**ni**má	'your mother'

Most nouns are relatively simple in form, though there are some phonological length and voicing alternations in some nouns when they are in a possessed form, e.g.:

3.a.	sis	'belt'		ni**ziiz**	'your belt'
b.	béésh	'knife'		bi**béézh**	'his belt'
c.	łį́į́'	'horse(s)'		shi**łį́į́'**	'my horse(s)'

Thus, prefixes on the Navajo noun indicate possession and the suffixed plural marker is found only on terms for humans and relatives, as above. Adjectival suffixes on the noun can indicate size or quantity; e.g.:

4.a.	naaltsoos	'book'	naaltsoos**tsoh**	'big book'	
b.	dibé	'sheep'	dibé**łání**	'many sheep'	
c.	chidí**yázhí**	'little car'	bichidí**yázhí'**	'his little car(s)'	
d.	ashkii**yázhí**	'little boy'	ashiiké**yázhí**	'little boys'	

Enclitics on the noun can indicate direction or location; these may also indicate direction or location in time as well as in space, e.g.:

5.a.	hooghan '	home'	hooghan**góó** déyá	'I'm going home'	
b.	Tségháhoodzání	'Window Rock'	Tségháhoodzání**dóó** naashá	'I come from W.R.'	

c. ałní'ní'á   'noon'   ałní'ní'áa-**gi** iishą́   'I eat at about

 noon'

d. tseebíí bik'ida'askę́ę́z   'eight o'clock'   tseebíí bik'ida'askę́ę́z**góó** deesháál

   eight   3rd.on it.up.3rd.points   'I'll leave from 8 o'clock on'

<u>1.b.ii. Postpositions</u>

        Postpositions occur after the noun and mark the relationship between the argument

and the noun. The initial morpheme of the postposition refers to the object the postposition

follows, and the final morpheme describes the meaning of the word. In the first example

sentence **bi-** is the 3rd person morpheme, -**yi'** means 'in,' e.g.:

6.a.   t'iis   **biyi**'   siké   'the two of them are sitting **in** a tree'

          tree   3rd.in   3rd.dual sit

   b.   chidí **bikáá**   sézį́   'I am standing **on top of** the car'

          car   3rd.on top 1st.sg.sit

   c.   **shikáá**   naniná   'you are **ahead of** (older than) me'

          1st.on top   2nd.walk

   d.   **nikáá**   naashá   '   I am **ahead of** (older than) you'

          2nd.on top   1st.walk

<u>1.b.iii. Verbs</u>

        The Navajo verb is the most important and most complicated part of every Navajo

sentence. Because the subject and object person pronouns are incorporated within the verb-

word, one verb can equal an entire Navajo sentence, and includes the noun phrase and the

verb phrase. The simplest type is the neuter verb, which changes form inflectionally only

for person and number. These verbs often correspond in meaning to English adjectives,

such as color, shape, size, or other property. e.g. the verb "łikan," 'it is sweet' is

25

conjugated as follows ('I am sweet, you are sweet, he is sweet, that person is sweet, we two
are sweet,' etc.):

7.   sing.   dual   plural

	sing.	dual	plural
1st.	łinishkan	łiniikan	daniilkan
2nd.	łiníkan	łinohkan	danohłkan
3rd.	łikan	łikan	daalkan
4th.	jilkan	jilkan	dajilkan

nízhóní   'you are pretty'

dootł'izh   'it is blue'

daaltso   'they are yellow

Figure 5: Neuter Verb Chart

Other Navajo verbs include morphemes indicating the stem, formed from the root
meaning of the verb, the classifier or type of verb, the incorporated personal subject
pronoun, aspect markers, and optionally a deictic subject pronoun, a direct object pronoun, a
distributive plural marker, reflexive morpheme, adverbial theme morpheme, or object of
postposition pronoun, e.g.:

8.a.   aha-ni-bízh-ní-sh-kaad   'I throw them together hurriedly' (e.g.: clothes)

recip.3rd.obj..throw.1st.move together

(lit. together. them. throw. I move)

   b.   łíshécháázh   'I took unfair advantage of him' (Y&M:42, 43)

         perf.1st.sg.take unfair advantage

   c.   bínabídíłkid   'ask him about it!'

         3rd.theme.3rd.2nd.sg.ask

(lit. him about it you ask-imperative is implied in use of 2nd. person)

   d.   nahodiit'aash   'we two scrounge for food' (Y&M 1987:540)

         around in a circle.1st.dual.walk

(lit.small steps forward and sideways we two go)

Young analyzes the Navajo verb into up to 10 morphemes in a template, with position 10 representing the stem of the verb, position 9 one of four classifiers (d, l, ł, and ø), position 8 the personal pronoun, unmarked in 3rd person. Position 7 is the slot for the perfective marker, 6 the aspect and mode positions, 5 the deictic pronoun position, 4 is the spot for the (possible) incorporated object, 3 is the position for the distributive plural, 2 is the position for the iterative aspect, and position 1 may hold an adverbial (Young and Morgan 1987). e.g.:

9. ałnánáshdá   'I commute (back and forth)'

  ał-   ná-   ná-   sh-   dá

  (0)recip.(Ib)repetition(II)iterative mode (8)1st.(10)sg.go

(lit. back and forth, repeatedly I go)

note: Not all positions in the template are filled in all verbs. The classifier is not overt in the first person imperfective, so position 9 is not indicated. Position 7 is ø imperfective, also not overt. Position 6 is "adverbial thematic," also not filled in this verb, position 5, the deictic pronoun, is also not filled, position 4 would be a direct object pronoun, 3 the distributive plural marker. e.g.: from above (8.a.):

aha-ni-bízh-ní-sh-kaad   'I throw them together hurriedly' (e.g.: clothes)

1b   4-5   6 7   10

(lit. together. them. throw. I move)

<u>1.c. Syntax</u>

        Syntax in Navajo is for the most part encoded in the verb morphology; as the syntactic relations between arguments are encoded in the verb morphemes, word order is not absolutely needed to describe the relationship between parts of the sentences. The sentence in Navajo has traditionally been described in terms of SOV word order, alternating with OSV in the case of only one overt argument and with the constraints of focus and an "animacy hierarchy" determining the order of the arguments in a sentence. e.g.:

10.a.   ashkii dzaanééz bishhash   the mule bit the boy

         boy   mule   3rd.obj.3rd.perf.bite

(lit. as for the boy, the mule bit him OSV)

  b.   ashkii dzaanééz yishhash   the boy bit the mule

         boy   mule   3rd.perf.bite

(lit. the boy the mule bit SOV)   (a. and b. from Y&M 1987:205a)

* c.   dzaanééz ashkii yishhash   ??? (no interpretation)

         mule   boy   3rd.perf.bite

(lit. the mule the boy bit SOV)

        A human being cannot be the object of a verb with a non-human subject in the

Navajo sentence, for example the English sentence, "Lightning killed the man" may not

start with the word 'lightning' in Navajo, but must start with 'the man' according to the

animacy hierarchy. The subject and object must be inverted not only when the subject is an

animal, but also when the subject is inanimate and the object is animate, e.g.: (Y&M

1987:205a)

11. ashkii k'asdą́ą́'   tó   biisxį́   'water almost killed the boy'

     boy   almost   water 3rd-obj-perf-ø-kill

        The yi/bi alternation is available for this subject-object inversion, with both yi- and

bi- prefixes indicating 3rd person, the bi- prefix indicating the "inverted" reference, so that

the second argument becomes the grammatical subject. In this way, the argument is

designated as the subject by the verb form, rather than by its order in the sentence. The

order of the subject and object in the following two sentences show two equally non-human

subjects for illustration. In example 12.a. the "yi-" prefix on the verb "yiztał" indicates

that "łį́į́'" (the horse) is the subject of the sentence, in example 12.b. the "bi-" prefix on

the verb "biztał" indicates that "télii" (the donkey) is the subject. e.g.:

28

12.a.   Łį́į́'   télii   yiztał   'the horse kicked the donkey'

   horse   donkey   3rd.perf.kick

   b.   Łį́į́'   télii   biztał   'the donkey kicked the horse.

   horse   donkey   3rd.perf.kick

Many example sentences in Navajo grammars do indeed demonstrate SOV word order, these are often translated from typical English SVO sentences, in which the subject occurs first. A Navajo speaker will interpret the English message automatically with the subject as not only the grammatical subject, but also as the semantic topic of the sentence, and translate it accordingly. In other words, there is a norm of use for the SOV structure, in which in a sentence with no semantic constraints and two overt arguments the subject comes first, followed by the object and the verb. It is fairly likely that in this case the first element is also the subject. The norm of interpretation naturally follows thus: the first element in the sentence will be "automatically" interpreted as the focus or theme of the sentence unless otherwise indicated.

Because of semantic constraints on what can be a topic, as discussed above, there are rules exchanging the first NP with the second in order; the strategy of "focus" may also explain the fact that expressions like "almost" and "not very well" can also occur first in a sentence, without the sentences being marked as the equivalent sentences would be in English (marked with *), e.g.:

13.a.   **k'asdą́ą́'** chidí nizhóní   léi' naháłnii.   'I almost bought that pretty car'

   almost   car   3rd.pretty   that buy.1st.perf.buy   (Goosen 1967:216)

*   'almost I bought that pretty car'

   b.   **doo hózhǫ́**   diists'a'   da.   'I don't understand it very well'

   not well   1st.understand it.   not

*   'not well I understand it'

29

Barss et.al. (1984) discuss focus and movement in terms of logical form in Navajo, illustrating focus and negative focus particles as well as movement to the front of the sentence for the topic of the sentence (1984:330) e.g.:

14. a   Kinłánígóó   ííyáa-go   yishcha   'I'm crying because he went to Flagstaff'

Flagstaff-toward 3rd.perf.go-sub.1st.cry

  b.   Ashkii at'ééd yiyiiłtsą́   'the boy saw the girl'

      boy   girl   3rd.perf.see

  c.   At'ééd ashkii biiłtsą́   'the boy saw the girl'

      girl   boy   3rd.obj.3rd.perf.see

  d.   Tł'éédą́ą́' ashkii ałhą́ą́'-ą́ą yádoołtih. 'the boy who was snoring last night will

          night.past   boy   3rd.snore-rel. 3rd.future.speak

speak'

Thus, the relationships between overt arguments in Navajo may be identified in the complex verb morphology. In addition, there are semantic constraints on the relative order of the overt arguments. For this reason word order in the Navajo sentence may be used to express focus or topicalization instead of grammatical relations. "Syntax" is realized in the verb morphology, rather than in the order of the words in a sentence, which may encode other information instead.

1.d. Pragmatics, ways of speaking

Navajo ways of speaking are very different from those of mainstream American English. It is generally more polite to speak softly, and to refer to human beings only indirectly. More on Navajo ways of speaking will be discussed in the following section describing Navajo English.

2. Description of Navajo English

The variety of English spoken on the Reservation is a non-standard variety; the kinds of differences found between that variety and Standard American English can be attributed mainly to Navajo-English contact; although there are some non-standard features in Navajo English shared with other non-standard American English dialects, the particularly identifiable characteristics can be explained best as substrate interference from Navajo. Many of the features found in Navajo English are found in all second-language learning varieties of English, but they may also be found on the Navajo Reservation among children who don't speak Navajo, for whom English is their first language. "This condition cannot be viewed merely as an interference phenomenon. Standard English details are not being "predictably" altered in these codes, but are being replaced, in whole or significant part, by Indian-language based phonological constraints. Such is found to be the case *whether or not* the individual speaker is fluent in the ancestral language of that community" (Leap 1982:105).

American Indian English (AmIE) is perhaps the latest one of the non-standard varieties of English to be recognized, though it has a history as long as the English settlement of the New World (Flanigan 1985:217). This code serves as an identity marker for being Indian, but not specifically for being Navajo. Though the idea is not addressed in much of the literature, the reason for the preservation of Indian English through time bears investigating. Speakers of Indian English may also be proficient in Standard English, and switch back and forth according to setting and addressee (Leap 1993:4). Since many Indians learned English in forced learning situations, in which their mouths were washed out with soap when they spoke their own language, speaking it "like an Anglo" has not often been seen as a goal worth striving for. Indians continue to use Indian English to establish solidarity with other Indians, not because they are unable to acquire the standard code. The "covert prestige" factor, which indicates that identification with the minority population is valued more highly than being associated with the positive attributes of the

dominant majority, cannot be overlooked. Leap describes speaking Indian English as a "means of talking to the outside world (literally) in Indian terms" (Leap 1982:101).

However, Indian English (AmIE) is definitely English, not a variety of an Indian language. While the speakers who first formed these codes must have been bilingual, structurally the non-standard English varieties resemble other second-language varieties of English; speaking these varieties now implies no knowledge of any language other than English.

The Navajo English code (NavE) is seen by Navajo and Anglo educators alike as evidence of imperfect learning on the part of the students, though there is some tacit acceptance among Navajos of this "solidarity code" as a legitimate means of communication. Teenagers in particular may use this code to establish their identity as Indians. It is made fun of by non-Navajos and Navajos alike, and by Navajo young people living near reservations (S., B. families, personal communication).[2]

The history of the formation of Indian English may be seen as an addition to an American Indian language rather than a problematic acquisition of English: Leap sees this variety of English formed by "the addition of English lexical synonyms to complement one's existing, or developing Indian language facility" (Leap 1982:101). Leap writes, "The presence of AmIE in the United States Southwest can be attributed, structurally, to the application of Indian-languages' grammatical constraints to English-language sentence-formation tasks, and historically to the rules of bilingual etiquette developed and still maintained within the speakers' tribal speech community" (Leap 1982:112).

Most Non-Indians in the Southwest learn neither the Navajo language nor the more subtle ethnological rules for behavior and language use among Navajos in the Southwest, which are carried over into NavE. Anglos may understand the superficial message of an utterance in NavE without catching the more subtle culturally encoded meaning. Navajos accommodate as much as necessary to participate in the aspects of modern Standard

American society they find desirable, and no more. A description of Navajo English follows, with examples of features in phonology, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics.

2.a. Phonology

In this generation English is learned as the first language by most children; until this generation, though, English has been a second language for most Navajos. Although now this variety is a non-standard L1 variety, it was formed as an L2 variety of English, and most of the features which distinguish it from Standard American English can be understood as substrate influence.

2.a.i. Consonants

The phonotactic rules of Navajo are very different from those of English and may be carried over into Navajo English as substrate influence. English [kl] is realized as Navajo [tł]; English [gl] is realized as Navajo [dl], so "clock" is realized as *tłock,* "glasses" is pronounced *dlasses,* etc. As Navajo has only a glottal final voiceless stop, speakers of Navajo English may not distinguish differences in final voiceless stops. They may delete them entirely or substitute one for the other, so "Shiprock" is pronounced *Shipro';* "Salt Lake" as *Salt Late*; "test" is pronounced *tess;* and "spit" is pronounced *spi''*. Consonant clusters often are not pronounced at the ends of words; Leap claims that reduction in consonant clusters is a general feature of American Indian English (Leap 1982:113). Navajo has no velar nasal, consequently English words with [ß] are pronounced [n]; this is similar to other non-standard dialects of American English when used in pronouncing the English -ing morpheme, but speakers of Navajo English also say "thin" for 'thing, "yun" for 'young, etc. which is not typical for other non-standard American dialects of English.

<u>2.a.ii. Vowels</u>

Variations in the pronunciation of English vowels in NavE are also due to readjustment between the Navajo system, which has distinctions involving tone, nasality, and length, as well as according to four points of articulation, and the English system, with distinctions drawn according to many more points of articulation. In Navajo English the words "bad" and "bed" may sound alike, and the words "he's" and "his" may also be only distinguishable by context (examples from Young, undated article), as the allophonic realizations of /a/, /e/, /i/, and /o/ in Navajo do not match up with those of English.

<u>2.b. Morphology</u>

The complicated morpho-syntax of Navajo does not seep into Navajo English in a transparent way. Word order in the contact variety of English is almost identical to that of Standard English, rather than the SOV~OSV order of the Navajo sentence. Some morphological differences are evident, though; as there is no overt marking of the plural on nouns in Navajo, in Navajo English there tends to be either no plural marking used, or extra plural marking due to hypercorrection, since it is known by all bilinguals that English marks the plural, e.g.:

1. Lots of truck over there.[3]

2. Last night we all had spaghettis.

3. The womens are over on that side.

There are no obligatory articles in Navajo; consequently their use is optional in NavE. More demonstrative pronouns may be used than is usual in English, this is because Navajo has more demonstrative pronouns than does English, and they are used in many instances in which a definite article is used instead in Standard English. In Navajo English as well as other varieties of Indian English "extra" articles are also heard, e.g. :

4. I have a land (also in Lakota: Flanigan 1985:223)

The d/t of the past tense and past participle /-ed/ of English are also not heard in NavE, not only because of the phonotactic constraint on final voiceless stops and consonant clusters, as mentioned above, but also because there is no parallel past tense suffix in Navajo. Although final [t] does not appear in Navajo, final [d] is an acceptable final consonant. e.g.:

5. shidííniid, łid, gad   'he told me, smoke, juniper'

Past time is not marked in an inflectional manner in Navajo; rather a time adverb may be used instead. This feature is carried over into Navajo English. Leap notes some other features of Indian English attributable to the substrate features of American Indian languages, for example, "syntactic convention from Indian-language narrative style allows the tense of the whole story to be marked just once, in the first verb construction of the text" (1982:113).). This tense-marking strategy has led to discussions regarding interpretations of phonological rather than syntactic interference being involved, since Navajo English typically has no final [t] sound which often marks the English past tense, but often the English base form verb is used in Navajo English not only with forms ordinarily used with the /-ed/ suffix, but with English stem-changing verbs as well, such as 'meet' (not 'met') in which both forms have the same final consonant. Aspect and mode (terminology used in Y&M 1987), are part of the verb inflections in Navajo, but actual time is expressed overtly by adverbials, in Navajo and in Navajo English.

6. We haven't cook it yet.

7. Yesterday we meet him in town.

William Leap has written about the kinds of English Indian children speak in general; many of his observations apply specifically to the English used by Navajo children as well. Leap notes that in general Indian English tense/aspect systems are characterized by no inflectional endings on simple verbs, verbal particles, or auxiliaries (Leap 1993:62). This

35

does not reflect any lack of inflection on verb forms in the Indian languages themselves, but rather a lack of parallel inflectional suffixes against which to borrow the English ones.

2.c. Syntax

In addition to aspect and mode, the Navajo verb has subject and object persons, number, and transitivity incorporated into each verb-word; speakers attempting to convey the same meaning in English sometimes sound verbose. Bartelt (1980) postulates that Navajo speakers find "native English patterns of tense and aspect usage inadequate..." (cited in Bartelt 1981:381). "The match between underlying Indian-language grammatical categories and the rather unimaginative morphology of English surface structure has only been briefly explored. The solutions developed to allow surface level word classifications for each Indian English code, given that the morphemic inventory available for the purpose is so meager, raise interesting questions about grammaticality..." (Leap 1982:114).

The possessive may be completely unmarked in Navajo English, but the direct translation of the Navajo possessive strategy is much more common. The unmarked possessives have been attributed to phonological transfer, but final [s] and [z] are not impossible in Navajo, e.g.:

8. "sik'is" 'my friend; "biziiz" 'his belt.'

The underlying structural difference is that in Navajo possessives are dependent rather than head marked; the possessed object is marked rather than the possessor, e.g.: (hyphens mark morpheme boundaries).

9. NavE: Jack father   'Jack's father'

Standard Navajo: Jack bi-zhé'é

                     Jack 3rd.poss.father

10. NavE: My aunt her house   'my aunt's house'

 Standard Navajo: shi-máyázhí   bi-ghan

                     1st.poss-aunt 3rd.poss.-house

11. NavE: My grandfather his horse   'my grandfather's horse(s)'

Standard Navajo: shi-cheii   bi-łį́į́'

                                    1st.poss-mat.grandfather 3rd.poss.-horse

(examples 9-11 from Cook 1973)

Although the first example above, "Jack father" could be attributed to the natural process of morphological simplification due to shift towards English, the more common strategy used in "my aunt her house" is a literal translation of the Navajo and this is to be interpreted as a substrate effect.

2.d. Pragmatics

Probably the biggest differences between Standard American English and Navajo English are those of language behavior and politeness, and it is likely that what impedes communication between Navajos and Anglos more than actual language differences is what is described as "inter-ethnic miscommunication" (Bonvillain 1993:360). Requirements for culturally correct and polite behavior in Navajo culture are different from those in Standard American culture. Particularly with children, any individualistic behavior that singles one person out is considered bad behavior, so teachers from outside the culture are disappointed in their students' unwillingness to "shine," especially in front of their classmates (also in Apache culture: Liebe-Harkort, 1984:26). It is also considered rude to state exactly what one wants; when asked, the polite Navajo child will reply that he "probably" prefers one or the other of the choices offered. He is not expressing uncertainty about his choice, or his ability to choose, and he is not trying to be vague. By saying "probably" he is ensuring that the request is not seen as bossiness on his part. For example, at a class party a very polite Navajo third-grader responded to his teacher's question regarding the color of punch he wanted by saying, "I probably want pink." "Probably" is a direct translation of the word "shį́į́" identified as a 'dubitative particle'

by Young and Morgan 1987 and used in these same interactions in Navajo. Some other differences in conversational norms are as follows.

Navajo has no indirect quotation, only direct quotes; consequently direct quotes are used more frequently in Navajo English than in Standard English. e.g.:

12. 'He says, "I want that"' rather than 'He says he wants that'

13. 'She says, "I'm going to town."' rather than, 'She says she's going to town.'

In relying to negative questions in Standard American English we usually agree or disagree with the questioner, e.g.: "He doesn't read English, does he?" Answer: No, he doesn't, or yes, he does. Negative questions in Navajo are answered by agreeing or disagreeing with the question, rather than the questioner, so the answer can be either false or at least ambiguous when interpreted through Standard English. e.g.:

14. 'He doesn't read English, does he?' Answer: YES (he doesn't read English)

NO (he does read English)

Although the meaning of the answer is unambiguous when the question is made in Standard Navajo, as the above interpretations are the only available interpretations, in NavE difficulty may arise with the need to choose between the Navajo and English strategies for answering negative questions. Since many Navajos are also aware of the different strategies for answering these questions, they may use either the Standard English or the Navajo English way of answering; thus it is often difficult to interpret the answer in inter-ethnic conversations.

There is no overlap in Navajo turn-taking strategies, and a long gap between turns. The Navajo interpretation of the typical Standard American "no gap, no overlap" turn-taking strategy is that the interlocutors are not listening to each other; they are just planning their own response while the others are speaking.

Direct requests are uncommon among Navajos; telling another person that you would really like to have him visit you, come to dinner, etc. in a manner that sounds polite in

the Standard American English code is seen as trying to manipulate that person, or denying him the capability of self-choice. It is not polite to put someone under obligation. Another feature of Standard American culture is the norm of use that greetings are made to everybody, whether the addressee is known or unknown to the speaker, and in a loud voice, with questions regarding the addressee's name and, apparently, his state of health. This is also seen as atypical or inappropriate behavior in the Navajo speech community, whether English or Navajo is the language of choice. There are many circumstances in which silence is used rather than speech in various Indian cultures. Basso lists other situations in describing Apache behavior in which the appropriate response is "to give up on words." These include being in the presence of rude people and meeting strangers (Basso, 1990 pg.84). Navajo ways are similar to those of the Western Apache described by Basso.

2.d.i. Affective particles

Affective and other kinds of particles and adverbs from Navajo may be used in Navajo English. Since they typically occur clause-finally or clause-initially, and are not dependent on anything else in the sentence structure, they can be added by bilingual speakers to English clauses as well as Navajo ones. (see further discussion of affective particles in Chapter 3) e.g.:

15. there's so many religions **ya'**   'there are so many religions, aren't there' (R.N.)

16. **jó** it's our tradition   'it's just that it's our tradition'   (R.N.)

17. **íídą́ą́'** Frank he fell off his horse 'a long time ago Frank fell off his horse' (P.G.)

These particles are found in all kinds of bilingual English and Navajo speech, they are also a feature of the bilingual mixed code. The fact that these particles are part of Navajo rather than English grammar indicates something about Navajo rather than English dominance in sentence formation, and provides a clue towards understanding the creation of Bilingual Navajo.

39

3. CONCLUSION

Although Navajo English sounds very "non-standard" or at the very least "ethnic" to a non-Indian speaker of American English, it cannot be stressed enough how "Anglo" this code sounds to the elderly and more traditional Navajo speakers. Although there are some very educated older Navajos who command perfect English and perfect Navajo, who tend to look down on both non-standard English and the bilingual mixed code as sounding ignorant and uneducated, Navajo English provides an outlet for non-speakers of Navajo to differentiate themselves from both their traditional (old-fashioned) relatives and also from the Anglo majority.

The two sources for the bilingual mixed code, then, are regular or Standard Navajo, which was the default language of almost all communication in the Navajo Nation as little as fifty years ago, and what was then the second-language variety of English, which has now become a first-language variety for many, known as Navajo English.

Endnotes

[1] See Klimov's description of "active type" languages (Nichols 1992:8-10)

[2] This is not meant as a slanderous comment. Navajos generally enjoy "playing" with language, theirs and everybody else's. "Making fun" of someone's style of speaking is done often but truly in fun.

[3] Unless otherwise noted, all examples come from personal observations on the Navajo Reservation between 1989 and the present.

CHAPTER 3

BILINGUAL NAVAJO: DESCRIPTION

Introduction

Nowadays many young adults find it easier to speak Bilingual Navajo than "real" or

Standard Navajo, although the mixed code has often received a negative evaluation by its

speakers themselves as well as by speakers of Standard Navajo. Neither English

monolinguals nor Navajo monolinguals can understand it, and fluent bilinguals cannot

automatically speak it, though they will often laugh when hearing it, thinking it is

humorous.[1] Both this code as well as Standard Navajo are now threatened by English,

which is heard everywhere in the Navajo Nation: in the media and in the public (now day)

school system. The mixed code may survive as a contrastive self-identification code even

though Standard Navajo is being learned by very few children as a first language. This

description of selected aspects of Bilingual Navajo starts with a description of code

switching, through which this language was formed.

1.a. Code switching: types

Bilingual mixed codes are formed in bilingual communities by bilingual speakers,

through the speakers' code switching behavior. Code switching behavior has been analyzed

in terms of its social motivation, its psychological significance, and its reported grammatical

constraints (Fishman 1968, Hock and Joseph 1996, Muysken 2000, Thomason 2001,

Myers-Scotton 2002, Winford 2003, etc.). Some analysts divide the phenomenon into code

switching, which is a switch at a sentence or clause boundary, and code *mixing*, which is

switching within a sentence or clause. Code switching is observed to happen most readily at syntactic boundaries; code mixing is more similar to borrowing in this model, in that individual words are transferred from one language to the other, rather than whole phrases or clauses, though the term code mixing may imply a greater number of "borrowings" per utterance than the usual borrowing situation, in which as few as one word may be borrowed. An extreme case of code mixing is one in which all the content morphemes are borrowed from one language into another, as in the language called "Media Lengua" (Muysken 1994).

Other linguists categorize the two as different types of code switching: *inter*sentential code switching, which is switching at the sentence or clause boundary, and *intra*sentential code switching, which is switching within the sentence or clause. Although both of these types of code switching behavior are observed in the Navajo speech community, it is the intrasentential code switching, or code mixing, which has contributed to the formation of the mixed code.

1.b. Code switching: analyses

Myers-Scotton (1993) defines code switching as the "...selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded language (or languages) in utterances of a matrix language during the same conversation (cited in Muysken 2000:15). Her definition likens code switching to taking information from one language and adding it to another language, rather than viewing it as an alternation or congruence between languages. Myers-Scotton's model is probably partially formed on the basis of her observations of Swahili-English switching, in which word-sized elements of one language are inserted into sentences of another. e.g.:

1. Na kweli, hata mimi, si-ko **sure** lakini n-a **suspect** i-ta-kuwa **week** kesho.

Well, even I m not sure,   but I suspect   it will be next week.

(Myers-Scotton 1993:81 in Muysken 2000:16)

42

Muysken divides code switching still further, observing three types of mixing:

a. the insertion of lexical items or constituents from one language to another, similar to borrowing.

b. alternation between languages, similar to code switching rather than code mixing, a switch made at an equivalent spot in the languages, for example at the point in which both languages have a clause boundary.

c. the congruent lexicalization of material from both languages into one grammar, usually found in switches between a dialect and standard variety of the same language (Muysken 2000:3).

Type c. is probably not relevant to Navajo-English switching, as there are very few points of congruence between the two languages.[2]: in Navajo the verb follows the object, whereas in English it precedes it; Navajo has postpositions and English has prepositions; English has definite and indefinite articles and Navajo has no articles; English has overt pronouns and Navajo pronouns are incorporated into the verb, etc. However the other two types of code switching are found in Navajo-English contact (see Chapter 4 for further discussion).

2. Code switching in Bilingual Navajo

Bilingual Navajo is an "intertwined" type of bilingual mixed code with mostly Navajo grammar, with some English nouns, adjectives, and verbs inserted intact into the Navajo "frames," meaning it is easy for its speakers to tell which elements of the language are derived from English and which components are from Navajo (see further discussion in Chapters 5 and 6). Bakker defines an intertwined bilingual code as one in which the grammar is derived from a different source from that of some or all of the lexicon, as opposed to a "converted" language, in which it is difficult to tell which part of a language comes from which particular source, as the convergence has been so extreme[3] (2000:29). Bilingual Navajo uses many English content words in its lexicon, but the grammar clearly

has Navajo as its source. There are some small differences between the grammars of Standard Navajo and Bilingual Navajo; constructions are used in Bilingual Navajo which are Standard Navajo constructions, yet they are used in innovative ways in the mixed code. There are also some Bilingual Navajo constructions which imply bilingualism with English; the semantics of some Bilingual Navajo translations come closer to the semantics of an equivalent English sentence than the Standard Navajo meaning.

English nouns can be inserted into Navajo sentences as borrowed elements with only the phonology nativized to Navajo phonotactic rules, but verbs are generally borrowed into a frame of a conjugated Navajo auxiliary verb *ashłééh* 'to prepare.' Navajo word order in the sentence is ordered according to topic and comment (as discussed in Chapter 2), rather than by grammatical subject; as there is so much information in the polysynthetic verbs, a strict word order is not required by the syntax, although there is a "default" SOV order in an ordinary sentence with two arguments. This convention regarding word order is generally adhered to Bilingual Navajo as well.

2.a. Intersentential code switching

Intersentential code-switching of English clauses is very common in Standard Navajo as well as in the mixed code. Most Navajos are now bilingual, and there are no social constraints against this type of borrowing. In fact it can be the most appropriate way of talking when quoting an English utterance, because Standard Navajo has only direct quotation rather than indirect (as noted in Chapter 2). If speaker X says "I want the food" speaker Y must say, "X says, "I want the food;"" A sentence like, "He says he wants the food" can only be interpreted to mean there are two different "he" referents involved. In an early study of English borrowing in Navajo done by the Holms, some of the borrowing among six-year-olds reported was of this type, e.g.:

2. "Spank you!" níi łeh   'he usually says, "spank you"'

       3rd.speak usually

44

3. "Get in line!" shi'di'niih   'someone says to me, 'get in line''

            1st.obj.-it-3rd.speak   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:10)

        Direct quotation of this sort is used both to simply convey information and also to "mark" or make fun of an Anglo person saying something. In addition to the use of English in the direct quote, the speaker's cheek may be pulled out and the voice pitched lower to make sure the audience knows it is an Anglo man being quoted. Examples of intersentential code-switching can also be considered Standard Navajo, however. When asked, some Navajo speakers often claim not to hear any English in their Navajo; code-switching of this type may go unnoticed. In the following two sentences the switch is made at the clause boundary, and in the second sentence the switch yields an implied "because;" when the speaker was asked if the word for "because" wasn't needed in the sentence, I was told that it wouldn't be added to an English clause, although other speakers seem to have no trouble adding Navajo subordinating enclitics to English clauses. In Standard Navajo the "because" could be encoded by the subordinating "-go" enclitic. Here "because" is understood by the context.

4. Ei   biyáázh   bee át'é she doesn't have a job.   'Because of her son .....'

     dem. 3rd.poss.son 3rd.inst. 3rd.be .....

5. I like him doo biyoochííd da.   '.....[because] he doesn't lie'

        ....neg. 3rd.lie   neg.

<u>2.b. Intrasentential code switching</u>

        Myers-Scotton's model seems most well-suited for describing code switching phenomena in Navajo and English. Myers-Scotton, along with the other theorists, claims that code switching occurs according to a set of ordered principles, and that there are guidelines for well-formedness in bilingual mixed speech. In her model there is a "Matrix Language" which supplies the grammatical structure of the language, and an "Embedded Language" which supplies the borrowed content morphemes. Most function words and

grammatical inflections are in the matrix language, and content morphemes may come from either language (Myers-Scotton 1997:224). e.g.:

6. Ku-li-kuw-a   na   **table long** namna hii, mazee

    loc-past-cop-indic with   kind this, friend

 "There was a long table like this, my friend"

(Swahili-English example from Myers-Scotton 1989:5, in Winford 2003:157)

7. Leo si-   -ku-   **come** na **books** z-angu

    today 1s-neg-past-neg   with   class.10-my

"Today I didn't come with my books"

(Swahili-English example from Myers-Scotton 1993b:80, in Winford 2003:138)

These same patterns of intrasentential code-switching are also found in the bilingual English-Navajo code. As described by Myers-Scotton, specific structural pieces or "islands" of a second language are borrowed into the matrix language; and "do" constructions may be used to borrow embedded language verbs (1997:225). In the code described here, Navajo provides the structure of the matrix language, and the Navajo variety of English is used for the embedded language. Myers-Scotton claims that: "Singly occurring nouns are the most commonly switched elements in codeswitching corpora" (Myers-Scotton 2002:2); this is also seen in Bilingual Navajo. Some examples of English words used in Navajo sentence frames follow, showing the structure of Bilingual Navajo, and its relationship to that of Standard Navajo.

3. Specific types of code switching in Navajo

3.a. Nouns

Nouns are relatively easy to borrow from other languages into Navajo; as native Navajo nouns are not marked for gender, case, or number (see also Chapter 2), English nouns, which are also easily found in bare forms, may be borrowed unaltered except for pronunciation. The fact that some words are nativized indicates that these words may no

46

longer be perceived by the speakers as borrowed words; and in fact some may also be used by non-English speakers.

<u>3.a.i. Single nouns</u>

Examples of Navajo sentences with single borrowed English nouns follow (hyphens mark some morpheme boundaries for clarification).[4]

8. Town-góó   déyá   'I am going to town'

    town-towards   1st.sing. go

Standard Navajo: Kintah-góó   déyá

                  town-towards   1st.sing.go

9. Bi-dlasses   nizhóní   'Her glasses are pretty'

3rd.poss.-glasses   3rd.sing.is pretty

Standard Navajo: Bik'i sinilí nizhóní

                  glasses   3rd.sing.is pretty

10. Ha'át'íí biniiyé tape recorder yilwoł   'why is the tape recorder running?'

what.3rd.because.of tape recorder 3rd.runs   (Holm, Holm, &Spolsky 1971:149)

11. Nihimá éí níléí Shiprock-góó Halloween yę́ę́dą́ą́' Halloween candy neiiyiisnii'

1st.pl.poss.mother dem. dem.S.R.-direction H. past H.C. 1st.pl.obj.3rd.perf.buy

'our mother went to Shiprock last Halloween and bought us Halloween candy'

(Holm, Holm, &Spolsky 1971:54)

12. Abe' fridge biih   naní'aah   'put the milk back in the fridge'

    milk fridge 3rd. into it revers.2nd.put solid object.

Standard Navajo: Abe'   bee ask'azí   biih   naní'aah

                 milk   3rd.instr. cool 3rd.into it revers.2nd.put solid object

'put the milk back in the refrigerator'

13. Computer room-góó   dishwod   'I'm going to the computer room'

                 -direction   1st.future.go

47

14. Computer training baa   naashá   ' I am doing computer training'

                 3rd.instr. 1st.sing.walk around

Standard Navajo: Béésh bee banséskees-ígíí   bá'ííníshta'

                 machine 3rd.inst.think-nom.   3rd.ben. 1st.learn

(e.g. 12 -14 from Diné College 2002 survey, see appendix B)

     The verb 'to walk around' is used for many kinds of activity, including living somewhere, coming from somewhere, and doing something in general, e.g.:

15. ha'át'íísh   baa   naniná   'what are you doing?'

  what-Q.enc. 3rd.about   2nd.sing.walk around

16. doo baa   naasháhí   da   'I'm not doing anything'

  neg. 3rd.about 1st.walk around.nom. neg.

3.a.ii. English nouns with Navajo classificatory verbs

     The fact that Navajo is maintained as the matrix language is confirmed in the following sentences, in which the complicated Navajo classificatory verb morphology is retained in the Bilingual Navajo sentences. A verb is selected according to the "shape" or other semantic classification of the object, even with an English borrowed noun, e.g.: (e.g.s 17 and 18 from Diné College 2002 survey)

17. Shi-łį́į́'   hay   bá   nishjooł   'I give my horse hay'

   1st.poss-horse   ...   3rd.for   1st.move fluffy object

18. Pen shaa   nítįįh   'hand me the pen'

   ...   1st.to 2nd.move slender stiff object

19. Elephant yę́ę ch'il néidiljooł   the elephant is eating plants'

   elephant previously mentioned. plants 3rd.eats.fluffy or loose object

(Holm, Holm, &Spolsky 1971:149)

20. Ha'át'íí biniiyé tape recorder si'ą   'why is the tape recorder [there]?'

    what 3rd.because.of tape recorder 3rd.solid.object.perf.in position

(Holm, Holm, &Spolsky 1971:149)

      There are up to 12 classificatory verbs used in Navajo for moving objects or describing them in position. They differ according to whether the object is solid, mushy, or loosely packed, long and stiff or long and flexible, animate or non-animate, many or few, etc. Thus, even though the English word for "hay" is used, the classification in the verb remains the same, as hay is loose and/or fluffy, the stem "jooł" is used. As a pen is stiff and slender, the verb stem for stiff and slender "tįįh" is used. A tape recorder is a solid (roundish) object.

3.a.iii. Many English nouns in Standard Navajo grammar, some structural affects

      In the following three sentences many English words are embedded in the Navajo matrix language, but the Navajo structure remains mostly intact. In these sentences the Standard Navajo translations use different verbs from those in the Bilingual Navajo examples, but they are minor differences, the verbs used in the Bilingual Navajo examples could also be used in Standard Navajo. However, the fact that the sentences are different at all suggests that the structure of Navajo is being affected by the mixing; the matrix language has not remained untouched by the embedding of English words. The English words "cookout," "clinic," and "check-up" can be considered loanwords also available to monolingual Navajos. (e.g.s 21 - 23 from Diné College survey)

21. Shi-relatives   bił cookout baa   nisiikai   'We went to a cookout with my

1st.poss-relatives   3rd.with...3rd.about   dual.perf.go   relatives'

Standard Navajo: Shik'éí bił cookout baa nisiikai

OR: Shik'éí   bił   cookout   ada'iilyaa

   1st.poss.relatives   3rd.with ...   recip.plu.1st.dual.perf.prepare

'we prepared a cookout for ourseves'

22. Tłinic-di check-up biniyé   all day sédá-.

Clinic-at check-up   3rd.for that reason ... 1st.perf.wait

'I went to the clinic for a check-up and waited [there] all day'

Standard Navajo: Tłinic-di check-up biniyé   sédáa-go   shei'íí'áh

Clinic-at check-up 3rd.for that reason   1st.perf.wait.rel 1st.obj.3rd.perf.went down

'I went to the clinic for a check-up and waited until it [the sun] went down with me'

23. shį́į́-go temperature ayóo high nádleeh   'it (temperature) gets really hot in the

Summer-adv   ......   really high 3rd.changes   Summer'

Standard Navajo: shį́į́-go   ayóo   deesdoi   náhádleeh

                Summer-adv   really   3rd.hot   customarily.changes

'it (weather) usually gets really hot in the Summer'

<u>3.b. English verbs</u>

Using an English verb in a Navajo sentence is much more difficult than using an English noun, as the Navajo verb may be conjugated for person (1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th), and number (singular, dual, or plural), in addition to mode, tense, aspect, and transitivity. Some of these alternations in meaning are expressed by prefixation, and others are expressed in a stem change. Because of the morphological opacity and simplicity of the English verb, applying the Navajo rules for verb formation to English verbs would be very difficult if not impossible.

Myers-Scotton describes mixed languages using auxiliation strategies in which a nonfinite EL verb is borrowed into the matrix language and the ML verb for 'do' is used to carry all the inflectional information needed for the verb. (Myers-Scotton 1997:235). Winford cites examples of this type from mixed Panjabi-English and Spanish-English codes. e.g.:

50

24. o *help* **karde ne**   'they help'

   3pl   do   AUX

(Panjabi-English example from Romaine 1989:123, in Winford 2003:149)

25. su hija   **hace**   *teach* allá in San José

    her daughter does teach there in San José

(Californian Spanish example from Pfaff 1976:254-5 in Winford 2003:150)

<u>3.b.i. Auxiliation strategy in Bilingual Navajo</u>

Bilingual Navajo has several methods for incorporating English verbs into Navajo sentences, the most widely-used among them an auxiliation strategy in which a Navajo transitive verb is conjugated and used with the base form of an English verb; for this auxiliation Bilingual Navajo uses the verb "áshłééh" 'make or prepare.' As the following examples below indicate, Navajo syntax is preserved in the bilingual code; only some lexical content words are borrowed from English.

As a main verb in Standard Navajo "áshłééh" is transitive and means to make or prepare something, such as food (hyphens mark some morpheme boundaries for clarification). e.g.:

26. Da'   ch'iyáán ání-lééh?   'Are you preparing food?'

    Q. marker   food   2nd sing-make

27. Naadą́ą́'   bá   áshłééh   'I am making corn for him'

     corn   3rd.BEN.   1st sing-make

In addition, "áshłééh" can be used with adverbial expressions in idiomatic expressions to produce verbs. As follows, the meaning produced is 'make (object) that way.' e.g.:

28. Naaltsoos   ąą   ánílééh!   'Open your book!'

    book   open   2nd.sing-make

29. Naaltsoos   ałch'į'   áníłééh!   'Close your book!'

    book   to itself   2nd.sing-make

30. Ahąąh   shizhoozhgo   áshłééh   'I set them side by side in parallel position'

    parallel   lined up   1st.sing-make

31. Naaniigo   shizhoozhgo   áshłééh   'I set them side by side crosswise'

    crosswise   lined up   1st.sing-make

(examples 28 - 31 from Young and Morgan 1987:128-129)

        This same construction has been used by bilingual speakers of Navajo and English

to incorporate English verbs into Navajo sentence frames. In Bilingual Navajo, English

verbs may be used with "áshłééh" in the same way to form a verb. Most likely nativized

English adjectives like "tłiin" were first used in this frame to form mixed verbs, parallel to

the formation of verbs in Standard Navajo; the verb-forming construction rule was probably

extended to allow English verbs as a secondary step. Since there is no historical data

documenting Bilingual Navajo, this cannot be proved. As recently as 1987 it was reported

that, "we do not have a single example of a verb that has entered the language as the result

of linguistic borrowing" (Y&M 1987:7). However code switching involving some English

verbs was observed by 1971, although of 508 English words borrowed only 26 were verbs,

and most of these were found within English phrases (Y&M 1987:7). "Áshłééh" can now

be used as an auxiliary with the English unconjugated main verb, in a way similar to

conjugated English "do." "Áshłééh" is conjugated in the usual way but has lost its main

verb meaning and has become what is called a "light verb," which serves to carry the

inflections for person, number, and tense for the English main verb.

        Although the Standard Navajo translations below reflect different ways of

expressing the same sentence meaning in Navajo, the Bilingual Navajo sentences may be

compared with sentences 28 - 31 above (Young and Morgan 1987:128-129), to show the

parallel Standard Navajo grammatical structure in the Bilingual Navajo sentences. In order

to incorporate English verbs into the Navajo frames, a construction of Standard Navajo is

used; although it is not the most favored construction for conjugating verbs in Navajo, it is a

construction found in Standard Navajo, though, as mentioned above, it is generally used

with Navajo adverbs; the only other verbs it may be used with are the neuter verbs. In other

words, Bilingual Navajo uses a less-favored construction of Standard Navajo for its most

favored verb construction.

Bilingual Navajo sentences with áshłééh follow, showing Navajo as the Matrix

Language Frame with embedded English (in bold):

32. Bi-**face**   **tłiin** doo bee   áshłééh   da. 'I didn't wash his face'

    3rd.poss.-face clean not 3rd inst. 1st.sing.-make not

Standard Navajo: Bi-nii'   doo tanézgiz   da.

                3rd.poss.-face not 1st.sing.perf.wash not

In the Bilingual Navajo sentence above the English adjective 'clean' is used. As mentioned

previously, this word is a loanword in Navajo. By using the "áshłééh" construction the

meaning 'make it clean' is obtained.

33**. Computer use**   ásh-łééh   'I'm using the computer'

            verb   1st.sing.make   (Diné College survey, 2002)

Standard Navajo: Béésh ntsékeesígíí   bee   naashnish

            machine   think   3rd.instr.   1st. work

In this sentence, the verb 'use' is used, obviating the need for a Navajo verb which

matches the shape or other properties involved in handling a computer, yet implies working

on it in the usual manner.

34. **Bookshelf**   ła' shá **save** ání-łééh.   'Save me (one) bookshelf'

    bookshelf   one for me save 2nd.sing.-make

53

Standard Navajo: Naaltsoos   biih ná'nil̨í́   ła'   shá   hasht'e'   niní'ah

                     bookshelf 3rd.into it.place.multiple.obj.nom.one.1st.for in storage(adv)

                                         2nd.sing move object

        In the preceding sentence using the English word "bookshelf" is a simpler and more precise way of naming the item, translated 'the [thing] into which multiple objects are placed,' and using "save" with "áshłééh" makes it unnecessry to describe the shape or position of the bookshelf being saved. In Navajo it is part of the grammar to include the shape of any handled object in the verb; the fact that this speaker used "save" instead implies knowledge of English as well. These choices of words would have to be seen as a reduction in complexity in Navajo grammar, if they occured in Standard Navajo sentences, since they are part of the grammar of Bilingual Navajo, however, we may analyze this constuction as an innovation instead.

35. Bi-'éé'   **change** íí-lééh   'we are changing her clothes'

    3rd.poss.-clothes   change   1st.dual-make

Standard Navajo: Bi'éé'   łahgo át'éhí   bii   ndeezhteeh.

                  3rd.poss.-clothes different one 3rd.into   1st.dual move animate being

        Using the English verb "change" is a different vehicle for describing the act of changing someone else's clothes for them than is used in Navajo, which requires the use of the handling verb for an animate object. "Changing clothes" in English encodes different semantics from the translation in Navajo; in English the emphasis is put on the clothes rather than on the body being put into them. Compare the following Navajo sentence, in which the verb involved in getting dressed involves walking, rather than doing something with the clothing itself. e.g.:

36. Éé'   biih   yisháah   'I get dressed' (lit. 'I walk into the clothes')

    clothes   3rd.into ist.walk

In sentence 37. "washmachine" is used as a loanword, the verb "use" is used as a general term, rather than describing the kind of washing done. This again can be taken to imply a knowledge of English, as "wash" in Navajo encodes the shape or texture of the material being washed. Reduction in the complexity of the verbs in Navajo is also observed.

37. **Washmachine**   táá'   **use**   íshłaa   'I used three washing machines'

   washing machine   three   use   1st.sing.perf.-make

Standard Navajo: Táá'   bida'iigisí   bee   daségis

                 three   washing machine   3rd.inst.   1st.sing.perf.wash clothes

compare: Łeets'aa' tánásgis   (impermeable object)   'I wash dishes'

        [Éé']   iisgis   (do laundry)   'I wash clothes'

38. Nancy bich'į' **show** ánílééh   'show it to Nancy'

    Nancy 3rd.toward show 2nd.make   (Canfield 1980:219)

Standard Navajo: Nancy yidinół'įįł   'let Nancy see it'

                 Nancy 3rd.obj.2nd.let.see

39. Haitéigo doo **dust** anáhólįį da?   'how come you never dust?'

    Why   neg. dust iter.2nd.make neg.   (Canfield 1980:219)

Standard Navajo: Haitéigo doo nahót'o'da?   ....wipe it with a rag?'

                 why.sub.   neg.2nd.wipe

40. Áádóó nihiroom **clean** ádahwiilnééh   'and then we clean our room'

and then 1st.pl.room clean 1st.pl.make   (Holm, Holm, & Spolsky 1971:134)

Standard Navajo: áádóó nihighan góne' hasht'e dahwiilnééh

                 and then 1st.pl.poss.home in it straightened 1st.pl.make

41. Bertha hádą́ą́ lá éiyá **take picture** ánihilaa   'When did Bertha take the picture of

    Bertha when.past emph.dem. take picture 3rd.perf.make   (H.,H., & S. 1971:149)

Standard Navajo: Bertha hádą́ą́ lá éiyá nihé'iilaa

Bertha when.past EMPH. dem. 1st.pl.3rd.perf.make

28. Ééshją́ą́ -shį́į́   Paul   call áshłééh   I guess I better go call Paul' (L.S.)

     "I better" probably Paul   call 1st.sing.-make

Standard Navajo: Ééshją́ą́ -shį́į́   Paul   bich'į'   hashne'

             "I better"-probably   Paul   3rd.toward   call

<u>3.b.ii. Other verbs</u>

This use of the verb "áshłééh" is the most typical and only productive strategy for incorporating an English verb into a Navajo sentence, but there are some few other ways as well. Canfield shows how English verbs are borrowed into what he calls a "nominalizing frame" which is then used with a Navajo verb to mark inflection for aspect, number, person, etc. The Navajo verb used as an auxiliary with English intransitive verbs is "ásht'į" 'to be doing something' (Canfield 1980: 22/218-220).

42. **Swimming** ásht'į   'I'm swimming'

    swimming   1st.sing.act   (Canfield 1980: 22/218-220).

Standard Navajo: naash-bé

             1st.sing-swim

The following expressions showing the parallel use of this verb in Standard Navajo. In sentence 42. "swimming" replaces an adverb modifying "act," forming a VP with ásht'į rather than with áshłééh.

43. łą́   ásht'į   'I'm acting silly'

much, many   1st.sing.act (idiom)

44. ch'ééh   ásht'į   'I'm trying in vain to do it';

    in vain   1st.sing.act

45. shí   doo ásht'į́į́   da   'it wasn't me who did it'

    1st.sing.pro. neg. 1st.sing.act neg

(examples 43 - 45 from Young and Morgan 1987: 130)

Canfield (1980) claims that ásht'į́ may be productively used with intransitive verbs and

áshłééh only with intransitives; this is likely, however he provides very few examples as

evidence. In the following sentence the verb may be translated as either a transitive or an

intransitive, e.g.:

46. jump íyiilaa   'he jumped' or 'he made a jump'

    jump 3rd.perf.make   (Holm, Holm, & Spolsky 1971:10)

In other sentences using ásht'į́ a postposition is used between the noun and the verb to

accomodate for an object. e.g:

47. dóó swing bee ásht'į́į́ nít'éé'   'and I did it with the swing'

    and swing 3rd.inst. 1st.act.past   (Holm, Holm, & Spolsky 1971:134)

Standard Navajo: dóó beenídazhnibałí bee   ndíshbał nít'éé'

                    and swing   3rd.instr.1st.swing past

3.c. Adjectives, adverbs, and discourse particles

        Although many content words in Bilingual Navajo are taken from English, the

pattern of discourse is still basically Navajo, rather than English. Most discourse strategies

in Navajo involve "particles" and enclitics; as Navajo has phonemic tone, intonation cannot

be used to add emphasis or referential information to a sentence. Many of the particles and

discourse markers used in Navajo are also used in Bilingual Navajo.

3.c.i. Adjectives

        Some English words without obvious Navajo equivalents have been "borrowed"

permanently into as loanwords into Navajo and are used by monolingual Navajo speakers

as well, for example, "clean" which is represented in Navajo by a variety of different words,

57

and "orange" which must be translated into Navajo as something like "extremely yellow" ('łitsxo'). The English adjective "clean" may be interpreted as a Navajo neuter verb and conjugated accordingly. However this does not seem to be a very productive construction; it maybe more typical to borrow an adjective into the áshłééh construction. In the following sentence "clean" is borrowed and nativized, and the distributive plural morpheme and a noun-making enclitic are added:

48. Éé' da-**tłiin**-ígíí **lower drawer** góne' bii' iishnííł

  clothes plural.clean.nom. lower drawer inside 3rd.into 1st.sing.carry away

                     plural objects

Standard Navajo: éé' dasigis-ígíí éé' bii' ná'niłí bii' iishnííł

       clothes washed-the ones clothes 3rd.in.place.nom 3rd.into 1st.sing.(verb

'I'm putting the clean clothes into the lower drawer'   as above)

(lit. 'I'm putting the washed clothes into the [thing] where clothes are placed')

   A Standard Navajo sentence with similar structure to the Bilingual Navajo sentence is as follows. The use of "clean" can be compared with "red," and the use of "lower drawer" can be compared with "basket." :

49. Éé' daalchí'ígíí ts'aa' góne' bii' iishnííł

  clothes plural.red.nom. basket inside 3rd.into 1st.sing.carry away pl.objects

'I'm putting the red clothes into the basket'

3.c.ii. Adverb formation

   English NP's may be made into AP's by using the Navajo subordinating enclitic "-go," which forms adverbial expressions in Navajo, and some English bare adverbs may also be used with the same subordination . e.g.:

50. Néínídzáago índída, hazhó'ó nił hodeeshniih. **Lady-to-lady talk-**go. T'áásh áko.

  2nd.sing.arrive.sub. then carefully 2nd.with it.fut.1st.tell ..... -sub. OK? Q.enc.

I'll tell you all the details, lady-to-lady, when you get back, OK?   (McLaughlin 1992:143)

51. Public Meeting deiil'aah k'ad **Thursday**-go, naadiin táá'góó yoołkááł   góne'...

        ... pl.fut.1st.put up   now ....-sub. twenty three-direction night is passing inside it

we'll be having a Public Meeting this coming Thursday the twenty-third [at five o'clock]...

                                                                    (McLaughlin 1992:27)

The same subordinating particle can be used with Navajo adverbs and other expressions to

form AP's, for example when added to the cardinal direction "East" it yields the meaning

'eastwards.

52. ha'a'aah-jí-**go**   'toward the east, eastward'

        east   -direction-sub.

        When added to the Navajo neuter verbs for 'careful' and 'dangerous' the adverbs

'carefully' and 'dangerously' are formed.

53. hazhó'ó-**go** shá   dinits'a'   'say it slowly [carefully] for me'

        careful-sub   1st.for 2nd.speak

54. t'óó báhádzid-**go**   bił   oolwoł   'he's driving dangerously'

        quite dangerous-sub   3rd.with   3rd.rolls

        Navajo time expressions may be marked with **-go** to indicate 'at that time' and with

-di to indicate 'at that place,' similarly English times and places may be marked with Navajo

time and place enclitics, e.g.:

55. Standard Navajo: tseebíí-**go**   ákǫ́ǫ́   déyá   'at eight I will go there'

                                eight-sub.   toward 1st.go

56. Dóó **four o'clock**-go   tł'óo'di   naashnée łeh.

    and   ......   -sub. outside.at   1st.sing.play usually

'and at four o'clock I usually play outside'   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:87)

57. Standard Navajo: Tségháhoodzání-**di**   naashá   'I live at Window Rock'

Window Rock-at   around.1st.walk

58. Be'eldííldahsinil-**góó**   diit'ash   'we two will go to Albuquerque'

Albuquerque-toward   1st.dual.go

59.   school-**di**   'at school'

60.   dormitory-**góó**   'toward the dormitory' (51 and 52 from H.H. andS.1971:9)

3.c.iii. Discourse

Navajo enclitic discourse particles may also be suffixed onto English nouns,

marking interrogatives and discourse references, such as "late" or "the one." Other

discourse markers may also be used in bilingual sentences, such as "jó" 'as you know.':

61. book-**ísh?**   'Is it a book?'

...Q.enc.particle

62. Carol-**sh**   teacher nilį́   'is Carol a teacher?'

Q.enc.particle   ...   3rd.sing.be

63. Tuba City **jó** teacher nilį́   'as you know, she's a teacher in Tuba City'

Tónaneesdízí-di **jó** bá'ólta'í nilį́

64. háí-**sh**   naalnish?   'who is working?'

who-Q.enc.part.   3rd.work

65. nilééchąą'í-**sh**   hólǫ́?   'do you have a dog?

2nd.poss-dog-Q.enc.part.   3rd.exist

66. shimásání- **yę́ę**   'my late grandmother'

1st.poss.grandmother-late

67. record player-**yę́ę** 'the previously mentioned record player' (H.H.and S. 1971:9)

3.d. Repeated forms

        Sometimes information is repeated in Bilingual Navajo sentences for emphasis, once
in English and once in Navajo. This reveals the fact the components are not strictly
separated by grammatical category in Bilingual Navajo, since each category may be used in
both languages, and also shows that the use of English content morphemes is not only due
to imperfect knowledge of Navajo, since the form in Navajo is used as well.   This is a
feature of Bilingual Navajo, as repetition for emphasis is not typically found in either
Standard Navajo, which generally uses affective particles for emphasis, or English, which
usually uses pitch, volume, or length changes.   e.g.:

68.   áłtsé wait!   'wait up!' (informal) (lit. 'wait wait'))

69.   díí'-go June fourth góne'   'on June fourth (KNDN 2002)

        four-sub............. inside it   (lit. on the fourth of June fourth in it)

Standard Navajo: Ya'iishjáástsoh díí' góne'

        In the following sentence directions are given for depositing hay, with the exact
location given twice, once in English and once in Navajo:

70. leave it by the gate on the north side, by that tire bíighah-gi   t'áá kwe'é

                                                                3rd.next-at right there

(lit. "leave it by the gate on the north side, by that tire by it right there")

        In the next example the preposed Navajo word for door precedes the English
"door," once again adding emphasis.

71. daadíílkaał door-ísh close ada'iilaah   'they closed the door, didn't they?'

     door   ... -Q.enc.particle ... 3rd.plural.perf.make

(lit.as for the door, did they close the door?)

Likewise, the preacher speaking in sentence 64. wants to emphasize the word 'today' with
the Navajo repetition of the same word. (also see Chapter 4)

72. We need to make a choice today dííshjį́į́di.   'we need to make a choice today today'

                                            this.day.at

Speakers intentionally make use of the mixing strategies, and produce "slang" mixtures as well. These are extremely idiomatic and funny, and not to be understood as productive mixing strategies in Bilingual Navajo. e.g.:

73.   T.L.C.   'come on, let's go'

    tį' let's cruise

Standard Navajo: tį'   'come on'

74. Shił naweasy   'I feel sick (queasy)'

   1st.with sick   (Canfield 1980:219)

75. Shiłééchąą'í anáyííł-turn   'my dog died'

   1st.poss.dog 3rd.perf.die (euphemism)   (Canfield 1980:219)

<u>4. Structural Change?</u>

In the following two sentences, however, there is definite evidence of change in the grammar. It must be pointed out, though, that these types of sentences are very rare; in fact these are the only two I have found. However, they may point to a changing situation in which the matrix language frame itself is becoming mixed in the language of younger speakers, similar to the Matrix language "turnover" (Myers-Scotton 1998:312).

76.   shí   one bale   bá   niná-sh-jol.

 1st.sing. personal pronoun   (one bale) 3rd.for   1st.sg.customarily move fluffy

'I usually give it one bale'   (Foster et.al 1989:15-16)   object'

In Standard Navajo a preposed personal pronoun indicates particular emphasis, so the translation would be something like: 'as for me, I usually give it one bale.' The way this sentence is translated without emphasis on the personal pronoun suggests that there may be some English influence already in the MLF. If this were found to be the beginning of the

pattern of sentences to come rather than an isolated utterance, the language situation might

be more indicative of convergence, and a shift towards English. According to Myers-

Scotton, although code-switching is a condition for the Matrix Language turnover, leading

to complete language shift, there is also evidence that code-switching can be "fossilized,"

and maintained in a Matrix language: Embedded language balance (1998:313).

Another example of a mixed (calqued from English to Navajo) sentence used by a

fluent speaker of Navajo, speaking "child directed language" to a child:

77. "da' díí ni-school?"   'is this your school?'   (Diné College 2002)

Q.particle dem. 2nd.poss.-school

Compare Standard Navajo: da'   kwe'é   íínółta' ?

                               Q. particle here   2nd.study

Sentence 49. resembles Myers-Scotton's model of "Matrix turnover," in which the

language situation has shifted so far that the original L2 has now become the Matrix

language, with lexicon borrowed back from the original L1 (Myers-Scotton 2002:268,

referring to Ma'a).

CONCLUSION

Thus, English content words may be used in Bilingual Navajo, whether noun, verb,

or adverb, though they must be inserted into the proper frame for each. Full NP's may be

borrowed, though bare noun borrowing is typical of Bilingual Navajo. Although nouns can

be added by one-for-one substitution, verbs must be added within a VP using the auxiliation

strategy involving the verb *áshłééh*.. Bilingual Navajo adverbs may be created by attaching

Navajo functional morphemes to English AP's.

The facts that:

a. all functional morphemes of Bilingual Navajo are Navajo morphemes, and

b. the structure of the Bilingual Navajo sentence remains basically the same as is found in

Standard Navajo, support the claim that this code is indeed a variety of Navajo rather than a

variety of English. The fact that there are some differences between the grammar of Standard Navajo and that of Bilingual Navajo point out that Bilingual Navajo is indeed a separate language and new creation, and not simply a reduced or declining form of Standard Navajo.

Bilingual Navajo can therefore fit into the model of "intertwined" bilingual mixed codes, since it is still transparent which morphemes belong to which source language. It shows many similarities with Media Lengua and Michif, other bilingual mixed codes formed from an American Indian language and a European language in contact.

Code-switching can thus provide a method in which English vocabulary words can be incorporated into Navajo, which is convenient for speakers with limited vocabulary; they are able to continue to speak Navajo without perfect knowledge, and are thus able to at least somewhat maintain the highly valued language tradition of their ancestors. But it may also be used by those with complete command of Navajo as well as English for a contrastive self-identification code. As this code switching continues among bilingual English and Navajo speakers in the Navajo speech community, the most common language used to express a separate identity from the mainstream culture may be the bilingual code.

Chapter 3: Endnotes.

---

[1] See Chapter 1 for a table of "types" of Navajo speakers.

[2] See Chapter 2 for further description of Standard Navajo.

[3] An analogy may be drawn from gardening: a "converted" language is like a hybrid plant, whch produces, for example, nectarines instead of plums or peaches. An "intertwined" language is more like the traditional American Indian way of planting corn, beans, and squash together. Although by the end of the Summer they may look like one plant, upon careful examination the separate intertwined plants can be identified, and they are found to produce normal corn, beans, and squash.

[4] Many more of this type of sentence can be found in the Navajo Reading Study 1971 by Holm, Holm, and Spolsky.UNM.

CHAPTER 4

BILINGUAL NAVAJO: Analysis and the results of a survey

Bilingual Navajo is at least partially accounted for by Myers-Scotton's (1993) Matrix Language Frame model of code-switching, in which pieces of an L2 are borrowed and "embedded" into an appropriate spot in the L1, or "Matrix language" Although her theory was developed as an explanation of the pathway to language shift and eventual language death, it can also provide an explanation for the development of Bilingual Navajo. Although the creation of Bilingual Navajo is a linguistic result of the shift from Navajo to English in the Navajo community, at this point the shift is in a holding pattern, and the bilingual code is being maintained.

McConvell (1996) uses Myers-Scotton's model to analyze speech data from Aboriginal children in Australia; he found that their most fluent language was what he referred to as a "creole" of an Aboriginal language and English. He also found that, although the most likely mechanism for the development of this creole was through the MLF code-switching model, the language had in fact stabilized and, although the language in use sounded like code-switching, code-switching was no longer happening among the children. (McConvell 1996:7). He claims that "full bilingualism with pervasive 'unmarked' code switching lies behind convergence and mixing" (1996:19). Similarly, full bilingualism and "unmarked" code switching has also led to the development of Bilingual Navajo, and a code-switched variety is in the process of coalescing into a new language.

The adults in this Australian speech community code-switch between the creole and the Aboriginal language, Gurindji, choosing elements of each code on the basis of its social association (McConvell 1996:7). Although the adults control both codes, the children don't; rather the children's language features the grammar of the creole and lexicon from both languages (1996:8). Although the components can still be borrowed back and forth by the adults, the children may not be fluent in Gurindji, and in the children's speech the switched components have apparently become fossilized, creating a new mixed code (1996:8). e.g. (from McConvell 1996:11)

1. karla- mi- yin **too skin-im** parntara -rni   'skin the whole lot from the upper west too'
    west- up- from too skin-it whole- only

2. Ngumpin- kari **all right they been get-im allabout** wankaj - ja jaru-ngka
   person - other ....   bad - LOC word- LOC

'admittedly they did get other people [with sorcery] because of bad rumours'
Although we can recognize the English elements marked in bold above, the children in this speech community apparently do not recognize two separate input codes in their language; they use all of its components as parts of the grammar of their own language, and are unaware of its status as a mixed code.

1. From code switching to mixed code

In a similar fashion, Bilingual Navajo is gradually shifting from being simply a product of the code-switching of fluent bilinguals to its own code, not only spoken by fluent bilinguals but also spoken by those whose command of Standard Navajo is not quite good enough to continue to manipulate both Navajo and English in this manner.

Muysken accounts for these types of examples of code-switching from the L2 into the L1 "matrix language" phenomena as illustrations of the "Relexification Hypothesis" (Winford 2003:181). He claims that only the phonological shape is adopted as the word from the second language, as opposed to a process of "translexification" whereby all the

66

information from the second language is adopted (Winford 2003:181). In societally

bilingual situations, though, in which the speaker has access to the entire L2, not just some

borrowed words, it seems that the translexification hypothesis would be more reasonable,

since speakers are unlikely to ignore all the semantic values of a word from a language they

completely control. The social situation of the Navajo-English mixed code may be different

from many others in this regard, as virtually all bilingual speakers in the Navajo Nation are

fluent as well as literate in English, and can therefore easily recognize English elements in

their language.

Winford combines models by Muysken and LeFebvre in the following description:

the L1 "item" is characterized by the L1 phonological representation, syntactic features,

semantic features, and morphological features. The parallel L2 "item" is similarly

characterized by its linguistic features; in the substitution of one for the other the contact

language item is characterized by the pronunciation of the L2 item, with the syntactic,

semantic, and morphological features of the L1 (Winford 2003:182). Although this is

apparently the case with Media Lengua, in which Quechua semantics are added onto the

translexified Spanish morphemes, in Bilingual Navajo the semantics of the L2 may or may

not also be adopted along with the form of the borrowed word. The forms, "clean" and

"change" are kept in their morphologically (English) bare form, and the English semantics

of each of these verbs is also retained in the switch. Navajo grammatical structure is

maintained in all of the sentences. e.g.: (also in Chapter 3)

3.   BN: bi-face **tłiin** doo bee   áshłééh   da   'I didn't wash his face'
          3.poss.face clean neg. 3.instr. 1.prepare neg.

Standard Navajo: bi-nii'   doo   tanézgiz   da
                 3.poss.face neg. 1.sg.perf.wash neg.

The English word "clean" [tłiin] is used even among monolingual speakers of Navajo,

reportedly because its semantics are so useful. In Standard Navajo something can be

washed, though "wash" can be one of several different verbs, depending on the shape and texture of the item being cleaned, or it can be bleached, or made special in some other way, but there is no Navajo word available with the exact semantics of "clean."

4. Bi-'éé'   **change** íí-lééh   'we are changing her clothes'

     3rd.poss.-clothes   change   1st.dual-make

Standard Navajo: Bi'éé'   łahgo át'éhí   bii   ndeezhteeh.

                    3rd.poss.-clothes different one 3rd.into   1st.dual move animate being

The meaning of "change" is identical to the semantics of the word in English in this sentence; to ascribe specifically Navajo associations with the verb would force the speaker to use a sentence more similar to the Standard Navajo sentence above, in which the animate body is the object handled, rather than the clothes themselves.

Likewise in the following sentence there may be no perfect translation for "casino," giving bilingual speakers a motivation for borrowing that word.

5. Ei casino-ji ndeeshnish   'she's going to work at the casino'

     dem. ...-at 3rd.fut.work

In sentence 6. as well the English verb "record" is used rather than coining a Navajo term. The English verb is incorporated into a Navajo VP frame.

6. "CD-ísh   record íínílaa?"   'did you record a CD?'

     CD-Q.particle   2nd.perf.make

<u>1.a. Embedded English in Matrix Navajo</u>

Borrowings or "L2 embeddings" found in Bilingual Navajo can be divided into three categories. In the first type, words are borrowed from English into structures where they don't interrupt the Standard Navajo of the matrix language. The speech behavior in these sentences cannot be distinguished from that of "regular" borrowing. There may or there may not be a new code developing; bilingual speakers of languages in contact

regularly borrow from one language to the other. Examples 7 - 9 are those with only one

English noun borrowed, e.g.:

7. chidí   **gas** biih   náákááh   'I put gas in the car' (P.G.)

      car   gas 3rd.into it   1st.put.liquid

8. **Paper plates** beisénah   "I forgot the paper plates' (L.S.)

                        3rd.obj.1st.perf.forget

9. da' Roy   bi-**sister**?   'Is that Roy's sister?'

  .   Q.particle Roy 3rd.poss.-sister   (Foster et al. 1989:15-16)

<u>1.b. Heavy borrowing</u>

        Even in sentences in which there are a number of English borrowings but no

structural change there is no real evidence of a mixed code developing or not developing.

e.g.s from Field 2001:ppc. (initial Navajo question in conversation provided for context)

10. ha'át'é'ígíí   nanideikidgo?   'What ones [in particular] did they ask you?

what 3rd.be.nom.   2nd.obj.3rd.pl.perf.ask

11. díkwííshį́į́   questions......   '(I don't know) how many Q.s'

      how many.probably   ...

12. t'óó ahayói, seven pages   daats'í   'A lot, maybe seven pages'

      quite many,   ...   maybe

13. graphs, dóó, áádóó nda łahdó' formulas   'graphs, and then also some formulas'

            and and then but some also ....

14. Ndi the last one-ígíí two pages multiple choice

      but ....   -nom. ....

'but the last one in particular was two pages multiple choice'

        The fact that Navajo suffixes can be attached to English NP's, as in sentence 14.

above, "the last one-ígíí" and in sentence 15. below, "fifteen minutesjį" does suggest that

real mixing has occurred, however, and that these sentences represent something beyond

mere borrowing. This is seen in sentence as well; the Navajo directional suffix "góó" is added to the English AP, "from the time of Christ."

15. "...twenty-five cents bą́ą́h ílį́į́-lá   áádóó aaji-ígíí fifteen minutesjį' náábąął.

                  ...3rd.cost-emph.particle and over there-the one ...[for] 3rd.runs (turns)

 '[the dryers] cost twenty-five cents and the ones over there run for fifteen minutes'

16. Áádóó from the time of Christ-góó....   'And from the time of Christ on...'

    and then ....   (direction)

2. Other kinds of code switching between English and Navajo

        Not all code switching between English and Navajo has led to the creation of the bilingual code. In some cases speakers may switch back and forth according to content of the conversation or to include speakers who may not understand one or the other languages involved. Some bilingual English and Navajo speakers switch back and forth without using the constructs typical of Bilingual Navajo, and with no apparent structural interference from one language to another, either for stylistic or for pragmatic reasons. Their vocabulary in English may not be sufficient for the topic of conversation, for example, or the emotional content of the utterance may support a switch back to Navajo. In the following examples Myers-Scotton's constraint on well-ordered code switching is stretched.   She accounts for "problematic code switching data" in various ways, and notes that code switching strategies differ among bilingual speakers with differing degrees of proficiency in one of the languages involved (Myers-Scotton 2002:149). The switching in the following sentences does not appear to have any kind of order or plan to it; the languages are switched apparently according to whim. There are no verb constructions using "áshłééh", and, although there are some few borrowed English words in Navajo clauses, most clauses are either all Navajo or all English. This is really code switching, rather than code mixing, or intersentential rather than intrasentential borrowing, and the switches may be accounted for by emotional or pragmatic constraints overriding the grammatical ones.   This type of code-

switching characterizes Navajo Nation "Type II" speakers, who speak both English and Navajo but do not speak the mixed language. Almost by definition these speakers are dominant in Navajo, rather than English. Borrowing of the word "breastplate" may be interpreted in yet another way: in sentence 18; the speaker was reading from an English Bible lesson, this is a foreign concept as well as a foreign word, and since her audience was bilingual, she was free to use the English word rather than coin a new word for "breastplate" in Navajo.

17. Diyin God éiyá He was dealing with man...   'As for God, He was dealing with man'
     holy God dem. ....

18. Diyin God bidiné'é-nt'éé' breastplate jó   ałk'idą́ą́' priests danilǫ́   jó

   holy God 3rd.poss.people-past .... (you see) long ago ...   3rd.pl.be (you see)

Aaron éí   dahoolzhiizh. The priest wore a breastplate; bikáagi   éiyá precious stones

  ...   dem.   it came to pass.   ...   3rd.on it-at   dem. ....

dabi'dii'ní gold is one of them óola wolyé-hígíí.

we said that about it   ....   gold 3rd.is called-nom.

'A long time ago God's people, the ones who were priests, you see, like Aaron [wore] a breastplate. The priest wore a breastplate with precious stones on it, we said that about it, gold [was] one of them.'

19. Ephesians 4 áádóó verse 4 góne' ei   biniinaa-yę́ę̨   áko dííshjį́į́-di we need to

        ...   and then ... in it dem. 3rd.because of it-already.mentioned thus today-at ...

make a choice today   dííshjį́į́di áko who are we going to serve? Diyin God daats'í?

              ....   today   thus   ...   holy God   maybe?

'In Ephesians 4 verse 4, because of what was already discussed, we need to make a choice today, today . Who are we going to serve? God, maybe?'

20. Áádóó M.C. Kerry Knight dóó koji   díidi Ute Mountain Tribal chairman éidi Judy

and then M.C. ....   and right here   dem.at .....   dem.at

Knight Frank hadahadziih   dooleeł dóó kojí   díkwííshį́į́'

....   they will speak it will be and right here how many.probably

nahada'iiłdeeh daaní eidí.   Danagai Apache Crown Dancers ádaat'éhígíí da.

visitors   3rd.plural.say dem. Plural.dem. ......   plural.3rd.be.nom. plural

'And then MC Kerry Knight and right here [our own] Ute Mountain Tribal chairman Judy

Knight Frank will speak and there will be many visitors: [for example] the Apache Crown

Dancers will be there.

<u>3. Bilingual Navajo identified</u>

        Thus, Bilingual Navajo is not simply the collection of random code switching

behaviors between English and Navajo; it has rules, structures for borrowing, and agreed-

upon norms of interpretation within the community.   In sentences using *áshłééh* there is at

least a stylistic difference between the Standard Navajo and Bilingual Navajo structure;

although the *áshłééh* construction is a Standard Navajo construction, in Standard Navajo it

is not used the same way as it is in Bilingual Navajo. Speakers of Bilingual Navajo tend to

use bare nouns, adverbs, and verbs from English in Navajo sentence frames; other kinds of

code-switching behavior, such as switching between languages at a major clause boundary,

are not typical of the bilingual code.

<u>4. Shift</u>

        Through time code-switching pathways between languages in shift often, though not

always, progress from larger to smaller borrowed pieces in bilingual speech. Myers-

Scotton (1998) describes the kinds of code-switching found in bilingual mixed codes and

also in languages in the process of attrition (1998:292). Although code switching between

large sections of English and Navajo are also heard in the Navajo Nation (see previous

section), and not all fluent bilinguals control the bilingual code, at this time Bilingual Navajo

fits the model of the mixed code rather than a disappearing language, as the matrix language

is clearly Navajo, with "embedded" elements of English. Even though some adjectives and adverbial phrases as well as many verbs and countless numbers of nouns are borrowed from English, they are all content morphemes; English prefixes and suffixes are not used in this mixed code, and Navajo syntax and phonology are maintained. As mentioned before, there are some loan words from English used commonly even in monolinguals' Navajo speech. In Myers-Scotton's model of "classic" intra-sentential code switching competence in both languages is assumed in the speakers of the mixed code; for most adult speakers this is probably true in the Navajo Reservation at this time.

5. Matrix Language Turnover?

Some few words are lately being borrowed from Navajo into English, which could point to further shift. However, these words may also be heard among non-Navajos living in areas close to the Navajo Nation; the possibility of two-way borrowing between the two speech communities cannot totally be ignored, although it is clear that in general Navajos are shifting to English and Anglos are not shifting to Navajo. The most commonly heard Navajo word in English is probably "chitty" for car, from Navajo 'chidí.' In Farmington, New Mexico there are "Chitty Lube" businesses to get an oil change, "Cheap Chitty" lots to buy a used car, etc. Field (2001) records some other words she has heard: the adjectives "chizhy" from Navajo neuter verb "dich'íízh" 'it is rough, dry, chapped' and "twooshy" from Navajo neuter verb "dit'oh" 'it is bushy.' e.g.: (from Field 2001:ppc)

21. "Why are your knees all chizhy, sister?"

22. "Your hair is all twooshy this morning" (i.e. sticking straight up; poking out at odd angles)

6. Results of a survey

I administered a survey in Navajo language and culture classes at Diné College in Shiprock, NM in June, 2002 (Appendix B).[1] Diné College is a tribal college established in 1968 (then called Navajo Community College) to provide a Navajo education for Navajo

students in the Navajo Nation; it was the first college owned and operated by American Indians on a reservation, and the first to be fully accredited. There are now 29 such tribal colleges in operation in the US (House 2002:70). Diné College provides general education for post high-school Navajo students and also provides many of the continuing education classes for Navajo language teachers during the Summer. Most courses are also open to students of other backgrounds, and occasionally non-Navajos living in the area will take language and culture courses as well. There were however none of these students in the classes responding to the survey.

The questions on the survey focused on language attitudes, language choice among bilinguals, and the appropriateness of the bilingual code, and asked the respondents' opinions as to whether they thought Bilingual Navajo was increasing or decreasing in the Navajo speech community. The respondents were also asked to analyze some Bilingual Navajo data and identify the Navajo or English source of each morpheme. They were then asked to provide completely English and completely Navajo glosses of the Bilingual Navajo sentences, and they were also asked to write other sentences they had heard in the bilingual code. Although writing complete sentences in Navajo and English was difficult for some, separating sentences in the bilingual code into its Navajo and English components was easy, even though some English words were written in their nativized Navajo form.

The respondents were between 19 and 71 years old, and represented a wide range of levels of education as well as a wide range of ages. Some were just out of high school, some had advanced college degrees, some were in the process of being certified for Navajo language teaching, and some were taking the classes for general knowledge.

Respondents of all but one out of twenty-four completed surveys had reportedly heard the bilingual code and knew people who used it. Many of the respondents admitted to using it themselves. Only two felt that using Bilingual Navajo was never appropriate, though one of these two admitted to using it. One respondent didn't think there *should* be

74

an appropriate time to use it, though that same respondent evaluated using Bilingual Navajo as positive compared to using English, and wrote that her children and her students spoke it. Four thought it was appropriate when there was no equivalent Navajo terminology for the discussion at hand, and six responded that it was appropriate "when necessary" or when the interlocutors do not command Standard Navajo. Two saw it as appropriate when trying to explain something in English to an elderly Navajo speaker. Ten saw it as appropriate in casual settings and learning environments. One felt that using two languages at the same time was a valuable accomplishment in itself. All but two of the respondents felt that speaking Bilingual Navajo was appropriate at least some of the time, in particular circumstances or settings. Although there was no question on the survey inquiring about pedagogy, some people wrote comments in addition to their survey answers, and quite a few mentioned its advantages as a pedagogical tool; the respondents felt that students could use it to "practice" Standard Navajo. One respondent wrote that it made them feel uncomfortable at times; they felt like they were making mistakes.

Five speakers reported that speakers use Bilingual Navajo when they can't speak Standard Navajo; two reported that it was easier to speak Bilingual Navajo than Standard Navajo, and one reported that code switching was a typical form of communication. A few felt that young people couldn't tell the difference between Bilingual Navajo and Standard Navajo, or else didn't care. This is reminiscent of the situation among Michif speakers, who sometimes call Michif, "Cree" (Bakker and Papen 1997:303) Although I believe the young people can tell the difference and do care about it, they may not control the standard code well enough to converse in it with their elders. Seven reported that speakers learn this code from their parents.. For speakers of both Bilingual Navajo and Standard Navajo, all agreed that elderly people preferred the standard, and that it didn't matter as much for younger speakers. Those who admitted switching from one variety to the other all reported that the switching occurred according to the age and Navajo proficiency of their addressee.

75

Bilingual Navajo is seen as appropriate in casual settings with (same-aged) family and friends, and inappropriate in traditional and ceremonial domains, such as meeting with elderly relatives and in traditional "sings" or healing ceremonies. These are not only attitudinal responses, but also practical ones, however. Elderly relatives in the Navajo Nation tend to be monolingual in Navajo, and speaking with them in a language they cannot understand would be considered rude. Respect for the elderly is a very important value in Navajo culture. Ceremonial sings are memorized verbatim by medicine men; the language used may not even be altered within Standard Navajo.

Field found that Navajo speakers have a number of different responses to code switching, which vary according to age group (Field 2001). She cites a survey done by Levy and Kunitz (1974) in which typical results for a language shift scenario were found, showing English being preferred by the youngest speakers, Navajo by the oldest, and mixing and/or bilingualism accepted in between:

Variety in Language Ideologies Across Age Groups (Levy and Kunitz 1974)

Elders   Purism: change/mixing is bad
              Navajo is an important symbol of identity/solidarity

older adults English is needed to "get ahead"
              Navajo is an important symbol of identity/solidarity

young adults codemixing and/or Navajo language change is a symbol
               of identity/solidarity

children   Navajo is stigmatized; English is more "cool"

Figure 6: Levy and Kunitz

Field also found positive evaluations of Navajo among the upper class and Traditional Navajos, and less positive evaluations of Navajo among lower class and Christian Navajos, who may associate the Navajo language with Paganism (Field 2001). This correlation may be particular to Cañoncito; neither Fuller (1982) nor House (2002) found Christian Navajos to have a negative evaluation toward the Navajo language. In Shiprock, NM, Fuller found that the domain of the church service was one of the most vital

76

for use of Navajo (Fuller:1982:88), and in Tsaile, AZ, House found that attitudes toward learning the Navajo language in schools were favorable by Christians and Traditional Navajos alike, though Christian Navajos did not want their children taught traditional Navajo religion (House 2002:74).

My survey did not yield the same age-graded results, to my surprise. Although all respondents felt that using the mixed code was inappropriate with the elderly, since they were not likely to understand it, the judgments by the respondents about whether or not it was appropriate in other situations did not vary by the age of the respondent. This could be because I specifically asked for judgments regarding the bilingual mixed code, rather than code switching in general. The Diné College survey was also done almost ten years later than Field's work, and almost thirty later than that of Levy and Kunitz. The mixing of the two languages may be more accepted now simply because the speech community is more accustomed to it. Shiprock, in the four-corners area, is also a different kind of community from Cañoncito, which is located closer to Albuquerque than it is to most of the rest of the Navajo Nation. My pool of respondents also might have had a higher percentage of potential Navajo Language teachers of all ages in it, since I administered the survey at Diné College. Navajo language teachers are probably the most aware of the threatened status of Navajo in the community, and see the value of any kind of practice in Navajo, even if it is mixed with English. I did not ask for the respondents to identify their religion or their income on the survey, but I also found many church services to be held enthusiastically in Navajo when I lived in the Navajo Nation.

Seven responding to the survey reported that Navajos learned this code from parents, while others commented on the lack of appropriate support for the standard code. More than twice as many (16) saw the bilingual code as increasing as those who saw it decreasing (6), two thought it was neither increasing or decreasing.[2] Some saw the increase

as a direct result of increased mobility and the decreased dependence on livestock among the Navajo population.

While a few people thought Bilingual Navajo was only acceptable for speakers whose Navajo is not perfect, and several who saw it is neither bad nor good, or both bad and good (7), most respondents (16) saw speaking Bilingual Navajo as at least "OK," or better than speaking English; as mentioned previously, several respondents appreciated the fact that students could use Bilingual Navajo to practice Standard Navajo, any use of Navajo forms helps to maintain the standard. One respondent said that since she was Navajo, she should speak Navajo. None of the respondents favored losing Navajo and turning towards English, even if the non-standard variety were the only one available. Contrary to much of the literature on minority and threatened languages, Navajo speakers generally do not think their language is ugly or worthless. The ages of the group reacting positively to the mixed code ranged from 19 to 71, including the youngest and oldest respondents in the survey. Only one respondent labeled Bilingual Navajo as bad.

The pool of respondents may be slightly skewed in the survey results; all but two who answered the survey were taking college classes, and one of those two had already taken the same college courses, they all could read and write in English, and may have had some interest in the subject, since they were willing to take a survey administered in Center for Diné Studies classes.[3] I was surprised at the positive attitudes toward Bilingual Navajo, and had actually expected more "puristic" responses about either using "pure" Navajo or "pure" English, and nothing in between. Instead, respondents seem to have positive attitudes toward any use of Navajo language, whether the speakers control it fully or not. This is a very positive response in terms of the likelihood of language survival.

7. Conclusion

Although there are several types of code switching between English and Navajo used at this time in the Navajo Nation, the code mixing type with smaller islands of English

embeddings and the "áshłééh" construction seems to be favored over types which switch only at a clause boundary and do not make stylistic adjustments for the mixed code. Bilingual Navajo is accepted as at best a group solidarity code, and at least a real effort to speak Navajo. Code switching from sentence to sentence and clause to clause may be interpreted simply as a strategy to deal with an insufficient command of English.

Although according to Myers-Scotton (1993, 2002) the "smaller island" code mixing exemplifies a situation of shift which is further advanced toward English and away from Navajo than the scenario in which only whole clauses are alternated from one language to the other, the mixed code itself has a greater chance of maintenance than other forms of code switching, because of its favorable social evaluation.

Chapter 4: Endnotes.

[1]   IRB Protocol # 02B0101

[2] This may have been a confusing question; I wasn't sure if some respondents weren't evaluating an actual increase but rather an increase in use of Bilingual Navajo as compared to that of Standard Navajo. Others may have compared the increase in Bilingual Navajo to the increase in English.

[3]   At Diné College all general education students must also take some of these classes; there was no question addressing the reason for being in the class on the survey, though it was administered during the Summer Session, so there were at least some involved in teaching taking the survey. was administered during the Summer Session, so there were at least some involved in teaching taking the survey.

CHAPTER 5

STRUCTURAL CHANGE AND MIXED CODES

Although intertwined bilingual mixed codes are at least partially defined by their maintenance of the grammar from one language and the lexicon of the other, mixed language grammars are usually slightly different from those of their input sources. This fact does not necessarily predict shift, but it does show that these languages have their own ways of speaking, including their own grammatical rules. Some classic and not-so-classic examples of mixed codes follow, with comparisons to the Bilingual Navajo mixed code.

1. Classic examples of bilingual mixed codes

A. MEDIA LENGUA

Media Lengua was created by fluent Quechua-Spanish bilinguals, in this mixed language the stems or content-carrying parts of the language have been replaced or relexified with Spanish stems, although the grammatical parts of the language are in Quechua (Muysken 1997:352). e.g.:(Muysken 1997:365)

1.   ML: Unu fabur - ta pidi - nga -bu   bini -xu -ni   'I come to ask a favor'

          one   favor-acc. ask-nom.-BEN come-prog.-1

        Quechua: Shuk fabu Ur-da ma`na-nga-bu shamu-xu-ni.

        Spanish: Vengo para pedir un favor

The phonology of Quechua has also been retained in Media Lengua, and Spanish sounds adapted to those of Quechua, e.g.: (Muysken 1997:365)

2.   ML: pidi < Spanish pedir; ML: bini < Spanish vengo

This is similar to the situation in Bilingual Navajo, in which English source words are nativized to fit Navajo phonological patterns, also discussed in Chapter 2.

Media Lengua may "borrow" entire NP's or bare nouns from Spanish, as illustrated below, though bare nouns are much more common. Spanish elements in examples 2 - 8 are in italics. e.g. (Muysken 1997:373):

3. Chi-munda shuk **amu kaballu monta**-shka *tupa* -sha-ga, ni-shka: May-mun ri-xu-ngi?

'in that way **a lord on horse mounted**　　　meeting, said.to.him: Where are you going?

4. *Yo*-ga **awa**-bi *kay* -mu-ni　　　　　　　　'I come after falling into the **water**'

　I-TOP water-LOC fall-CIS-I[1]　　　　　　　　(1997:366)

Media Lengua also has intact VP's from Spanish as well as bare verbs, though once again the bare verb forms are more favored; VP's from Spanish are "fossilized" forms rather than produced or borrowed during present-day speech. e.g.:

5. **no be ki** *no i*- sha-chu *dizi* -n?　　(**VP**)

not see that not go-1FUT-NEG say-3

'don't you see he does not want to go?'　　　　　　　(1997:400)

6. *no* **sabi**-ni-chu *[kin* **bini**-nga]*　　(**v**)

 not **know**-I-NEG [who **come**-3FUT]

'I don't know who will come'　　　　　　　　　　(1997:400)

Adverbial phrases may be borrowed intact from Spanish, again for the most part in fossilized forms; bare adverbs and adjectives may be used in Quechua frames. e.g.:

7. **todabia no byen** *aprendi*-naku-n *porke eskwela*-bi *anda*-naku-n.　(**AP**)

　still not well　　learn-plural-3　because school-LOC go-plural-3

'They don't learn well yet because they go to school'　　　　　(1997:401)

8. *Alla*-bi-ga **entonces**-ga *artu terreno propri tini*-ndu-ga *riku*-ya-na, *no?*　(**adv**)

there-LOC-TOP **then**-TOP　much land　own　have-SUB-TOP rich-become-NOM, no?

'There one could become rich then, having one's own land, no?　　(1997:385)

In the following sentence Quechua morphology, word order, and affective particles are retained in Media Lengua (Muysken 1997:366).

9. ML: kuyi-buk   yirba nuwabi-**shka** 'there turns out to be no grass for the Guinea pigs'

   cavias-ben   grass there-is-not DP (sudden discovery particle)

   Quechua: Kuyi-buk k'iwa illa-**shka**

   Spanish: No hay hierbo para los cuyes

Navajo structural features are similarly retained in Bilingual Navajo, for example affective particles such as the "discovery particle" *lá*. e.g.: (from Canfield 1980:219)

10.   BN: na'iish   crash **lá**   'I am about to pass out'

       1sg.pass out   crash EMPH

       Navajo: naa'iish ch'ááh   **lá**

         imp.1sg-keel over   EMPH

The history of Media Lengua is different from that of Bilingual Navajo, however. The Incas conquered the area of Ecuador in which Media Lengua is spoken in the late 15th century. There was some Quechua in use, carried in from Peru by traders, but it was not the language of the local population. When the Spaniards conquered the area not too long afterwards in 1540 they encouraged the use of Quechua as a lingua franca for all the Indians; Muysken sees this as an effort to detribalize the Indians and acquaint them with the new caste system. There were several varieties of Quechua spoken, but the variety used as the lingua franca acquired prestige among the Indians there and became the valued code. The contact variety of Spanish spoken in that area at that time had features of Andalusian and other minority Spanish features; when the Indian population started to acquire Spanish they adopted those features along with it (Muysken 1997:368).

Media Lengua is more than the sum of its two source components, however; it has new structures not found in either of the source languages, and ways of using the vocabulary unique to the mixed code. Nowadays Media Lengua is spoken as an in-group

language among bilingual speakers who want to express their identity as acculturated Indians, separate from both the rural Quechua and urban Spanish culture (1997:376). It may be the first language for young people, who may later acquire Spanish rather than Standard Quechua (1997:374). It has a low social evaluation, and is called "Little Quechua," as distinct from Standard Quechua (1997:377). It is interesting to note that it is not called "Little Spanish," though the vocabulary is almost all Spanish in origin. This population speaks Spanish to outsiders, Quechua to Indians from the mountains, and Media Lengua among themselves. Other speech communities in the area include Indians who are fluent in Quechua but know little or no Spanish, and those who speak fluent Quechua and fluent but non-standard Spanish (1997:373). Media Lengua speakers identify themselves as an "in between" group: between the urban "blanco" world and the Indian mountains (1997:374). There is an expressive rather than a communicative need being met with this code, as the speakers are all also fluent in Spanish. Relexification, then, is the result of an act of identity in this case, rather than a result of imperfect learning of one or the other code.

Media Lengua is not similar to Spanish-Quechua interlanguage, and it has been shown not to be part of the process of second language learning. Knowing both Spanish and Quechua does not imply understanding of Media Lengua (1997:376). This code contains productive uses of the forms not found in the source languages, and differing uses of the vocabulary. The different use of Spanish words is illustrated below; "entre" is used similarly to the way it is used in Quechua, but with Spanish calques. :e.g.: (Muysken 1997:396)

11.   ML: entre seys - mi ga - nchi   'there are six of us'
               among six - AFF be -1pl

        Quechua: sukta-pura-mi   ga - nchi

<div style="margin-left:2em">six   among-AFF be -1pl</div>

Spanish: somos seis

Among the new ways of using Quechua structure is the comparative structure in Media

Lengua. e.g. (Muysken 1997:397):

12.   ML: Xwan-mi Pedro-da   gana -sha   grande ga-n   'John is taller than Peter'

             John-AFF Peter-acc. win SUB tall   be-3

Although the *gana* < Spanish *ganar* 'win' is substituted for Quechua *yalli* 'surpass' in

Quechua this verb is always uninflected, though in Media Lengua *gana* must be inflected.

Reduplication is used for emphasis in Media Lengua; this is an internal development, and

does not occur in either Spanish or Quechua. e.g.: (Muysken 1997:384)

13.   ML: yo-ga   bin-bin   tixi-y-da   pudi-ni.   'I can weave very well'

          I -TOP well-well weave-inf.ACC can-I

        Spanish: yo puedo tejer muy bien.

14.   ML: anda-y   brebe-brebe   kuzina-ngi.   'go cook quickly'

         walk-IMP quick-quick   cook-2

        Spanish: anda a cocinar breve.

Standard Spanish: anda rápidamente a cocinar (W. Collins)

Similar to the structure Media Lengua, Bilingual Navajo also retains Navajo for the

grammar, and takes lexicon from the colonial "power" language. There are slightly

different ways of using Navajo grammar in Bilingual Navajo from the ways it is used in

Standard Navajo, and repeated forms are also used for emphasis, although reduplication is

not used for this purpose in either Navajo or English. Repetition in discourse is a

recognized Navajo strategy for emphasizing something important in a story (Bartelt 1980)

but the repetition of one word, as in these data, is not typical in Navajo discourse. [2]

Bilingual Navajo is also seen as a variety of Navajo rather than one of English; similar to

calling Media Lengua "Little Quechua" rather than "Little Spanish." This same

relationship holds among Michif speakers; some speakers simply refer to Michif as Cree (Bakker and Papen 1997:303); apparently nobody refers to the language as French.

B. MICHIF

Michif is a mixture of Cree and French; a simplified explanation of its structure would be to say that its noun phrases are derived from French (in bold, below), and its verb phrases are from Cree. This is an oversimplification; in some cases it appears that the French articles are borrowed as part of the French nouns themselves, since Cree demonstratives and other qualifiers are also used in the Michif NP's, and in fact there are some VP's involving French as well (discussion follows). The following sentences illustrate the classic pattern of French NP's and Cree VP's in Michif. e.g.: (Bakker and Papen 1997:316-7)

15. **«n s~ c yr** d-u st-am-a: - su-n.　　'I am making myself a belt'

　　　IAFsg belt　　1-make-BEN-TA-REFL-non3

16. **la munisj~u**　c~I: kI-t-aja:-na:n　sI-papa:-ma: ci:-jahk?

the ammunition Q. 2-t-have-1pl.INCL COMP-about-hunt-1pl.INCL.
'Do we have enough ammunition to go hunting?'

17. papIkwa:w **lI l~ z**　　　　　　　　　'the cloth is rough'

　be.rough-AI.3 DAMsg cloth　　　　　　　　(1997:338)

18. **lI za:br**　mIçsIkItI-w　　　　　　　'the tree is big'

DAMsg tree　be.big-AI.3　　　　　　　　(1997:338)

The interpretation and use of the French articles in the Michif NP structures are different from that of French, and also from that of Cree, since that language has no definite articles. Most quantifiers require a French article between the quantifier and noun (1997:329), it is possible that the "l" of the article has been reinterpreted as an initial consonant in sentence 20, e.g.:

19.　~ p ci br~ **la sup**　　　　　　　'a bit of soup'　　　　　(1997:329)

20.　ki:-micimin - e:w　　a:tiht **lar z~a.** 'he kept part of the money' (1997:316)

This kind of reanalysis is found with the "n" of the indefinite article as well. e.g.:

21 . **zI** rispek mu **nuk**.　　　　　　　'I respect my uncle' (1997:337)

22. j~ k pe:jak ~ **nor~a z** dawe:jIm-a:w.　　　'I want only one orange' (1997:329)

　　　Other grammatical words, such as demonstratives and question words are usually from Cree. The Cree distinction in animacy for the demonstratives is retained in this code, even in the NP construction, which is the component of the language with the most French input. e.g.: (1997:328)

23.　awa　**lI gars~u**　　　　　'this boy'

　　　Dem.(animate) art. boy

24.　u:ma　**la bw« t**　　　　　'this box'

　　　Dem.(inanimate)　art. box

Michif has some prepositions from French, and some postpositions from Cree, sometimes even in the same sentence.[3]

25.　**d~a lI frij** uhci　　　　'out of the fridge'

　　　in art. fridge from

Compare Standard Cree: tahkascikan-ihk ohci　　　　　(1997:334)

　　　　　　　　　fridge　　loc from

26. utahk **d~a lI　sa:r**　　　　　'behind the car'

　behind in the car

Compare Standard Cree: otahk ota:p:na:sk-ohk　　　　　(1997:335)

　　　　　　　　behind car-LOC

There are variations in usage, however, and "the degree to which French and Cree are used varies from community to community and from person to person" (Bakker and Papen 1997:306). Although there are mostly French NP's and mostly Cree VP's, some Cree NP's and French VP's may also be found. Although there is variation in structure in any language, Michif speakers tend to use more analytical structures where Cree speakers would use synthetic ones (Bakker and Papen 1997:317). There is also a French copula construction, some fossilized French verb expressions, e.g. "all~u" from French 'allons'

and "sa pr~a" from 'se prend' and several productive verb construction strategies which

allow for insertion of a French adjective or noun. The following sentence uses a Cree verb meaning 'make' as an auxiliary. e.g. (Bakker and Papen 1997:319):

27. lI   zali-ihke:-w   s/he is decorating him/her

   art.pretty.3rd.makes   from French "joli"

Another strategy for incorporating French words into Cree verb frames is by using a French noun and a Cree verb stem meaning'be' as an auxiliary. e.g. (1997:318):

28. ti suji   la-bu- Iw-an-wa.

your.pl shoe DAFsg-mud-BE-4-pl

'your shoes are muddy'

There are a few French verbs in fossilized forms used in Michif, e.g.: (1997:320)

29. i va dispary   'he will disappear'

30. i-l-a-noz-amyzi   'he amused us'

31. sa-s-akord pa   'they don't get along'

To actually borrow a French verb into Michif requires a nominalizing frame, however, using the French infinitive form and a preposed and postposed "le." e.g.: (1997:318)

32. lI   p«:r ki: lI   m~ud.

DAMsg priest PAST-DAMsg-bless-INF-TA.3->3' DAMsg people

     The Michif auxiliation strategy using the verb 'to make' is very similar to the "´áshłééh" construction in Bilingual Navajo, except that the construction in Bilingual Navajo has been extended to allow for the insertion of English verbs as well. Adjectives only exist as French input inMichif, as Cree itself does not have adjectives as a grammatical class of words. This is also true for Navajo, which has a class of neuter verbs corresponding to adjectives in English. The mechanism for the transfer of an element from one language to another in Michif is similar to that of Bilingual Navajo; although an element may be taken from one language and inserted into another, it may do so only into the appropriate "frame" in the receiving language.

     There are also French-based AP's in Michif, composed of a French preposition and a French or English adjective. e.g.(1997:332):

33.   ci:stastam si par¿l ~a grus.   'she speaks in an affected way'

pick.TI.3->4 POSS-3pl word in big

34. ~a r¿f pi:kI skwe:-w   'he talks in a rough way'

  in rough speak-AI.3

     The speech community of Michif represents a different population from either the Cree population or the French Canadian population. The Michif speech community was made up of the descendants of people who had one Indian and one French parent, usually a French-speaking fur-trader or trapper and an American Indian Cree-speaking mother (Bakker 1994:14). Apparently the Métis, or "mixed" children of these unions identified themselves more with each other than with either the Cree or French Canadian population. and this bilingual code was developed and maintained by this group. Now speakers of Michif may identify themselves as any kind of Indian or mixture of Indian and European.

The specific mechanism involved in the development of this language was probably code-mixing, in which both languages are used by bilingual speakers interchangeably. This suggests that the children in question were raised speaking the languages of both parents; although the way they used them together was their own, they had access to fully developed varieties of both (Bakker 1997:301). There were varieties of spoken Canadian French at that time which correspond to the French elements of Michif, and there are varieties of Cree which correspond to the Cree elements of this code (1997:301).

Many phonological rules of Cree have been extended to Michif, such as vowel raising of [o] and [e] to [U] and [I] respectively, and sibilant harmony, in which sibilants within a word are required to "agree" in the features of "hushing" and "hissing" so that if there is an [s] or [z] within the word, all sibilants are realized as [s] or [z] or, conversely, if [s] or [z] appear in a word, all sibilants must be realized as [s] or [z]. e.g.: (Bakker:1997:302)

35.   [sez] 'chaise'   'chair'

36.   [sava z] ~ [savaz]   'savage'

The same kind of retrograde sibilant assimilation is found in Navajo, for example the 1st person possessive morpheme is [sI] unless the word following the possessive contains an [s] or [z], in which case the possessive morpheme is realized as [sI]. e.g.:

37.   shimá   'my mother'

       shideezhí   'my younger sister'

       sik'is   'my same-sex sibling' (colloquial 'friend')

       siziiz   'my bag'

This rule also applies in noun formation involving compounding, for example the word for 'mule' is pronounced [dzaanééz], although it means 'long ears' from "jaa + nééz" ('ear + long). Not all bilingual speakers apply this rule to English lexicon in Bilingual Navajo or to

Navajo English, but forms such as [dz s] 'just' and [dzi:z s] 'Jesus' are often heard.

Although there are many similarities in Media Lengua, Bilingual Navajo, and Michif, there are also structural differences reflecting their having arisen at different stages of shift. Michif borrows entire NP's rather than individual nouns; in addition a few verbs are borrowed in VP frames made of French verbs and Cree auxiliaries. In Bilingual Navajo NP's, VP's with an auxiliary, AP's, and bare nouns may be borrowed, and in Media Lengua all of these plus bare verb and adverb forms. The following table illustrates the differences in structures, corresponding to degrees of shift.

borrowed:	NP	AP	VP	N	A	V
Media Lengua	(√)	(√)	(√)	√	√	√
Bilingual N.	(√)	(√)	√aux	√	√	-
Michif	√	√	√aux	-	-	-

Figure 7: Degrees of Shift

Thus, Media Lengua has some fossilized Spanish NP's, AP's, and VP's, but the language mixing has generally taken place at the word rather than the phrasal level. In Media Lengua the noun phrase appears to be borrowed intact; some adverbial phrases and a few verb phrases as well are incorporated into the language. Bilingual Navajo exemplifies a shift stage between these two; although verbs are borrowed as bare forms, they must be borrowed into a VP using a Navajo auxiliary. Bare noun and bare adjective forms from English are used in Navajo frames; thus structurally Bilingual Navajo resembles Media Lengua more closely than it does Michif. Michif and Bilingual Navajo share the auxiliation strategy for incorporating verbs, though it is much more productive in Bilingual Navajo. In this way Michif and Bilingual Navajo are also similar.

Bilingualism in English among Michif speakers has is own problems: now the main threat to Michif is neither French nor Cree but English, which is spoken by all Native and European people and by the Métis when they are speaking with non-Metis people. They

90

see Michif as their own ethnic language, and relatively few still speak Cree (Bakker 1997:303).

Michif and Cree are not mutually intelligible, and not even fluent speakers of both French and Cree can understand Michif right away (1997:303). This is all very similar to the linguistic situation among Bilingual Navajo speakers, but the social and demographic situation is different: Bilingual Navajo speakers represent the SAME population as those who speak Standard Navajo, there is no ethnic identification which goes along with speaking the mixed code. Bilingual Navajo is also threatened by English; the difference is that English is one of the input languages to Bilingual Navajo, but it is not an input language to Michif.

Although there are structural and historical similarities among these codes, their degree of endangerment is quite different. Both Spanish and Quechua are thriving languages and have large speech communities outside the Media Lengua area, the Quechua element can be reinforced by use of the Standard. Some young people are learning Media Lengua or "Little Quechua" as a first language, but this does not affect the monolingual Quechua speaking population, which also has many children learning Quechua as a first language. Spanish is also obviously not a threatened language in the world, though there are some areas in which it is in decline.[4] With Michif, however, the situation is different. For generations, Indians of various degrees of Indian-ness have learned the mixed variety rather than the "pure" Cree, and Cree itself is in decline. Although French itself is of course thriving, it is spoken much less in Western Canada than it was at the time of contact; Michif is threatened now not by Cree or French but by the dominant English. Bilingual Navajo, along with Standard Navajo, is also threatened by English.

C. MEDNYJ ALEUT

Another bilingual code used to express a particular identity is Mednyj Aleut, or Copper Island Aleut. In a situation similar to that of the Métis speakers, the speakers of this

code were called "Creoles" as children of Russian and Aleut parents, usually Russian trapper or fur-trader men and Aleut women. But the language was maintained for its communicative facility between the two peoples as well, and perhaps for this reason this language is not used anymore; the members of this speech community can now all communicate in Russian (Thomason 1997:453).

Russians and Aleuts both moved to the Commander islands for purposes of trade; this was not "home territory" for either group. Mednyj Aleut was spoken between the two groups and by Creoles as a step between Aleut and Russian; it had mostly negative identificational status, as the Creoles were looked down upon by both Russians and Aleuts. Aleuts as well as Creoles who worked for Russian companies and those who became Christian were encouraged to learn Russian (Thomason 1997:455).

Most of the phonology in Mednyj Aleut is from Aleut, though it was simplified in forming the new language. "Pure" Aleut phonological features, such as the distinction between uvulars and velar sounds, are disappearing, and distinctive Russian phonological features, such as palatalization, are being maintained or increasing (Thomason 1997:456). Structurally this code may be compared to Michif, in that whole classes of words are identified as being derived from one language, and other whole segments of the language are seen as derived from the other language; it therefore also probably arose from code-switching behavior among fluent bilinguals. The finite verbs, including their morphology and pronoun system, are chiefly from Russian; noun inflection, derivational morphology, and non-finite verb inflection are from Aleut (Thomason 1997:457). e.g.: Russian morphemes are in bold. (Thomason 1997:458)

38.   **eta moj**   asxinu-   'this is my daughter'
      this 1st.poss.   daughter-poss.

39.   hína   tayágu-x   sisaxta:-**l**   'this man is lost'

this   man-ABS   lose-PAST

Although Thomason claims that imperfect learning played no role in the formation
of Mednyj Aleut, as there is very little distortion in either the Aleut or the Russian
components (Thomason 1997:462), the speakers asked about their language seemed
unaware of the Russian component of their language, though they knew their variety was
different from other varieties of Aleut. (Thomason 1997:450) This code represents a
slightly different situation from that of Michif and from that of Media Lengua. Media
Lengua speakers seemed to be aware of how their own language was different from that of
Standard Quechua, and to value their language as expressing their status as perhaps "above'
the Mountain Indians. Mednyj Aleut Creoles seemed to value their identity as "between"
only negatively, though they were rewarded above "pure" Aleuts by the Russians with better
jobs, privileges, etc. Although to form a bilingual code with so many features of each
language intact would seem to imply a high degree of bilingualism, and at various points the
Russian men were encouraged to actually marry and settle down with the Aleut and Creole
women, the ethnic identification factor may not have been as high as with the other codes,
and the communicative factors may have played a larger role, as Russians were much more
likely to learn this variety of Aleut than the non-mixed variety. It is likely that the fluently
bilingual children raised in a home with both Russian and Aleut may have chosen to speak
Russian outside of the home.

Although Bilingual Navajo speakers are the same population group as those who
speak Standard Navajo, this code as well was created to identify with a particular social
group, though at this time its usefulness as a self-identity code is even more important for
those who don't speak Standard Navajo. Although many Navajos still speak varieties of
Navajo, many American Indians from other tribes prefer to use English outside of the home,
and have developed an Indian variety of English to use instead of a mixed variety of a tribal
language.[5] Tribal groups originally located further East in the US were in contact with

93

English speakers far earlier than were the Navajos and other American Indian groups from the Southwest; for that reason their languages have suffered much greater loss. English is now understood by almost everybody, and it is the default code for communicating between speakers from different American Indian tribes.

D. MA'A

Ma'a is a bilingual mixed language spoken in Africa, spoken by the Mbugu people. Throughout their history these people have had to protect themselves and their cattle from the Masai, Pare, and other tribes, until they were forced to leave their ancestral homeland in a Nilo-Saharan area and move among Bantu-speaking peoples. They are determined to resist cultural assimilation (Thomason 1997:472); to that end they have maintained vocabulary from their originally Cushitic language, while the basic structure of their language has become Bantu. e.g. (non-Bantu components are italicized):

(example from Mous 1994:176 in Winford 2003:195)

40.   hé-*ló*   i-*ʔazé* i-wé   áa-*sé*   va-*maʔa*   na v-sitá   na

      have   day   one   1:PAST-call   Mbugu   with   Shambaa with

va-*ʔariyé* vá-*so*   vá-zé-m-hand-í-ya   ma-*gerú*   *kuʔu*

  Pare   2:SUBJ-go   2:SUBJ-IT-01-plant-APL-F   bananas   his

'On a certain day, he called the Mbugu, Shambaa and Pare people to go and plant his banana trees'

It is not known exactly how Ma'a was formed. One hypothesis is that of a Matrix Language turnover, from Cushitic to Bantu. Other possible scenarios have been proposed; one is that the language was originally Bantu and borrowed Cushitic lexicon in order to form a special speech register, the other scenarios involve greater or lesser amounts of code switching and borrowing of Bantu language components in the process of shift, with various strategies for maintaining the language for contrastive self-identification (Bakker

and Mous 1994:198). Although the Navajos are also resisting ethnic assimilation, they were only forced to leave their homeland temporarily (see chapter 1 for more information on *The Long Walk*). As these codes may all be seen as arising at different stages of shift from one language to another, Bilingual Navajo can be seen as having arisen at an earlier stage than that of Ma'a.

2. Diglossic bilingualism and mixed codes

Navajo and English have been described as being in a diglossic relationship in Navajo society (Slate 2001:394), but in fact this is not true. Field (2004) claims that the myth of stable diglossia among the Navajo to be "even a fallacy perpetuated by some within the Navajo community who would like it to be true" (2004:ppc). She describes the situation among some Navajo families as having gone from monolingualism in Navajo to monolingualism in English within a few generations. It would be an ideal scenario if Navajo were always spoken at home and English were only spoken at work and school: in such a setting the language would have a better chance at survival than it probably has, since languages may be maintained in diglossic relationships for centuries. In a diglossic relationship there is generally separation of the codes by function; in the cases observed in which Navajo and English were used alternately the switch was triggered by language of the interlocutor, not by function. Navajos still switch codes according to interlocutor today, and Navajo language activists encourage the use of Navajo in all domains, not just at home and around the "kitchen table" settings. Although during boarding school days the students spoke mostly English at school and only Navajo at home, this was because their parents did not understand English. Contrary to the usual historical progression in a diglossic language relationship, in which the "L" language slowly gains on the "H" language, English is in fact gaining in all domains of Navajo life, and Navajo is being affected in the contact relationship more than English. It may be possible to create a diglossic relationship between two languages, but it does not yet exist in the Navajo Nation. The relationship

95

between English and Navajo is parallel to that of Spanish and Guaraní, and has its roots in the colonial settlement of the US by Europeans, not in a functional separation of "H" and "L" codes.

On the other hand, in a situation of typical diglossia, both the non-prestige, or low "L" language, as well as the prestige code, or high "H" language are evaluated as representative of the speech community involved, either because they are perceived as being related varieties of the same language, as in the case of the German-speaking area of Switzerland, the Arabic-speaking communities of the Middle East and Northern Africa, and in Greece among speakers who use both Dhimotiki and Katharévousa, or, in the case of the diglossic relationship between Yiddish and Hebrew, because they are culturally rather than linguistically related (Ferguson 1959, Fishman 1967, Hudson 1991).

Although the language situations in diglossic speech communities tend to be very stable, maintaining the "H" and "L" relationship between the two languages for centuries, the "L" varieties may eventually take over areas and domains in which only "H" varieties were spoken previously, in these situations the "H" varieties themselves also do not survive unchanged. Particularly in the lexicon many "H" features "seep" down into the vocabulary of the succeeding "L" language variety. This has been shown to have happened in Latin in competition with Greek, in European vernaculars in competition with Medieval Latin, in Dhimotiki in competition with Katharévousa, and in English in competition with Norman French (Kahane 1979:193). In each case, even after the "H" language fades from use, it lives on in the vocabulary of the "L" and occasionally in other aspects of the language as well.

In the functional division between Standard New High German and the vernacular Swiss dialects there is competition for domains. This is seen as not only a threat to the Swiss population's command of Standard High German, but also to the structural integrity of the Swiss dialect (Voser 1985:11). The vernacular dialects are taking on domains of all

96

kinds of mass media, particularly television talk shows (Schiffman 1991:176). As a consequence of this competition, the Swiss German surviving at the expense of Modern High German in many domains where the "H" used to dominate is now being criticized about its form. There is some overlapping or "mistakes" among school children, who attach High German sentence structure to Swiss German sentences, and there is also the impression by many that all originally Swiss German words are being replaced with Swiss German pronunciations of High German ones, e.g. "Anke" > "Butter." Although Swiss German is now being spoken sometimes even in the University classroom, which would have been seen as impossible fifty years ago, the Swiss German heard in the classroom is different from that of fifty years ago; if it had somehow remained untouched by the "H" language during that time, all the new words required in the domain of a University lecture would have had to be borrowed or calqued from somewhere, or else coined intentionally on the spot, with the translation in Standard German in the professor's mind. It is understandable and expected that all the new words needed for the expanding domains of the "L" language will be borrowed from the lexicon of the "H," as a natural source to turn to, as it is also controlled to some degree by all speakers of the "L."

A European example *not* involving a "standard" versus "dialect" of the same language is the case of the "a la mode" period in German. Although French did not quite achieve the status of "H" language in Germany, it had been approaching that position when German regained prestige as the standard language. German became the "language of the people" under the influence of the Enlightenment, and Goethe advocated its use as being more "natural" for the German people, but there was still a large retention of French words, not only words for politics, art, religion, and commerce, but also words for daily life, referring to the home, garden, cooking, clothes, and furniture (Kahane 1979:195). Code switching can start out within this kind of borrowing framework, in which words associated with new elements of a language perceived as representing a "higher" speech community

are borrowed in, without affecting the structure of the original language. At the time of first contact between Navajos and "Americans," this was also likely to have been the case; as Navajos experienced new items associated with Anglo culture they may have borrowed English words. As the level of bilingualism among the Navajos was very low at that time, there very few English words borrowed into Navajo. Young states: "Despite several centuries of contact between the Navajo and other linguistic groups, and despite widespread cultural borrowing across that same span of time, the number of loan words that has entered the Navajo language, historically, has been very small" (Young and Morgan 1987:7). He lists only twenty-seven loan words borrowed before the time Navajos became bilingual in English, and those words are mostly borrowed from Spanish (1987:7).

5. Mixed codes in Europe

Mixed languages formed by bilingual speakers in contact are not only found in exotic combinations such as the European and American Indian language mixtures discussed earlier, but may also be found in which the two input languages are not structurally very different   Although their mixed structures may not seem as striking, mixtures of closely related European languages are formed in a way similar to those mixtures whose language input structures are very different from each other.

A. FRANCE

"Francitan" is what the mixed spoken language in the Provence has been called (Mazel 1982). As Occitan is spoken less and less, most of the population would be considered monolingual in French. However, the French spoken in the traditional Occitan-speaking area is structurally as well as phonetically different from the French spoken in Paris; elements of Occitan survive in the "intermediate" code (Thomin 1993).

(e.g.: from Mazel 1982:98-106)

Occitan	"Francitan"	French
41. La platana se desfuelha.	La platane se défueille.	Le platane perd ses feuilles.

42. Aquo m'agrada pas.   Ca m'agrade pas.   Ca ne me plait pas.

43. Te cerca de pertot.   Il te cherche de partout.   Il te cherche partout.

In example 41. the morphology of the Occitan verb 'to lose leaves' is combined with the French word "feuilles" ('leaves') to form the Francitan verb "se défueille." In example 42, the Occitan verb 'to please' is conjugated as if it were French, without the -a 3rd person singular morpheme expected in Occitan, and in example 43 the obligatory French pronoun is added to the Occitan sentence to form Francitan. Although this mixture has arisen originally in the contact between two language groups, the French speakers and the Occitan speakers, the mixing is a characteristic of Occitan speakers only. This can be compared to the Bilingual Navajo situation, in which it is only Navajo speakers and not English speakers who use the mixed code. The social situation of Bilingual Navajo can also be compared to that of Occitan; there, too, the minority language is viewed as an "adult" code, and teenagers may use it more rather than less as they get older (La Font 1971).

In the following example the contact is between two varieties spoken by the same speech community; the diglossic situation requires command of both German and Swiss-German according to domain, but the contact with German is in "high" registers such as school and government, not with native German speakers.

B. SWITZERLAND

In the diglossic German-speaking area of Switzerland there are not only the "High" Modern Standard German and the "Low" Swiss German spoken according to socially-determined function in Swiss society, but also an intermediate variety called "Swiss High German." This is not an example of contact between two speech communities, but between the two varieties of German available to each speaker. Its phonology reflects that of Swiss German, and some lexical and grammatical differences between the written code

99

and the spoken are maintained. "Schwyzer Hochdütsch" is characterized as an uneducated way to speak, nonetheless it is heard among speakers who may not have a perfect command of the written standard. e.g.:

44.   Swiss German: dr Maa wo gschaffe het

45.   Modern High German: der Mann, der gearbeitet hat

46.   Schwyzer Hochdütsch: dr Mann, welch geschaffen hat

Sentence 12 illustrates the Swiss relative pronoun "wo," which has a single form in all cases. In sentence 12 the German relative pronoun, which is declined according to case, number, and gender, is shown here in the nominative, singular masculine form. Sentence 13 shows the Schwyzer Hochdütsch form of the relative pronoun, which also does not change. The verb 'to work' is "arbeiten" in German, "schaffen" is Schwyzerdütsch; the Schwyzerdütsch word is used with German past participle morphology to form "geschaffen" in Schwyzerhochdütsch.

CONCLUSION

Thus, mixing is possible in the mind of any bilingual, and what is in the mind may come forth as speech, whether the codes are typologically distant or close. Although there are constraints on mixing, or these mixed codes would not be so ordered, as they clearly are. But constraints are not absolute barriers, and although it is more difficult to borrow some words into certain structures than others, it is possible. Structural changes are also evident: in Media Lengua there are different uses of "Standard" verb forms from those in Quechua, there are different expressions, and there is reduplication for emphasis. In Michif the structure and use of words are slightly different from those of Standard Cree, and in the between case of Bilingual Navajo the different use of the áshłééh construction exemplifies the difference between its grammar and that of Standard Navajo.

Mixing also occurs in bilingual speech communities in which the languages are not as typologically different from each other as the ones discussed above. Even in situations of societal diglossia the languages may mix in the minds of their speakers.

Chapter 5: Endnotes

[1] "Cislocative" morpheme on non-movement verbs indicates here that the subject comes after some action. (Muysken 1997:366)

[2] See Chapter 3 for description of Bilingual Navajo.

[3] This is also seen in Bilingual Navajo, see further discussion in Chapter 3.

[4] e.g.: The Loss of Spanish in Lorain County, Ohio. (see Ramos-Pellicia 2004)

[5] See discussion of American Indian English and Navajo English in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 6

LANGUAGES IN CONTACT

"Language contact phenomena involve the transfer of substantial material...they can always be explained as the imitation, in one language, of some linguistic trait of another. In the case of decay, however, we are not dealing with transfer in any sense, but with downright loss leading to a heavy expression deficit" (Sasse 1992:14).

The phenomenon of language contact has been observed as long as people speaking different languages have been in contact with each other, and there are many linguists who have investigated the historical background and linguistic consequences of this contact, e.g.: Lehiste 1988, Thomason and Kaufman 1988, Spears and Winford 1997, Thomason 1997 and 2001, Hock 1986, Hock and Joseph 1996, Winford 2003, etc. Languages arising as a result of people from different speech communities speaking with each other have been investigated regarding the languages' own structures, their histories, their uses in society, and their relationships to "standard" languages. The structural differences between creoles, pidgins, and other contact languages and languages passed on via "regular" transmission have been shown to be mostly due to differences in the histories of their contacts, and due to which kinds of languages have served as input material to any particular code, rather than resulting from the act of mixing itself. As defined by Thomason (1997), "a contact language is a language that arises as a direct result of language contact and that comprises linguistic material which cannot be traced back primarily to a single source language" (1997:3). Contact languages are seen to differ from other languages in this

regard, as their histories may provide *several* background input sources for their phonology, structure, and lexicon. Although contact languages are seen as unique in the fact that they each have at least two "parent languages," in fact, the term "contact language" can probably be used in many more contexts than it generally is; most languages have some history of contact as well as some history of genetic inheritance. "...foreign interference in grammar as well as in lexicon is likely to have occurred in the histories of most languages" (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:3).

Although much of the analysis of the different varieties of contact languages has concentrated on pidgins and creoles, there is a third type of contact language categorized as a "bilingual mixed code" (Thomason 1996:1). Bilingual Navajo can be categorized as one of these languages, and may be compared with other, better-known bilingual mixed languages in terms of its structure, history, and use in the speech community.

There may be some structural similarities found among different bilingual mixed languages, but these similarities are coincidental, and not more striking than those among other unrelated languages. If the unmixed source languages with which to compare the mixed varieties did not exist, the degree to which mixing has occurred would not be known; in fact, without knowledge of the unmixed varieties it would not even be possible to ascertain that the formation of the code involved mixing at all. Although the input origins of these languages are often very clear, bilingual mixed codes are better analyzed as new creations than as "dialects" of the source languages. However, it is also shortsighted to ignore the linguistic relationship of a bilingual mixed language with its known input languages, particularly when analyzing the structure of the mixed language, and when observing possible changes in language choice in the speech community. Although bilingual mixed languages generally arise in periods of shift from one language to another, they are not merely symptoms of shift. According to Winford, these languages may "involve such extreme restructuring and/or such pervasive mixture of elements from more

103

than one language that they cannot be considered cases of either maintenance or shift in the strict sense of those terms" (Winford 2003:18). The way bilingual mixed codes are created, chiefly by means of code-switching by bilingual speakers, are similar across many different kinds of language mixtures, but the structural results reflect the original source languages, not a universal "mixed code structure." Perhaps the most salient features these codes have in common have to do with their social background: the establishment and maintenance of self-identification usually plays a role in their development, and contact languages often seem to share a low social evaluation.

1. Bilingual mixed codes defined and categorized

Thomason has defined the bilingual mixed language as a language created in a two-language contact situation involving widespread bilingualism in at least one of the speech communities. The language creation usually shows little simplification in either of the language components, and the components of the two input languages are usually still recognizable as such (Thomason 1997b:80). These descriptions characterize the Navajo-English bilingual code, which shows the same characteristics as other, better documented bilingual mixed languages, including the maintenance of the native syntactic structure and phonology, its socially determined usage, and its low evaluation among its speakers. Both Standard Navajo and Standard English may be considered "better" languages than Bilingual Navajo in the Navajo speech community, though this opinion may be changing.[1]

Winford also uses a social development scenario in his definition of the bilingual mixed code, explaining that these languages often arise in settings in which two different ethnic groups are in contact; bilingualism leads to the mixture of the two languages. These languages represent neither maintenance of one or the other input languages as such, nor shift to another language; rather they are languages of a new creation. In these situations, the components of each language may remain recognizable as from one or the other input language (2003:18-19). Winford thus distinguishes language "intertwining," in which the

parts of the input languages remain mostly distinct and like the same components in the input languages, from languages with "extreme structural replacement," whose linguistic components have become mixed themselves. (Winford 2003:173).

Thomason categorizes bilingual mixed languages by socio-historical characteristics and linguistic processes involved in their formation; the two categories that emerge are as follows (from Thomason 1995 in Winford 2003:172):

Type I is characterized by "persistent ethnic group resisting assimilation...overwhelming cultural pressure from dominant language...[and] gradual change" and is identified by "massive" to "near total" replacement of the L1 grammar. This type is exemplified by Kormakiti Arabic, Asia Minor Greek, Ma'a, and Anglo-Romani.

Type II is characterized as "newly emerging social group...abrupt creation, sometimes within a single generation" and is identified in its "clear compartmentalization of components from the two sources" and structural components preserved intact from the source languages. Examples of this type are Media Lengua, Michif, and Mednyj Aleut. Bilingual Navajo fits into Type II more easily than into Type I in Thomason's categories, though Bilingual Navajo speakers are not really a separate social group from other Navajos.

Bakker correlates sociological attributes of the speech community in his four-way analysis of possible social situations and purportedly predictable outcomes (from Bakker 1994:24 in Winford 2003:174):

Category I: In this model the social situation is characterized by a history of ex-nomads needing a secret language; the language is formed during the process of shift from an L1 to an L2; in this case the L2 contributes the grammar of the bilingual mixed code, and the L1 contributes the lexicon. Examples of this type are Anglo-Romani, Caló, Callahuaya, and others.

Category II: Bakker's type II category is characterized by a history of mixed-marriage households with immigrant men and local women, the languages are identified as having the

grammar from L1 and the lexicon from L2. Examples of this type are Michif, Island Carib, Cindo, and others.

A. social setting	B. language description
I. "secret language" scenario	L2 grammar, L1 lexicon
II. "mixed households"	L1 grammar, L2 lexicon

Bakker's four-way distinction does not account for every intertwined bilingual mixed code, however; Media Lengua fits the linguistic but not the socio-historical description of Bakker's category II; the same categorization applies to Bilingual Navajo; the ethnicity of the speakers is usually not mixed, but the grammar is from the indigenous language, and more and more lexicon is being drawn from English.

Because of the discrepancies involved in categorizing these languages according to their social histories, Winford categorizes bilingual mixed codes according to their linguistic features only; he divides those whose grammars resemble situations of convergence from the "intertwined" languages whose input language components can still be recognized (Winford 2003: 206). In this way Ma'a, Anglo-Romani, Media Lengua, and Bilingual Navajo may be categorized together, as they are all intertwined mixtures, even though the relationship of originally L2 structure to originally L1 lexicon in Ma'a and Anglo-Romani is historically the reverse of the L1 structure to L2 lexicon relationship in Media Lengua and Bilingual Navajo.

The vehicle for the creation of bilingual mixed codes is apparently code-switching behavior, first with only a word or two borrowed here and there for items associated with the culture and speakers of the "foreign" language, then more and more different kinds of words are borrowed in as speakers control both codes interchangeably. Bilingual mixed languages are often seen as one step in the process of language shift, often away from the "matrix" language and toward the embedded language in a "matrix turnover" (Myers-Scotton 1998: chapter 3). In the actual process of shift the bilingual code will often be

accompanied by other symptoms of reduction, for example simplification of the grammar and phonology.

A bilingual code may survive as a legitimate language if it serves a social use, for example in the function of an identity marker. In that scenario the bilingual mixture may be maintained without further simplification of either of the language components. If there is no valued social function for the mixed code, the bilingual mixture may mix further, taking not only more words from the embedded language but also features of its morphology, phonology, and syntax. Myers-Scotton (2002) categorizes the different types of bilingual mixed codes as having "fossilized" at different stages of shift from one language to another. In her model, each type is characterized by the degree of Matrix Language turnover it has undergone (2002:271). Although all bilingual mixed codes may be seen as one unified type of phenomenon, the "degree of turnover" model explains the differences between languages whose Matrix language has shifted from that of the L1 to that of the L2, like Ma'a and Anglo-Romani, and languages like Media Lengua, in which the matrix language is still the original L1, in this case, Quechua. Winford (2003) explains their differences as being due to their arising at different stages of language shift, rather than shifting to a certain point and remaining there (2003:170).

This small difference in analysis is important in examining the data. If these languages represent various stages in the process of shift, after a certain length of time we may expect them to shift more. Both the Winford and Myers-Scotton models put Media Lengua, Bilingual Navajo, and Michif into a continuum of shift stages: while Michif reportedly has mostly only noun phrases from the French L2, meaning it signifies the least shift; Bilingual Navajo has more nouns but some verbs from English as well; Media Lengua has almost all content words taken from Spanish, implying the greatest degree of shift. In fact, though, the fact that Quechua and Spanish are both vital languages and are not threatened, means that Media Lengua does not necessarily have to shift any more; the input

107

languages to this code are still readily available, and speakers have access to whichever input language they choose. Although the speech community does not need access to the source languages of its code to retain an identifiable and vital language of its own, having access to both of the source languages provides access to increased vocabulary and flexibility of expression. Media Lengua arose sometime between the 1920's and 1940's (Muysken 1997:374) among fluent bilingual Quechuas and is still spoken to this day. The language may remain fossilized as it is and suffer only the usual internal changes to which all languages are susceptible, or it may further "borrow" components from either source language. In the case of Bilingual Navajo, though, one input language is much more available than the other; all Navajos are exposed to English, though not all are exposed to Navajo, so there is an extreme likelihood of further shift.[2] Among Michif speakers the contact situation has changed: Michif speakers are not exposed to either French or Cree on a regular basis, but to English. Michif as we know it has been maintained with many French NP's and few French VP's, but it cannot be described as being maintained in the same kind of shift continuum as Media Lengua and Bilingual Navajo, because it is no longer in contact with its input languages. It was probably formed before 1840 and had many native language speakers at the beginning of the 20th century , but it is now in decline (Bakker and Papen 1997). Analyzing these languages as being in various stages of shift in which the codes are fossilized *while their speakers are shifting* from one language to another is therefore unlikely; understanding them as *having arisen* at various stages of shift is more explanatory.

2. Shift

Though even in the cases of structural simplification and change a language cannot be said to have shifted until the "tip" occurs, after which point in time it is almost too late to switch back; it is also possible for morphology, phonology, and syntax to change rapidly from internal causes alone.[3] A pattern of shift in one bilingual mixture does not predict

108

shift, convergence, or even borrowing between two other languages with the same types of structural differences (Dixon 1997:27); these changes occur according to the social circumstances of the speech communities in contact. However, some patterns in mixing have been observed. Winford generalizes many factors into three categories, and finds the following constraints (2003:92):

I. constraints based on congruence of morphological structure

II. constraints based on transparency

III. constraints based on functional considerations

In other words, it is easier to borrow from one language to another if there is a one-to-one correspondence between forms, if it is easy to separate the morpheme in question from the surrounding sentence, and if there is a corresponding functional gap in the recipient language. Though a lack of parallel structures may serve as a constraint to mixing, it not an absolute barrier. Navajo and English share very few parallel grammatical structures, however one particular structure was found in Navajo which would allow for the insertion of English verbs and adjectives: the "áshłééh" construction. However many English nouns are borrowed, as there are neither functional nor transparency constraints in placing them in Navajo speech. English nouns are usually found in "bare" forms, therefore the morphological congruency constraint is also not an issue. Earlier in the history of English-Navajo contact borrowing between the two languages was considered impossible; what has changed is not the respective structures of the languages but the level of bilingualism in the speech community.

Although many have proposed structural limits on all types of mixing, including code switching and borrowing, proposing the frequency of bound morphemes as a possible constraining factor (Dixon 1997:25), the main constraint seems to be the attitude towards mixing itself, and in fact people's attitudes toward borrowing change along with their languages, and attitudes determine maintenance or loss of any code more than any other

factor. According to Dixon, speech communities may be "averse to borrowing from other languages for a period of some hundreds or thousands of years, but then it may change and begin borrowing in profusion." He offers as an example the case of Japanese, whose written history shows periods of both scarce and plentiful borrowing, and of Hungarian, whose speakers used to borrow freely but later only coined new words from within the Hungarian lexicon (Dixon 1997:27).

3. Outcomes of societal bilingualism

Often contact languages are formed in situations in which one language is gaining and the other(s) losing speakers. As a language is spoken by more L2 speakers than L1 speakers in a speech community, and in situations in which the L2 speakers speak the language with each other rather than with L1 speakers, a certain amount of change or "interference" is to be expected. Although contact languages are generally evaluated as non-prestige languages by their speakers as well as by speakers of "standard" languages, in some contact settings they are often the only code in which speakers can communicate with each other. In some other cases in which one or the other language in contact already has a low social evaluation, due to its being associated with a poorer or otherwise less-valued group of speakers, a contact variety of a higher-prestige language may be held in higher esteem by some speakers than the "regular" variety of the lower-prestige language; for example Tok Pisin is now one of the official languages of Papua New Guinea (Winford 2003:21). It is now held in higher regard than the native Papuan and Austronesian languages, although it was originally formed as a pidgin variety of English.

3.a. Colonial languages

The degree to which one or more of the languages are lost or maintained in a multilingual situation has to do with the historical background and the social situation of each of the participating speech communities. The attitudes held toward those languages by their speakers also play an enormous role in determining the ultimate maintenance or loss of

each code. If there are monolingual and bilingual speakers in the same speech community, it is generally the speakers of the language held in lower regard who will be bilingual; the speakers of the language with higher prestige will see no reason to learn the language of the speech community with lower prestige (Lehiste 1988:46). This has been proven true in many colonial situations, in which the colonists never learn the languages of the people whose land they have conquered, although the conquered people must usually learn the language of the conquerors. The colonized group may not actually lose their language, as there are often many more speakers of the conquered language than colonists, but the colonized language will have lost prestige, and the generation of colonists generally see no need to learn the language of the conquered. In India English is one of the official languages, and even though it is the language of the former colonial power it maintains its prestige. On the other hand, the official Indian languages such as Hindi, Bengali, and Urdu are recognized as official but cannot displace the role of English, even after more than 50 years of independence from Britain. In the Western Hemisphere there have been very few Europeans who have learned the Native American Indian languages, and English in North America and Spanish and Portuguese in South America have become ubiquitous even in Native speech communities.

3.b. Immigrant languages

In immigration situations the people immigrating must learn the language of the area to which they have moved, but their new neighbors generally feel no obligation to learn the immigrants' language. In any language contact situation, there is a tendency among speakers of both languages to see one language as "better" than the other, and to associate the language of the speech community with more political power, economic advantages, or military might with higher prestige. When the "power" language is seen as better, the bilingualism in that community is unstable, and the less-powerful language may lose speakers, lose functions, or even become extinct. Although many immigrant languages

have been lost in the US, different speech communities have lost their languages slowly or quickly, and some have even maintained them. For example, immigrant Lithuanians in many parts of the US, notably Madison, WI, diligently send their children to Lithuanian school on Saturdays; many Greek immigrants also send their children to language school, though in Columbus, OH, this may be seen as an effort to reverse the loss already observed rather than to maintain an actively spoken language. Many other European immigrants do not pass their languages on to their children. Mufwene sees the recent decline among Native American languages as a further continuation of the colonial process in which European immigrants to the US also gave up their native languages (Mufwene 2003:329). Power and prestige are not always associated with the size of the speech community, however, and people may choose to retain languages associated with their most comfortable or traditional speech community rather than with economic prosperity.

3.c. One-way bilingualism

There are also instances of one-way bilingualism in which a different underlying attitude controls the direction of bilingualism. Sometimes a language can be seen as more utilitarian though less prestigious. Many Navajos value Navajo more highly than English, though they see learning English as a practical tool in today's society. This attitude may play a role in the development and maintenance of the Navajo bilingual code. There may also be cultural or religious constraints regarding learning another group's language.

Before Spanish and English speakers played large social and economic roles in the American Southwest, and before Spanish and later English were used as lingua francas among the Indians in the area, inhabitants of the various Indian Pueblos learned Navajo for purposes of trade, though Navajos generally did not learn the Pueblo languages (Iverson 1981:4). This was probably not because Navajo was held in higher regard than the other languages, but because there are taboos among the Pueblo peoples against letting "foreigners" learn their languages. On the other hand, Navajos have traditionally allowed

112

and encouraged foreigners and "women taken from other tribes" to learn the Navajo language (Harry Walters, CDS Chair, Diné College, Tsaile, AZ).

3.d. Substrate influence

In many language contact situations in which the colonial language has survived or is surviving at the expense of a conquered, or minority language, the colonial language in the mouths of the minority speakers retains features of the minority language. Thus, the English spoken in Ireland and thus in Appalachia has many distinctive characteristics, probably due at least in part to the influence of the Celtic languages spoken before they were replaced by English in those speech communities. The English spoken in India sounds almost like a different language from the Standard English "Received Pronunciation," with aspirated and unaspirated stops where Standard English does not expect them, and retroflex r, d, and t. Similarly, the Spanish spoken in some areas of South America not only sounds different from that of Spain because there are older, regional features surviving that have faded from Peninsular Spanish, but also because the Indian languages spoken there have left their mark on the Spanish spoken in the area (Escobar 1999, Lipski 1994).

4. Theory and bilingual mixed codes

The theoretical basis for calling a bilingual mixed code something different from a creole or pidgin has been hotly debated. One difference has to do with the linguistic situation in which they generally arise; bilingual mixed codes are created by bilingual speakers. Creoles are generally, though not always, made up of three or more language inputs and become the native languages for the next generation of its speakers, and in pidgin situations the new language is formed as speakers of one or more codes aim at a foreign "target" language, out of the need to communicate without a common language. In bilingual mixed code situations the target language is likely to be the bilingual mixed code

itself, as its speakers may control both input languages quite fluently (Thomason 1997:*Introduction*). Although these codes arise in periods of shift from one language to another, the immediate purpose of forming a bilingual code may be to establish a groups identity with other bilingual speakers.

There are several unresolved issues pertaining to the classification and formation of bilingual codes. One question is how to ascertain if what is happening is actually the formation of a new code, rather than the gradual loss or decline of an old one, or if both of these are happening concurrently. Many bilingual language mixtures have been observed to arise within a generation of widespread bilingualism; some of these seem to survive, and some fade out as quickly as they arise, only afterward can they be classified as "interlanguage phenomena" rather than a bilingual mixed code. Structural shift is also seen in interlanguage phenomena as well as in bilingual mixed codes. Whether a given language mixture will survive into the future cannot be predicted, the long-term maintenance of these languages has not been sufficiently investigated at this time. "Spanglish" might survive in New York and Los Angeles for a long time without threatening the English of the rest of the USA or the Spanish of Central and South America, and Media Lengua may survive for similar reasons, but it is perhaps more common that a bilingual code will be spoken in competition with one or both of the input languages. Mednyj Aleut has not survived the complete shift to Russian, Anglo-Romani and Ma'a have shifted so far that the original L2 now provides the grammar for the mixed code. Michif is almost lost as well, but in competition with English, not French. The Bilingual Navajo situation has developed too recently to tell what its future holds; although the grammar of Bilingual Navajo shows structural differences from that of Standard Navajo, at this point in time these may be interpreted either as "reductions in complexity" of Navajo grammar, or as "innovations" in Bilingual Navajo.

This scenario of language shift has often been analyzed only in terms of language death or extinction, though in fact a speech community may change its choice of language without the language itself dying, as long as someone continues to speak it. When some elements of one language are being replaced by the elements of another language with which it is in contact, and the replaced elements are seen as "lost", this course of events may lead to language death for the language with its parts substituted. But it is not the differences in the formation processes which separate languages fading out of use through replacement of elements or relexification with words of a second language from those involved in the creation of a viable bilingual code; rather the difference lies in the social use of the code, and how it is valued and used within the community. It appears as though Navajo itself is in the process of decline, with more and more English replacing Navajo elements in the bilingual code, but there are still domains in which only "pure" Navajo is allowed, and there are speakers from whom only Standard Navajo is expected, such as the Tribal Chairman, as discussed in Chapter 4. As long as Navajo speakers are still using Bilingual Navajo alongside and separate from English, they have some access to Standard Navajo. Although the standard code is being transmitted "normally" to fewer and fewer children, Bilingual Navajo may also be seen as a valued code, used to communicate with other bilinguals and to establish common Navajo identity with other speakers. Fluent Navajo speakers who "hate" hearing Bilingual Navajo will often prefer it to hearing only English.[4] Navajo language teachers at the tribal college see the bilingual code as a "step up" to "real" Navajo, and a useful tool for non-native Navajo speakers to use as they are perfecting their Standard Navajo skills.

Bilingual Navajo can be compared to several other language mixtures of a Native American Indian language and a European language. Although American Indian languages and European languages are quite different from each other in structure, in these mixed codes elements of each are "mixed" together in a structured, non-random, coherent code.

These codes can be differentiated from examples of imperfect learning, interlanguage, and the various stages of language demise in several ways.

Characteristics of these bilingual mixed codes are: the maintenance of the native syntactic structure and phonology, often with little or minimal reduction in complexity, their socially determined usage as a group identification marker, and, often, their low evaluation by speakers. Often there are also innovative structures, which can not be traced back to either of the source languages. These attributes characterize the Bilingual Navajo code, as well as Media Lengua and Michif. Mednyj Aleut has some similar grammatical characteristics, although there was some simplification in the phonology; its social function, however, seems to have mostly passed. Ma'a and Anglo-Romani are examples of the converse structural situation, in which one grammar has converged with the other, but the vocabulary of each language is retained.[5]

5. Relexification

Relexification is the substitution of a word or morpheme from one language with the word or morpheme with approximately the same meaning from another language. It is a documented avenue for Caribbean Creole formation, with West African substrate grammar and colonial language vocabulary (LeFebvre 2004) though its explanatory usefulness is now being questioned even in that capacity (Winford 2003:337).

In the Surinamese creole language Ndyuka the lexifier language is English, but the grammar corresponds to those of the languages of West Africa. e.g. from Migge 1997, "Substrate Influence:"

1.   Ndyuka: mi seli a osu   gi   en   'I sell the house to him'
                    I sell the house (serial verb) him

        Ewe: e   o   tru-a   ne a   e-a   'he put the door on the house'
                 he put door-the (serial verb) house

116

A morpheme-for-morpheme substitution of one lexicon with another has taken place, resulting in a new language. Apparently in Ndyuka the grammar of Ewe was retained, with the new lexicon of nativized English for vocabulary.

Media Lengua is an example of almost complete relexification of one language with the content morphemes of another. This phenomenon has been suggested as a possible mechanism for the creation of various languages and language types around the world, among them Yiddish and other Jewish languages of the Diaspora. It is difficult to account for the linguistic facts with this model alone, however, and particularly regarding the Jewish languages it is often hard to tell which is the substrate and which the adstrate, as Hebrew has remained the liturgical language for thousands of years (Wexler 1981:119). Relexification can also be seen as a stage in L2 acquisition, as the means by which L2 learners form interlanguage varieties in the process of learning.

7. CONCLUSION

The question must be addressed as to whether a language should be classified according to its synchronic description, or according to the family of its known ancestors. Further, should basic vocabulary, grammatical structure, or its function as an identification marker be used in the classification? The main difference between Ma'a and the surrounding Bantu language varieties lies in its lexicon. It is reported that 50% of Ma'a vocabulary is Cushitic in origin (Thomason 1997:475). In this way it has been compared to "Anglo-Romani," a "secret" language of the ethnic Rom living in England, who otherwise speak English. This code is formed by English speakers inserting Romani words into their English sentence frames as an act of Rom identity. In this way, also, Ma'a speakers can speak the local Bantu language with words of their own to express their identity. Does this make it a separate language, or only a separate "secret language" register? The answer is, of course, that it is a separate language, whether it is used for a special register or not, and the fact that its ancestry is unclear further defines it as a contact language.

117

The issues dealt with when identifying the Ma'a language situation can be compared to the dilemma of identifying the "parent" language(s) of Yiddish: is it a Germanic language with elements of Slavic and Hebrew-Aramaic lexicon? Is it a Hebrew-Aramaic language with Germanic and Slavic lexicon? Is it "secret language" German, in which "their own" words are substituted as an act of identity? Synchronically it resembles Germanic very closely, but that fact does not diminish its value as an expression of contrastive self-identification. In fact there are some syntactic differences between Yiddish and other varieties of German, even the varieties of German spoken at the time of initial contact, but the differences are very small compared to the similarities. The fact that those particular small differences are also found in some of the other, non-Germanic, input languages lends further evidence that Yiddish is also a contact language, and its patterned differences are probably due to other language input, rather than coincidentally similar internal change.

The difficulty of identifying the history of Ma'a may be contrasted with the ease of recounting the history of the language situation in Kupwar, India. Urdu, Marathi, and Kannada are understood to be three separate "converged" languages with three separate lexicons; although their structures have grown to resemble each other more and more in the three hundred years of mutual communication and understanding, they maintain three separate lexicons (Gumperz and Wilson 1971 in Winford 2003:84). The difference between the situation in Kupwar and Ma'a is that there are other areas in India where the "ordinary" varieties of Urdu, Marathi, and Kannada are spoken, so that there is an outside check and a way for linguists to compare the core vocabularies. Likewise Anglo-Romani may be compared with both English in England and Romani spoken elsewhere in the world. The vocabulary of Ma'a can be compared with that of other Cushitic languages, but there is no other Ma'a language spoken outside of the Bantu area with which it may be compared. The Kupwar speakers themselves may not be aware of the differences between their varieties of these languages and those spoken outside the Kupwar area, but the influence of

contact can be seen in a comparative study. Similarly, Michif speakers may consider themselves to be speaking Cree, since they are no longer in contact with Standard Cree speakers, though linguists may compare data from their language with other data documenting "unmixed" varieties of Cree. Although some older Navajo speakers have the impression that young speakers of Bilingual Navajo think they are speaking Standard Navajo, I have found that the younger speakers are also aware of the differences, though they may not be able to produce Standard Navajo as well as the older speakers.[6]

There are also written records of at least one style of Standard Navajo from 150 years ago. Some of the Navajo traditional ceremonies were transcribed by anthropologists and missionaries at the time of initial contact; although ceremonies are learned by rote and are thus by nature not identical to the everyday vernacular code, at least these records can provide examples of unmixed Navajo for comparison with today's Standard Navajo and Bilingual Navajo. The unmixed pre-contact variety of Ma'a, without the Bantu grammar matrix, is apparently without written documentation. Although the structure of Ma'a may be compared to those of other Cushitic languages, the exact Cushitic input to present-day Ma'a is unavailable.

Thus, although intertwined bilingual mixed codes are primarily *defined* by their structure involving two discrete and mostly unsimplified input languages, they are *identified* by their identification with a particular speech community. Rather than being associated with an expressed function like pidgins, or their (typical) history of formation of at least three input languages and the function of mother-tongue, like creoles, they are formed in bilingual speech communities, they may become the native language of a speech community, may be used for any purpose within the speech community, and probably will not be used to communicate with monolinguals of either input language. Bilingual Navajo is identified with the bilingual population of Navajos, spoken among themselves is casual settings, and may now be the first language for many Navajo children (see Chapter 1).

Chapter 6: Endnotes

[1] See Chapter 4 for further discussion.

[2] Bilingual Navajo most probably arose in the 1970's: see Chapter 1 for further details.

[3] Even structural features as complex as polysynthesis can be lost quickly under the right, or rather wrong, circumstances: Mithun demonstrates how an Austronesian language has acquired polysynthesis in a relatively short time, and claims that languages can also lose them easily (1991:36).

[4] 2002 survey at Diné College, Shiprock, NM. See discussion in Chapter 4.

[5] See Chapter 5 for further discussion.

[6] See Chapter 4 for further discussion.

CHAPTER 7

LINGUISTIC CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIETAL BILINGUALISM IN SEVERAL
AMERICAN INDIAN SPEECH COMMUNITIES

Languages always change, and social pressures can seem to increase the rate of
change dramatically, though it is not always clear if it the rate of change within a given
language which is increasing, or if the rapid development of a new code makes it seem that
the speed of change is actually increasing. In cases in which a new code is being formed as
another is lost, what is actually replacement of one code by another may look like extreme
change. In languages formed in the process of "interrupted" or "broken" transmission,
an entirely new code may be formed in one generation. Minority languages in heavy
contact with majority languages may change or disappear very quickly in this manner. It is
usually the minority language speakers who become bilingual in contact situations, for this
reason it is the minority languages which are more likely to experience loss of complexity
along with loss of domains in bilingual communities. Some historical backgrounds of
various kinds of bilingual speech communities are presented first, in order to place Bilingual
Navajo into its social framework.

1. Bilingualism due to imperialism

Many bilingual communities have become bilingual as a direct result of a history of
colonialism or imperialism of some kind; in these cases the colonial language is likely to be
evaluated as the "prestige" language, and the language of the conquered or colonialized
speech community is likely to be evaluated as a non-prestige language. As prestige

languages survive in these bilingual speech communities, sometimes at the expense of the non-prestige languages, they will slowly change. These changes may be due in particular to substrate influence from the non-prestige language speech community as well as to the "normal" historical processes of change. As they are, in many cases, seen as foreign or almost foreign languages by their speakers, their use can only be maintained with certain social supports in place. "But only when the status of the non-prestige languages is raised, or when the prevailing social conditions which upheld the prestige languages change, due to drastic revolution or gradual erosion of previously held values, are the non-prestige languages are likely to take over the domains in which only the prestige languages were previously heard" (Kahane 1979:183). The civil rights movement in the 1960's provided a setting for Indian political movements in which the social evaluation of being Indian and speaking an American Indian language was raised dramatically (House 2002:11). Thus the "drastic revolution" in the United States was a social one, but attitudes toward the value of Navajo and other indigenous languages started to change at that time. The Navajo situation at that time was unusual among American Indian communities, in that most people in the community still spoke their language; the shift toward English had not progressed as far as it had in most other Native speech communities, and speakers were still able to shift back. This was very fortunate timing for the future of the Navajo language. In most Native communities in North America the languages were already lost by that time.

In South America the Indian languages are not as threatened as they are in North America, however, and linguistic influence can be observed in both directions: from the Indian language on the European language and from the European language to the Indian language.

2. American Indian influence in South American Spanish

A brief discussion of the well-documented Indian language influence on Spanish, and the less well-known Spanish influence on Indian languages in South America follows

as background for the linguistic situation in the Navajo area of the US: the Navajo situation is much more localized than the situation in South and Central America, however, and the influences back and forth, of Navajo on the European language and English on the Indian language are only similar within the Native speech community.

A. ECUADOR

According to Escobar (1999), the Spanish of South America shows evidence of Indian language grammatical tense and aspect markers not ever found in Peninsular Spanish. In Ecuador, Spanish may have postposed 'estar' presumably reflecting a verb-final Indian language substrate influence. e.g. (Lipski 1994:251)   (Standard Spanish translations thanks to W. Collins)

1.   escuchándote   estoy   'I am listening to you'
        pres.part.listen   1st.be

Standard Spanish: yo te escucho

2.   ocupado estoy   'I am busy'
        busy   1st.be

Standard Spanish: estoy ocupado

Also in Ecuador "no mas" may be used as an intensifier instead of meaning 'no more.' e.g. (Lipski 1994:252).

3.   Aquí no más vivo   'I live right here'
        here no more 1st.live

Standard Spanish: aquí mismo vivo

4.   Cuánto no más   cuesta?   'Just how much does it cost?'
        how much no more 3rd.cost

Standard Spanish: cuánto cuesta

B. BOLIVIA

In Bolivia the syntactic changes in Spanish are attributable to substrate influence from Aymara and Quechua. Direct object clitics are always doubled, even with inanimate objects; this is not the case in Standard South American Spanish (Lipski 1994:191). e.g.:

5. Ya **lo** he dejado la llama (Stratford 1989:119)[1] 'Now I have left (working with) llamas'

6. Tú **lo** tienes la dirección (Stratford 1989:119)   'You have the address'

Pero, pues, and *nomás* may be used in Bolivian Spanish to express degree of involvement and effect. This is particularly strong in Aymara-influenced Spanish, in which several of these phrase-final particles may be used in the language to show slightly different meanings (Lipski 1994:192). e.g.: from Laprade 1981[2]

7.   Los dos nomás   pero   'Just those two, then'

         art. two no more but

Standard Spanish: sólo esos dos

8.   Dile nomás   pues pero   'Well just go ahead and tell him then'

         tell him no more then but

Standard Spanish: dígalo pues

3. Bi-directional Influence: Guaraní and Spanish

Another example of a speech community made bilingual by colonialism in which both languages are being maintained is that of Guaraní and Spanish speakers in Paraguay. Clearly the bilingualism among speakers of Spanish and Guaraní has come about as a result of colonial contact between conquerors from Spain and the indigenous people of Paraguay. After 500 years of contact, both languages have been affected. Although speakers of Navajo have been in contact with speakers of English for only about 150 years, there are some similarities in the relationship between Spanish and Guaraní and the relationship between English and Navajo.

There is evidence of Guaraní influence on Spanish, and also real evidence of Spanish influence on Guaraní. In addition to the code switching one would expect in a contact situation of prestige versus non-prestige languages, there are also some structural and pragmatic changes. e.g.: (Gynan 2004)

1. phonology- Guaraní has 12 vowel and 21 maintained consonant phonemes; several sounds now heard in Guaraní were originally taken from Spanish, e.g.: /l/ and /rr/ (trilled).

2. morphology- Guaraní is agglutinative, with three prefixes and up to six suffixes on the verb, however Guaraní morphology of has not been affected by the contact with Spanish.

3. syntax- there is evidence that Guaraní has borrowed the definite article "la" and a plural "lo," but they are not used in Guaraní the same way they are used in Spanish. e.g.: (from Gynan 2004:) (English translations from W. Collins)

      a. Mba'ere-pio la che-ra'y-pe-nte

      por qué-INT la IIN-hijo[s]-a-sólo

      (por qué sólo a mis hijos?)   'Why only my sons?'

      b. Mba-ere-pio la pepe-nte o-ñambo'e-ta la guaraní-me

      por qué-INT la allí-sólo se-enseña-FUT la guaraní en

(por qué sólo allí se va a enseñar guaraní en?)   'Why only over there will he teach in

                                              Guaraní?'

4. The most obvious impact of Spanish on Guaraní is in the lexicon. Numbers, days of the week, months of the year, animals imported from Europe, religious and technical terminology are taken directly from Spanish. Some Spanish words are also calqued into Guaraní. All of them are nativized into the Guaraní phonological system. e.g. (from Gynan 2004:):

From Spanish: almidón	Guaraní: mamirõ	'starch'
bolso	bosa	'bag'
corral	kora	'corral'
caballo	kavaju	'horse'
cebollo	sevoi	'onion'
cabra	kavara	'goat'
ventana	obetã	'window'

5. Discourse strategies are also borrowed from Spanish into Guaraní. Direct questions can be calqued directly: e.g.: (from Gynan 2004:)

  Re-ho-ta-ma-piko.

  2Ac-va-FUT-PERF.-INT

  (? Ya te vas?)   'are you going to leave now?'

Compare Standard Guaraní: Mb'é re-ho-ta-katu-ma-piko-re ína

              Cómo 2ac-va-FUT-bien-PERF-INT-2Ac-PROG.

  (Así que seguro que ya está para irte?)   'so then, are you really leaving now?'

There is also some evidence that Guaraní word order is becoming more set; as the synthetic Guaraní is in contact with the more analytic Spanish, word order becomes more rigid (Gynan 2004:3). There is also some evidence of a mixed Spanish and Guaraní code, which may be compared to Bilingual Navajo. e.g.(Gynan 2004:3):

6. heta-eterci a-hecha che-guata-'~y̶-va

  cosa-mucha 1AC-ve yo-gusta-NEG-REL

  (Vi muchas cosas que no me gustaron)   'I saw many things I didn't like'

     There has not been equality of social status between the Spanish and Guaraní speech communities; the relationship has been one of conqueror to conquered. In spite of this, Spanish and Guaraní speakers have communicated with each other somehow for five centuries. Alongside the much-studied substrate influence of American Indian languages

upon South American Spanish (Escobar, Lipski, et al.) there has also been a considerable amount of influence from Spanish on the Native Guaraní, as illustrated above. The features of Spanish may be converging with those of Guaraní, or they may have entered the Guaraní language through the mechanism of one-sided borrowing, in any case, there has been structural change in the Guaraní language. According to Gynan, if all traces of Spanish were to be removed from Guaraní today, the communicative function of the language would be greatly reduced, and the language efforts being made to save it would actually put the language in greater danger. He states that it is impossible to take a living language out of its social context, since Guaraní is in contact with Spanish right now, contact phenomena are inevitable (Gynan 2004:7).

Many of the features of Spanish-Guaraní mixing are similar to those found in Bilingual Navajo. The contact between the two groups has been of much longer duration in Paraguay than in New Mexico and Arizona, though, and the results of mixing represent a greater degree of convergence than is found in Bilingual Navajo. The social distance between the groups is much wider in Paraguay, and the indigenous ethnic group there is much larger. The speech community of Guaraní speakers may not desire bilingualism with the dominant code, preferring to maintain a separate identity to merging with the Spanish speakers. However becoming fluent in Spanish in Paraguay may be inevitable. Wardhaugh (1987) states that: "Bilingualism may not be a real choice in such circumstances, it may be no more than a temporary experiment, a somewhat marginal phenomenon, because when one language encroaches on another, bilingualism may prove to be only a temporary waystage to unilingualism in the encroaching language as the latter assumes more and more functions and is acquired as the sole language by greater numbers of speakers" (1987:17). Although there has been much Spanish influence on the Guaraní language, the speech community may be large and loyal enough to their language that Guaraní may survive contact with even a world language like Spanish.

127

One interpretation of these changes is that there is a third "in between" or "bilingual" code emerging, and another is that Guaraní is being assimilated to the point of loss (Gynan 2004:7). Bilingual Navajo also suffers both types of evaluations: it is viewed both as a new code and just another symptom of attrition. In the case of Guaraní, both interpretations seem to be driven by ideology rather than linguistic analysis. For those who perceive a new third "merged" code, the agenda is a final truce between oppressing and oppressed languages, conqueror and conquered. For those who see only assimilation, the historical role of conqueror and conquered experienced in the past 500 years of Paraguay is reflected in the current language situation (Gynan 2004:7).

The range of repertoires in the Spanish-Guaraní contact situation is seen as occurring along a continuum, with varying degrees of mixing among groups separated by ethnicity and differing bilingual and monolingual competence (2004:6-7). The Navajo mixed code is spoken only by Navajos, however, and is seen as a solidarity code rather than as a variety of different mixing styles, although in fact there are a variety of mixing styles to be heard. For this reason Bilingual Navajo may be seen as an emergent but stable bilingual code, rather than a mere interlanguage shift phenomenon.

Although in the Navajo Nation English at one time represented oppression, the military, and Anglo people, nowadays it is losing its negative associations and becoming the lingua franca for communication with people from other tribes, as well as with people from all over the world and the US.

4. Convergence and diffusion

The label of "convergence" implies a two-way transfer of features in language contact situations, as opposed to borrowing, which usually implies one language is taking elements from another while the language "borrowed against" remains the same. "Diffusion" refers to the spreading of the linguistic features themselves. Although both of these terms are used together with "attrition," neither convergence nor diffusion necessarily

implies loss. Attrition of a particular language in a particular speech community also does not automatically imply convergence and diffusion (Myers-Scotton 2002:164). Separate languages are often maintained although some features may have converged, for example in Kupwar, India, three languages, Urdu, Kannada, and Marathi are each separately maintained within their own speech communities, yet 300 years of contact and a high degree of mutual bilingualism has led to many featural similarities among the three (Gumperz and Wilson 1971 in Winford 2003:84). Mutual benefit for accommodating to each other's code is seen as part of the rationale for this phenomenon (Winford 2003:120). Winford lists some of the mechanisms of convergence as borrowing, substrate influence, and simplification (ibid.:63). Tewa provides an example of a language affected by the diffusion of features from other languages.

4.a. Tewa

It is interesting to see how much influence English has had on American Indian languages in the last two centuries, considering for how many centuries the different speech communities of Native Americans were in contact with each other before the Europeans arrived on the North American continent. Kroskrity (1982) researched diffusion among languages of the Southwest US, and examined the kinds of bilingualism and mixing found in Arizona Tewa. The Arizona Tewa speech community is a perfect lab model, as it has been in steady contact with a number of other speech communities during the last several hundred years, and its closest sister languages, the Rio Grande Tanoan Pueblo languages, have not been in contact with the same groups, and do not exhibit the same particular features seen in Arizona Tewa. Kroskrity examines the social context in which each contact example occurs, and identifies which kind of diffusion is seen in each instance, and also which social effects the linguistic contact has had. He looks at contact with Apachean (in historic times, not discussed here), with Spanish since the 16th century, with Hopi since the 18th century, and with English in the 20th century (1982:52). Although Tewa and Navajo

129

are not related languages and have not been in much contact with each other, there are some kinds of language change in contact with English which the two languages share. The name "Navajo" also reportedly comes from the Tewa word for the Navajo people: "naabeehó" is the word for 'plowed fields' in Tewa, referring to the "plowed fields Apaches." The Navajo word for their tribe is "Diné," but when they use the word "Navajo" in Navajo they pronounce it "naabeehó" as well.

Nowadays the younger members of the Arizona Tewa speech community use English as their dominant language; according to elders of the tribe their Tewa is "impaired" and they have little or no proficiency in Hopi (Kroskrity 1982:53). The elderly people also note that traditional vocabulary for planting, hunting, and herding is lacking in young people's speech. As is usually the case, the elders attribute this lack to "moral degeneration" rather than to language shift (1982:53). In Tewa speakers aged 20 to 30 the Tewa spoken was found to contain 30% of English lexicon, whereas older speakers from 30 to 50 years old used less than 10% English lexicon in their Tewa speech (ibid.:54).

Kroskrity notes grammatical differences as well. He poses the question of why English seems to interfere only in the speech of the younger speakers when both the 20-to-30-year-old group and the 30-to-50-year old groups are fully bilingual; and why the older group compartmentalizes the two languages more effectively (ibid.:56). The explanation lies, as always, in the social situation. Many young people were sent to boarding school with other Native American Indian children from other tribes, and the common language among them was English (ibid.:57). Younger Tewa speakers show synthetic and semantic differences from the language of the elders as well as vocabulary differences, however these differences are apparently not as noticed by the community as are the lexical ones.

In any language contact situation where the contact is seen as having influenced language change, the features changed should be found in the "interfering" language. A

grammatical change in progress is observed in Tewa speech in the age group with the most

exposure to English.

In fluent Tewa, an NP in a sentence with two subjects, for example "the man and the

woman" can be marked for subjecthood in three possible ways:

7. a. the man-á-dí the woman (VP)

   b. the man-á-dí the woman-á-dí (VP)

   c. the man the woman-á-dí (VP)

The youngest speakers (aged 20 - 30) used the construction (a.) which parallels the

typical English construction in 90% of their sentences, though the next youngest group

(aged 30 - 50) used that same construction in only 48% of their sentences. In the speech of

the oldest studied group (aged 50+) only 38% of the sentences used the NP á-dí NP

construction (Kroskrity 1982:54). In the following Tewa sentences, "E-A" is the

"Emphatic-Associational" marker, which identifies the subject. Although the meaning of

this morpheme is not the same as the English word "and," it may occupy the same slot

between two NP's in the Tewa NP as "and" does in the English NP with the same

meaning, therefore providing a suitable place for the parallel construction. Once again, in

this way the grammar of bilinguals is shown to be slightly different from that of

monolingual speakers of the same language, which can lead to language change in that

language, if more and more of the speech community become bilingual. A linear SOV word

order is not required in Tewa, as the logical subject is labeled with this marker. e.g.:

(Kroskrity 1982:55)

8.a. sen-n**á-dí** kʷiyó da-cu   de-'«   «   'the man and the woman are entering'

   man E-A woman 3rd.dual stative-enter

   b. sen-n**á-dí** kʷiyó-w**á-dí** da-cu   de-'« 'the man and the woman are entering'

   man E-A   woman   E-A 3rd.dual stative-enter

131

c. sen k(w)iyó-w**á-dí** da-cu de-'« «   'the man and the woman are entering'

man woman E-A 3rd.dual stative-enter

Although the numerical research has yet to be done, the percentage of VP's in

Bilingual Navajo constructed with *áshłééh* compared to the percentage of the same

construction in Standard Navajo would be expected to show similar statistical significance,

particularly since the *áshłééh* construction allows for the insertion of more different types

of words in Bilingual Navajo than it does in Standard Navajo . Whether these differences

in Tewa will also lead to a separate self-identification code, as they have in Navajo, remains

to be seen.   In the Tewa spoken by the youngest group in the study, it was found that the

structure [NP á-dí NPnp] was found significantly more than in the speech of older Tewas,

even bilingual ones. [NP and NPnp] is a common English type of NP, and it is only the

youngest group using 90% of this construction whose primary language of instruction was

English (ibid.:57).

According to Kroskrity (1982), the "linguistic conservatism" of the Pueblos has

guarded against diffusion (1982:68). Language attitudes can also prevent loss. Tewa has

been maintained against Hopi in spite of hundreds of years living among Hopis, the Tewa

language must carry significant cultural values in the Tewa speech community (ibid. 67).

According to Leap, individual-level multilingualism is favored even today, for purposes of

friendship or trade. This has not necessarily led to language loss or convergence in Tanoan

and Keresan pueblos along the Rio Grande, either (Leap 1982:108).

4.a.i. Contact with Hopi and Spanish

Other contact change can be deduced when a group is removed from related

language groups, and a new feature or constraint is added to one but not the other of them,

also found in the contacted language but not found in the related but separated language

community. One example of this in Arizona Tewa is the voiced lateral phoneme /l/. It

cannot be proven that the Tewa speakers borrowed this sound from the Hopi speakers with whom they were in contact, the evidence strongly suggests this source. Hopi and Arizona Tewa have this sound, and none of the Kiowa-Tanoan languages related to Arizona Tewa has it. Either only the Arizona Tewa speakers retained the voiced /l/ phoneme in contact with Hopi, or they acquired it in contact with Hopi (Kroskrity 1982:59). Another possibility is that they developed it on their own, only coincidentally in contact with a language that had it, but there is also no evidence for this scenario.

There is not much other influence of Hopi on Arizona Tewa, in spite of 300 years of contact and societal bilingualism, though there is some congruence of codes and values regarding kinship behavior and ceremonial organization. The Tewa system is now more matrilineal and matrilocal; Rio Grande Pueblo systems are generally patrilineal and patrilocal. There are also Tewa clans borrowed from the Hopis. Some have also borrowed the Kachina cult (ibid.61). Young mentions a similar unusual split between cultural borrowing and language borrowing among Navajos and other speech communities in the area (Y&M 1987:7).

The Tewa have also borrowed far fewer Spanish words than the speech communities among the Pueblos who stayed in the Rio Grande valley have, who were in much greater contact with Spanish speakers (Kroskrity 1982:61). Not only was the contact with the Spanish of much longer duration among the Rio Grande pueblos, but it also represented a more peaceful time between them; the Tewa left the Rio Grande area fleeing the Spanish. Many Spanish terms regarding Catholicism among the Rio Grande pueblos are also not found in the Tewa speech community, reflecting their smaller degree of contact with Spanish culture as well as with the language (ibid.63).

Navajos have also been in much greater contact with English speakers than they ever were with Spanish speakers, which partially explains the greater mixing of Navajo and English. At no time, however, was either Tewa or Navajo threatened by Spanish the way

133

they are both threatened by English today. Although the Spanish speakers represented wide-scale imperialism in some parts of the Southwest US at that time, their area of complete conquest did not reach quite as far north as Navajoland, and the Tewa were able to escape the conquest of the Rio Grande valley by moving in with the Hopis. English, however, has taken over in only a few centuries. Imperialism, then, seems to play a large role in language endangerment and subsequent decline. The influence of English on the indigenous languages of North America has gone beyond diffusion of features to outright replacement.

Although English has had an enormous effect on Navajo, as well as on many other languages, the Navajo speech community may be able to withstand the onslaught. Navajos are well-known for being adaptable and for adjusting to adverse circumstances, and see that struggle as part of their identity (House 2001:90). It has been pointed out that Navajos have traditionally borrowed cultural knowledge from all around and made it their own, for example, weaving in wool, silversmithing, and the care of livestock were all originally learned from the Spaniards and Americans, though they are now considered traditional Navajo skills (House 2001:24).

5. Language decline

There are several categories of language death or decline: "sudden death," in which all or most of the speakers are killed; "radical death," in which the entire speech community stops using the code in question, usually to avoid severe consequences, "gradual death," which implies intermediate bilingualism and probably age-grading, and "bottom to top" or "Latinate death," in which the domains of speaking a particular code are lost from the "lowest" or most informal to the most formal. In these cases there may be "rememberers" among the (former) speech community: those who can recite something, sometimes quite long, in the archaic language, but who may not understand it themselves (Campbell and Muntzel 1989:185). Some of the mechanisms for language decline are as

134

follows: bilingual speakers may make less of a distinction between the two phonologies, and features of one may overlap onto another, for example in Pipil vowel length differences are being lost, perhaps under the influence of Spanish, and the distinction between [q] and [k] is being lost in Tuxtla Chico Mam, also in contact with Spanish (Campbell and Muntzel 186). There can be both overgeneralization of unmarked features, such as the case of Mam, above; the marked [q] is lost, not the more "natural" [k] (Campbell and Muntzel 1989:188), and overgeneralization of marked features as well. For example, in one variety of Xinca the glottalization rule has been extended so that a speaker may glottalize almost every possible consonant (Campbell and Muntzel 1989:189); although a glottalization rule has been simplified, the actual marked articulation has been increased. This cannot be said to have been adopted from the Spanish language with which it is in contact, but there could definitely be a contrastive-self-evaluative function involved in pronouncing each word in as non-Spanish a manner as possible.

Although Navajo is changing in contact with English, these kinds of reductions and overgeneralizations in structure are not found. The phonemic contrasts remain the same. Although not every speaker may control the elaborate Navajo verb morphology, Navajo speakers have devised methods of speaking the language without all of them, and the phonology remains intact.

6. Contrastive self-identification

"...linguistic items are not just attributes of groups or communities, they are themselves the means by which individuals both identify themselves and identify with others (LePage and Tabouret-Keller 1985:5).

Tabouret-Keller and LePage studied a mixed group of speakers in Belize, those who switched among Spanish, English, and American Creole codes, depending on which identity they chose to be part of or those from which they wanted to be separate (LePage and Tabouret-Keller 1985:14). The "acts of identity" model needs to allow for the possibility

135

of greater ease in one or the other, which is part of what identifies the social situation of Bilingual Navajo. Not only is the mixed code a self-identification marker, giving it an advantage over the ubiquitous English, but it is also easier for less-than-perfect speakers of Navajo to speak than Standard Navajo. Mufwene lists "practicality and the principle of least effort" as greater factors leading to language decline among Native Americans than the boarding school system (Mufwene 2003:332), for bilingual speakers it require less effort and may be more rewarding to speak the mixed code well than the prestige standard poorly.

Although ideally there would be no poor speakers of any language which held value for the speakers, the fact is that in many contact-language situations one or another code in contact does not get the support needed for speakers to learn and maintain full linguistic and social competence in the speech community. It may be more difficult for a bilingual speaker to use one than another of the codes in his repertoire in a particular setting. For this reason another dimension must be added to the language choice as an "act of identity" concept, that of perfect or less-than-perfect control over the chosen code.

Thus, the results of language contact must be seen in context not only of the historical situations which led to the contact in the first place, but also within the context of the identity of the speakers within the socio-historical context. Lehiste quotes Weinreich as follows: "The locus of language contact is in the mind of the bilingual" (Lehiste 1988:28). My interpretation of the situation is that Bilingual Navajo speakers are attempting individually and as a speech community to use their bilingual minds for preserving and maintaining their language.

Chapter 7: Endnotes

[1] reference in Lipski 1994.

[2] reference: Escobar 1999.

CHAPTER 8

PURITY AND SURVIVAL

"On occasion people may go so far as to fear that taking words into their language from another language will weaken their identity and pose a threat to their continued existence. They may strive therefore to maintain the 'purity' of their language and keep it 'uncontaminated'" (Wardhaugh 1987:5).

Wardhaugh describes a popular view: the idea that to maintain a language in the speech community one must keep it "pure" and free from foreign influence. In fact, though, borrowing "foreign" words does not threaten the vitality of a language; rather, it may insure its continued survival. When a speech community is actively borrowing new words into its own language and using them according to the rules of its own language, there is no question that their language is being maintained. This chapter explores the relationship of language purism and language flexibility to language survivability, using examples from the Montana Salish, Chipewyan, Old Order Amish, and other minority speech communities.

1. Threatened languages

Threatened languages must be defined as such by their uses or lack of uses in a speech community, rather than by their structural description. According to Crawford, a language is known to be threatened: when degree of fluency in the language increases with age, when a different language is used in domains in which the language under discussion was always spoken before, and when parents cease to pass on their language to their

children (Crawford 1996:1). Although there are also structural signs which are used as evidence that a language is changing, these structural features alone are not evidence that the language is threatened, unless the changes and reductions in the grammar are accompanied by reductions in use as well. There are some dying languages which don't change at all, however, in which the "pure" unmixed variety survives unchanged until the last speaker dies. Montana Salish spoken on the Flathead Reservation has fewer than sixty speakers left, and those people are elderly and not passing the language on. No mixing has been found between English and Salish in the speech of those people. Thomason has found that the people she interviews speak Standard English and Standard Montana Salish, and nothing in-between (Thomason 2001:236). Yet there are other languages which are radically changed from the original form, yet are still widely spoken. The Mbugu speakers of Ma'a have maintained their Cushitic lexicon in spite of a migration to a different part of Africa (see chapter 5 for further discussion). Ma'a grammar has come to closely resemble that of their Bantu-speaking neighbors. It is still maintained for purposes of contrastive self-identification (Thomason 1997:472-475; Mous 1994:175-200). There are some threatened languages which have developed mixed codes so different from the original language that the two are not mutually intelligible, yet even with so much structural change they may still be considered varieties of the same code, and they may fulfill the same social function in society as the original source language did at an earlier time. Although Quechua is not really threatened at this time, Media Lengua may be used as an example, as it is also called "Little Quechua" by its speakers (Thomason 1997:377) and is used by the same ethnic group as is Quechua; the populations differ mainly by generation and employment status, as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

The Navajo language is threatened by the use of English. As long as the functional split between the use of Navajo and English was maintained, in which Navajo was spoken at home and English was spoken only at school, the Navajo language was not in danger. Now

that all Navajo children and college students speak, read, and write in English, more effort needs to be put forth to maintain the Navajo language. The survival of Navajo in the Navajo speech community may be seen in perspective by comparison with the following examples of language change and language maintenance.

2. Language change as a widespread phenomenon

It is well-documented that all surviving languages change, and have changed through time. The English spoken today is very different from that of Beowulf, Chaucer, and Shakespeare, and the same claim can be made about any language which has been studied over time. Elderly Standard Navajo speakers speak even Standard Navajo a little bit differently from the way their children speak it. McDonough has documented differences in the frication of initial aspirated Navajo consonants, and found differences among men and women, and older and younger speakers. (McDonough 1996) Although the phonetic values of the stop consonants in McDonough's study show differences according to age and gender of the speaker, the number and kind of phonological distinctions remain the same; there are three classes of voiceless stops articulated at the alveolar and velar region: unaspirated, aspirated, and glottalized (McDonough 1996).

Phonetic change, like other kinds of change, is to be expected from any living language: languages change. The only languages that have stopped changing entirely are those which are no longer spoken. Examples of these are Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Biblical Hebrew, and Classical Latin. These languages all had large bodies of literature, which are still available for study to this day, but almost nobody uses them anymore. When people continue to speak their languages, the languages survive. When people stop using them, they may stop changing, but they do not continue on. Furthermore, it has been found in minority-language-speaking communities that flexibility regarding the rules of a language may *increase* the likelihood of that language's survival. For example, it is the Pennsylvania German communities who have lost the distinction between the dative and accusative object

139

markers in their language who are passing the language onto their children (Huffines 1989:225, also in Keiser 2001). On the other hand, Huffines (1989) shows that excessive purism, particularly regarding threatened languages, i.e. unwillingness to allow for change in the language, has been shown to correlate with language *decline*. Navajo elders who laugh at their grandchildren's Navajo find that the grandchildren turn to English to express themselves instead. House (2001) reports that: "there are many people (particularly the elderly) who do not want to talk to the youth, who criticize and condemn their less than fluent performances in the Navajo language and who push them away because they don't measure up to past standards of Navajo-ness" (House 54). Although many young Navajos are interested in reclaiming their heritage language, the very members of the speech community who could best help them are often no help.

However, the Navajos' willingness to allow other people to learn their language surely helps contribute to its continued survival. Other American Indian speech communities having taboos against outsiders' learning their languages are having a more difficult time maintaining their languages, for example it was not until very recently (1998) that a Hopi dictionary was allowed to be published, and Hopi is also in decline.

3. Language Maintenance

The important questions for investigation of the issue of minority language maintenance, particularly regarding Navajo, are as follows: what are the factors involved in the maintenance of a minority language surrounded by speakers of a majority language? How do some languages manage to survive, when so many others become extinct? Several classic and non-classic cases of minority language survival and decline follow as examples.

3.a. Swiss-German or Schwyzerdütsch in Switzerland

Switzerland has four national languages, German, French, Italian, and Romansch (Wardhaugh 1987:213). In the so-called German-speaking part, German is taught as the first written language, but it is not spoken outside of school. The Swiss variety of German

140

represents for the Swiss a large part of their cultural identity; they know they are not

Germans, or Austrians, and they show this by maintaining their separate "dialect." In the

19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century the use of Schwyzerdütsch actually

started to decline, as school had become mandatory and literacy in German became

practically universal. But with the approach of World War II, the Swiss did not want to

identify with the Germans. "In the Nazi period this association [of High German with

Germany] was strong enough to result in the antipathy to the Nazi regime and its policies

being transferred to Hochdeutsch itself, and the natural antidote was to upgrade the role of

Swiss-German dialects" (Schiffman 1991:179). Schwyzerdütsch was spoken more and

more as an expression of contrastive self-identification. German has continued to be the

school language, the language of literature, and the official language at the universities. But

this contrastive self-identification has been maintained since WWII with the continuation of

the spoken dialect**.** Although the spoken language was seen as threatened one hundred years

ago, it is now thriving. German teachers in the schools now worry that their Swiss students

will never master the written standard (Schiffman 1991: 176). This is an attitudinal issue

rather than a pedagogical or cognitive one, though, as the spoken language is also a

Germanic language and related to Standard German. While previously Swiss-German was

viewed as a variety of German, it is increasingly written about as a "foreign language" for

Swiss children. "Wird heute oft nur der Dialekt als 'Muttersprache' und das

Hochdeutsche als 'Fremdsprache' bezeichnet, so galten noch vor wenigen Jahrzehnten

beide allgemein als verschiedene Formen ein und derselben Muttersprache (Ris 1979:56,

quoted in Schiffman 1991:178)[1] All children in the German-speaking part of Switzerland

learn to read Standard German.

Although the language relationship between German and Schwyzerdütsch may be

changing, the fact remains that having two languages to control on a daily basis does not

prevent modern education and progress. The attitude among some Navajo language activists is that all education must be provided only in Navajo; many students and parents are understandably unwilling to go along with this plan (House 2001:86). The Swiss situation shows that it is possible to live with more than one language at a time and survive in the modern world.

3.b. "Ivrit" in Israel

As has been mentioned before, Biblical Hebrew is no longer a living language. But Modern Hebrew is spoken by almost every Israeli. The fact that a spoken language has been resurrected after thousands of years of disuse is viewed by many as miraculous, but there is a natural explanation as well. Even though Hebrew hadn't been spoken as the day-to-day language of the Jews since before the time of Christ, Hebrew never stopped being used as the liturgical language for religious functions. With the creation of a Jewish state, Hebrew could be modernized from the religious liturgical language that was already in existence and declared the national language (Telushkin 1991:270). Modern Hebrew is very different from Biblical Hebrew, in structure as well as in the lexicon. Wexler attributes this fact to what he sees as the history of the modern language: Modern Hebrew is the result of the latest in a series of language shifts over 2600 years, from Hebrew-Aramaic through Arabic, Turkish, Greek, Yiddish, Slavic et al. to its present state (Wexler 1981:112). Since the modernization of Hebrew in the 20th century the grammar may have changed from the ancient Biblical standard, but this may not be as important to Israelis as the fact that it is their own language. Similarly, even though Navajo language is changing, it may still be used to represent the identity of the Navajo people.

3.c. Yiddish

In the twentieth century in as widely separated areas as Cincinnati, Ohio and Israel, Jews have given up Yiddish in favor of Hebrew as a more positive expressive code for self-identification. Speaking Yiddish represented for many speakers not only being Jewish

142

but also being poor, oppressed, and at the mercy of "foreign" governments. Speaking Hebrew instead represented being independent. In the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe upper-class and educated people were giving up their regional dialects all over the German-speaking parts of Europe; many could not understand why the Jews did not also give up Yiddish (Freimark 1979:164). Yiddish is not extremely different from various regional dialects of German, but it was maintained as a separate language from German for centuries as a way of contrastive self-identification; the key to assimilation in Germany was seen as giving up all ethnic languages in favor of Standard German.

As Yiddish was given up in favor of a majority language in various speech communities, a Jewish "accent" often remained for self-identificational purposes. New York "Jewish English" may still maintain the identificational value of Yiddish for its speakers, with only stylistic departure from Standard English. This may be a transitional phenomenon, according to Wexler, as the features of this code are adopted by non-Jews as a marker for simply being from New York (Wexler 1981:106). In other words, "Jewish English" provides an example of a minority language actually converging with the majority language and still being maintained, at least for a while, as a separate solidarity code. In many American Indian speech communities American Indian English may serve this same purpose.

3.d. Pennsylvania German among the Amish

There are several different communities of Pennsylvania German-speaking Amish in the US, some of which have maintained their language to a greater degree than others. What Huffines has found among Amish and Mennonite speakers in Pennsylvania is that the group with the strongest group identity, the "Sectarian Amish," use the language the most across the whole population. In the non-sectarian Amish and Mennonite communities the language is spoken mostly by the elderly. However in the Sectarian group there is a merged dative and accusative case in all age-sectors of the population (Huffines 1989:225),

and in the non-Sectarians it differs according to age; younger speakers are likely to switch to English, while older speakers may still attempt to use separate dative and accusative cases (Huffines 1989:225). What is interesting is the fact that the language of the group that is maintaining the language is the variety with the most English features. The groups with the "purest" form of the language, or the oldest form that most closely resembles Standard German, are those whose children only speak English (Huffines 1989:225).

4. Code switching and language maintenance

Code-switching has been defined and discussed in terms of language formation in chapter three, and in change and decline in chapter six; here code-switching is seen also as a useful tool for maintaining a language. Ideally code switching can be used as a "safety valve" for the less-than-perfect speaker of a speaker of a threatened language; if the bilingual speaker doesn't know the word he is looking for, he is free to substitute a word from the other language without having to switch to the other language entirely (Woolard 1989:361). This is true among the sectarian Amish, probably because they are not depending on their language alone to define their identity, since they live separately from the mainstream culture and maintain separate cultural observations and religious beliefs. If the ideology of the speech community values its solidarity more than linguistic purity, there is a much greater chance for a minority language to survive (Woolard 1989:361).

In the past few years analyses of code-switching have become less negative in reference to the speakers' competence, and broadened to include an option of the speakers' choice of codes: "In recent years, the pendulum has swung away from seeing code-switching as necessarily the result of a decline in language skills to one that views the bilingual as always being in control, deliberately switching to express their dual identity..." (Clyne 1998:145). Although this is a positive outlook regarding the Navajo language situation, along with the optimistic attitude the fact must be admitted that many young people in the Navajo Nation do not know Navajo as well as their parents did at the same

age. Whether the lack of skill is attributed to "non-acquisition" rather than attrition is not the point, blaming the speaker as a "language-loser" rather than a "language-user" is counter-productive.[2] Among fluent speakers of Navajo, English, and the bilingual code, the choice of language for each utterance may be switched according to aspects of their dual identity, but for many young people Bilingual Navajo is the only variety of Navajo they can speak.

Sometimes mixing languages together can be analyzed as the first step in a process of language shift, in which a whole population switches from one language to another. But this is not always the case. In the example of the Pennsylvania German speakers, it is the language most affected by English features that is surviving, not the "puristic" varieties, or codes which most resemble the older forms of German. Code-switching in Pennsylvania German and also in the case of Bilingual Navajo may be seen as evidence of language change rather than language loss. Speakers can use this "safety valve" of code switching as a way of continuing to speak their language. The phenomena of language survival among minority languages in spite of interference from majority languages has been documented.[3] These languages are maintained by their speakers out of a sense of group identity, rather than by an insistence on linguistic purism, and a change in a language doesn't need to reduce its usefulness. "Structural contraction does not necessarily reduce the social power or utility of a language" (Dorian 1989:3).

5. Structural language change (also discussed in Chapter 6)

Some signs of language decline rather than language survival that have been documented are: simplification of the phoneme inventory, simplification of the grammar, loss of grammatical categories, and "easier" or more fixed word order. Reduction of incorporation and other complex syntactic mechanisms has been seen in Oklahoma Cayuga (Mithun 1989: 249), and a reduction in the number of relative clauses has been documented in such unrelated languages as Cupeño and Luiseño, Trinidad Bhojpuri, East Sutherland

145

Gaelic, and Dyirbal (Hill 1989:149). Mithun also documents the loss of unused lexical items, such as moose, mink, weasel, and beaver in Oklahoma Cayuga, as well as specific terms such as "eyebrow" and "cheeks," while more general terms such as "eyes" and "face" are retained (Mithun 1989:248). A reduction in complexity is not so obvious in Bilingual Navajo; while many lexical items are code-switched with words from English, the basic structure of Navajo is not changed in the bilingual code.

If there is loss of a form with instant replacement by another form, even from a different language, we are perhaps obliged to call it transfer or language change; if it is lost and not replaced, it counts as reduction or attrition (Hill 1989:179). It has been shown that any aspect of a language is susceptible to change and loss; but all elements of language are also capable of being maintained. In languages which are in decline distinctions in phonology as well as morphology with a heavy functional load will be maintained more easily than distinctions which are redundant or minor (Campbell and Muntzel 1989:186).

The mixed structure of Copper Island Aleut or Mednyj Aleut is also seen as surviving rather than shifting. Nikolai Vakhtin objects to the "life or death" dichotomy in the descriptions of language maintenance, and describes this bilingual mixture of Russian and Aleut as having been a viable language for 150 years (Vakhtin 1998:317). It was formed by children of mixed Russian and Aleut marriages as an expression of contrastive self-identification, and it has been maintained for the same purpose. At this point in time the social prestige of Russian is apparently high relative to that of the Aleut language, so whichever features of Russian the Copper Island Aleut speakers control, they will probably try to use. Michif, as described by Bakker (Bakker:1997) and Media Lengua, as described by Muysken (Muysken:1996) have also been described as socially viable and useful codes, albeit different codes from their original Cree and Quechua source languages.

On the other hand, Marianne Mithun has found that even though Oklahoma Cayuga has very few speakers left, those few speakers still show "nearly complete retention of an

146

amazingly complex morphological and phonological system" (Mithun 1989:257). In other words, the degree of "purity" or conservatism in a minority language does not correlate with the number of its speakers, and therefore does not correlate with its chance of survival.

Crawford claims that "language shift is determined primarily by internal changes within language communities" (Crawford: 1996:4). Although social conditions obviously play a role in the degree of access speakers may or may not have to a given code, for example many American Indian children were punished for speaking their native languages at school, it is the attitude of the speakers themselves in a speech community which determines both the "purity" and the maintenance of any language, not the difference in structure between the threatened language and the languages with which it is in contact.

Many linguists and language activists are at work trying to stop the decline of a particular language; RLS or "Reversing Language Shift" movements gather eager participants on every continent. Perhaps the most famous of rubrics for gauging how far a language has declined, and for deciding in which domains work must be done, is Fishman's "GIDS SCALE."

6. The GIDS scale

Fishman has listed common disruptive social conditions which have often led to language loss; he claims that the most important factor, though, is social status. In situations in which it is seen as socially advantageous to sound like an Indian, Indians maintain features of their native code, either by speaking a variety of their language, or by imposing Indian features onto their English. In situations in which the dominant culture is evaluated as higher than the native one, features of the dominant language are adopted. Language choice is influenced by social conditions, but the same types of social conditions which have led some speech communities to give their codes up have often led others to entrench themselves and increase the use of their languages.

147

Fishman wrote of his GIDS or "graded index of disruption scale" in 1991, in which he described a series of goals one should try to attain in order to save an endangered language (Fishman 1991). His model was based partly on the world's most famous success story in the realm of saving threatened languages, that of Israeli Hebrew. Hebrew was re-elevated to a spoken language after approximately two thousand years of disuse, during which time Aramaic, Arabic, and languages of the Diaspora were used by Jews for daily living, while Hebrew was reserved for limited use as a religious read and chanted, rather than spoken, standard liturgical language. Its new speakers were adults making a new nation in the ancestral homeland, and modern educational attributes and functions were the expressed goal. It is an understatement, however, to mention that the case of Hebrew is rather unusual and not very similar to threatened American Indian languages.

Reversing Language Shift, or "RLS" efforts are included in the "status planning" part of language planning policies, and have a stated goal of "attaining and augmenting intergenerational mother-tongue transmission" (Fishman 1993:70). The GIDS stages have been used to label and classify all kinds of threatened languages, from immigrant languages whose children have adopted the language of the new land to minority languages being displaced by a conquering language all the way to tribal or indigenous languages in Australia and the Americas. Fishman's (abridged) GIDS Scale follows, in which the stages are numbered from 8, which is the most endangered to 1, which is the least endangered:

GIDS Graded Intergenerational Dislocation Scale by Fishman

Stage 8:   Reconstructing the language, adult acquisition of language as second language.

Stage 7: Cultural interaction in the language primarily involving the community-based older generation.

Stage 6: Intergenerational and demographically concentrated home-family-neighborhood: the basis of mother-tongue transmission.

Stage 5: Schools for literacy acquisition, for the old and for the young, and not in lieu of compulsory education.

Stage 4a: Schools in lieu of compulsory education and substantially under own-language (threatened language) and staffing control.

Stage 4b: Public schools for own children, offering some instruction in own (threatened) language, under dominant culture's language curriculum and staffing control.

Stage 3: the local/regional (i.e. non-neighborhood) worksphere, both among own group and dominant group.

Stage 2: Local mass-media and governmental services.

Stage 1: Education, worksphere, mass media and governmental operations at higher and nationwide levels.   (Fishman 1993:71)

Figure 8: GIDS Scale

        As part of language policy, examination of the GIDS scale has proven useful in

Navajo schools. The stages are analyzed by Lee and McLaughlin for correlation in the

Navajo Nation.

Navajo according to GIDS (summarized)   Lee and McLaughlin 2001

Stage 8: Navajo does not need to be reassembled as a linguistic system. Not only are there many fluent native speakers, there are also still elderly monolinguals, with whom the fluent bilinguals can only communicate in Navajo. The enormous respect accorded the elderly in Navajo culture cannot be ignored as a stabilizing force on the spoken language. There is also a generally accepted written standard, though this is less relevant to the Navajo language situation than to some others.

Stage 7: Though most adults over thirty can still speak Navajo, the younger generation is growing much faster than the parent generation, and many of the young parents do not teach their children Navajo. The median age of Navajos is now 22 (Lee and McLaughlin 2001:27); the language situation has the potential to shift rapidly at this time if nothing changes as the "young" generation becomes the "parent" generation.

Stage 6: Far less Navajo is spoken in the home now than in any preceding generation. Along with changing attitudes on the part of parents raising the children, children speak more and more English with each other at school and outside the home. Students report hearing less and less Navajo in the community, and still report more Navajo spoken at home than outside (2001:32).

Stage 5: All Navajo language programs in the schools are designed to meet compulsory state language requirements.

Stage 4a: A few Navajo schools have used Navajo-dominant curricula in the past thirty years. Navajo speaking, reading, and writing are taught first in these schools, before English.

Stage 4b: There is more Navajo language education on the elementary school level than in high school in the public school systems.)
Stages 3, 2, 1: Navajo is rapidly becoming a language spoken just by adults.

(Lee and McLaughlin 2001: 23-49)

Figure 9: Navajo GIDS Scale

Although there are some few mothers in their twenties raising the children primarily

in Navajo, most raise their children to speak English. Navajo government is conducted in

Navajo, though records are kept n English. This is reflective of something other than

language maintenance, however; even when 100% of Navajos spoke Navajo all the time,

records were kept in English by those who knew how to read and write. Literacy is shown

to be valuable in maintaining a language, but it is not a traditional value in Navajo culture.

The Navajo Nation president and vice-president are required to be fluent in Navajo, but

council delegates are not (Lee and McLaughlin 2001:36). There are only a few newspapers

and other publication written in Navajo, since so few Navajos are fluent readers of their language.

6.a. Problems with GIDS

It is far easier for language planners to implement school programs as in GIDS stages 4 and 5 than to force young mothers to speak to their babies in Navajo; for this reason most of Navajo RLS efforts are directed at the schools. Fishman warns of the dangers of working towards RLS at levels where the society really is not situated; and points out the failure of the schools in Ireland to institute spoken Irish anywhere but in the classroom (Fishman 1993:74). If learning Navajo in school is seen as a threat to acquiring Standard English, some parents will not involve their children. Lee and McLaughlin offer useful suggestions for individuals, pairs of individuals, families, and communities to help reverse the shift from Navajo to English (2001:37-40); the only problem is spreading the commitment into the community.

RLS scores are given to communities on the basis of adherence to Fishman's GID's scale, and whether they are indeed reversing language shift. Fishman himself criticizes some of the interpretations afforded by the GIDS Scale: "Intergenerational mother-tongue transmission depends on processes which have too long remained overlooked by RLS movements but, to make matters worse, even when squarely acknowledged, these processes are difficult to plan because they require the establishment and fostering of interactional contexts and relationships which are difficult to plan and cultivate as long as X-ish-embeddedness in Y-ish-dominated everyday socio-cultural processes remains uninterrupted" (Fishman 1993:76-77).

Navajo was judged fairly favorably by Fishman's rubric in 1991, since there was an active adult Navajo-speaking community. The impression of many is that at each succeeding age level there are proportionally fewer Navajo speakers, however. Fishman's favorable interpretation of the Navajo data (1993:79), is misleading, however . His data

151

showing that there are speakers "moving up" in the survival scale does not attest to the strength of his model so much as to the fact that the shift from Navajo to English had probably not proceeded as far as originally thought. In other words, if the selected reservation Navajo is doing better than expected by Fishman, it is most likely that the language among those speakers had not shifted as far as he had thought to begin with, not that the programs were succeeding in halting or reversing language shift. Likewise, the advanced classes in Navajo language at Diné College show success not only because they are remarkable programs, but because the students in those classes already spoke the language before the classes started. There has been much success with students at Diné College in the classes of so-called "latent speakers" as students (Slate 2001:396).

The larger problem with using this kind of a scale when referring to American Indian or tribal Australian languages is, however, that the stated end goal, which is highest development of literacy, was never part of the value system for most of these indigenous languages, and to the extent that these languages are still used for higher educational purposes, they are still used without literacy. Navajo medicine men are still trained orally by other medicine men, and in the process the younger men learn and memorize the ceremonies by rote as they always have, without books. The Navajo language is threatened, then, not at stage 8 or at stage 1, since the highest functions of the language are still intact and the structure of the language is still known and already codified in many scholarly books, but rather in the middle, in which the older generations are not passing the language down to their children.

7. Schmidt and Dixon scale

A more appropriate scale for the phenomenon of language loss in Navajo is that devised by Schmidt and Dixon (1990/1993:123-5; 1989:123) They have devised a five-stage scale of language attrition, in stages from 1 (healthy) to 5 (extinct).

Schmidt and Dixon Scale (summarized)   (1990/1993:123-5; 1989:123)
Stage 1: Language is vital, passed on from one generation to the next, spoken fluently by most speakers who use it as their main means of communication with a full range of styles and repertoires available.

Stage 2: There are fewer speakers, and increased use of another language. The language is still transmitted from one generation to another, though some speakers may not be able to use all styles and repertoires.

Stage 3: The language is no longer being transmitted from one generation to the next. The language is fully functional only for older uses. Radical simplification and massive code-switching are occurring in casual speech.

Stage 4: The language may have few or no fluent speakers left, the native language is used interspersed with replacing language for ethnic marker and acts of identity.

Stage 5: There are no fluent speakers and no semi-speakers left. The only use of the minority language is "ethnic influence" on the replacing language (Fishman 2001:394-5).

Figure 10: Schmidt and Dixon Scale

This scale is more descriptively accurate of the Navajo Language situation than Fishman's GIDS scale. Compared to many of the world's threatened languages, Navajo scores very well, between stages two and three on Dixon's scale. Standard Navajo also still carries enough prestige that the bilingual variety of Navajo is looked down upon by almost everyone as being clearly inferior to the standard code. This is illustrated by the radio presentations by the Navajo Nation Chairman, spoken in unmixed Navajo, and confirmed by a survey (Diné College survey 2002). However, the fact that the bilingual variety of Navajo even exists, as mixed or "impure" a form as it is, attests to the vitality of a spoken Navajo language in Navajoland. In a situation of impending language shift the question must be asked: is it better for the young people to speak Bilingual Navajo, or only English? Or: is it *worse* for the young people to speak Bilingual Navajo, or only English? Is it the purity of the language that is important, or is the culture maintained by the fact that the people still speak it? Field (2004) maintains that it is too early to tell: "Whether a tolerant attitude toward codeswitching will prove to be a force for language maintenance or language shift would appear to be very hard to predict, at this point" (2004:ppc).

House (2001) criticizes the current plans for Navajo-ized education as merely repeating the mistakes of American education, only in reverse. She sees this as part of the "Westernization" of American Indians. Instead of the previous program of belittling and insulting Navajo language and culture, the new curricula call for belittling and insulting English and "Anglo" ways of life (House 2001:38). She proposes a new sort of balanced education encouraging instruction in both English and Navajo, to "create and maintain a true and equal bilingualism and mutually respectful biculturalism" (House 2001:90).[4] The new curriculum would assume an attitude of responsibility instead of blame, and be based on the traditional Navajo understanding of the life cycle corresponding to the four cardinal directions, symbolizing the processes of thinking, planning, sustaining, and securing one's life (ibid 90-103). It should be pointed out, however, that many peoples' traditional values are good and positive, and if people's behavior would follow their values, we wouldn't have the problems in society we have. Although House puts her pedagogical ideas into a more Navajo and less Western framework than the average school curriculum, there is no more guarantee of anyone's following through with that kind of curriculum than with the various bilingual programs already in existence. The problem may not be the curriculum so much as parents' and children's unwillingness to put them into practice.

While I respect House's research and her idealistic plan for the future, it may be more practical for most people simply to encourage whoever speaks Navajo to keep speaking it, especially to their children. Whether someone controls the most conservative variety or only Bilingual Navajo, continued use is the real key to language maintenance.

Chapter 8: Endnotes.

[1] Whereas today the dialect is portrayed as the 'Mother-tongue' and High German as a foreign language, only a few years ago both the dialect and High German were considered different varieties of the same mother-tongue."

[2] terms from Clyne, 1998:145

[3] Woolard 1989:359 referring particularly to Catalan, which has been maintained vis-à-vis Spanish without the typical diglossic "functional separation," rater with separation according to interlocutor. This case offers an model of survival for other minority languages surrounded by majority languages and cultures.

[4] The SNBH model, or Sa'ąh naagháí bik'eh hózhóón Paradigm (House 2001:90)

CHAPTER 9

ENDANGERED LANGUAGES: Comparisons, ideology, agenda.

"It is those for whom their speakers struggle against the odds that we might want to call minority languages. In this sense minority languages come into existence when their speakers use them to express their identity as a group, an identity which may be tied concurrently to feelings about a shared racial origin or to desire to attach themselves to a particular place, religion, or way of life" (Wardhaugh 1987:30).

Wardhaugh identifies the struggle Navajos have in maintaining their language. Even though Navajos are not a minority in their own community, unlike, for example, immigrant groups in big American cities, Navajo is definitely a minority language compared with English. Although English is the language of the dominant culture, Navajo still represents ties to the culture, the extended family, or "k'é"[1] and to the land between the Sacred Mountains.[2]

Speaking Bilingual Navajo does not need to imply failure to speak either one or the other of the two standard codes available, English and Navajo; there are some speakers who command all three. Speakers may use Navajo with their parents and grandparents, English at school and with non-Navajos, and Bilingual Navajo with their peers. This situation is somewhat similar to Schmidt's description of the speech community in which the Dyirbal language is spoken by young aboriginal people in Australia (Schmidt 1985). As with some speakers of Bilingual Navajo, there are some young bilingual Dyirbal speakers who can adjust their usage of their tribal language according to the age and fluency of their addressee

(Schmidt 1985:32). As is also seen in the Dyirbal-speaking community in Australia (Schmidt 1985:40), younger Navajo speakers using a non-standard variety of the tribal language will not use it with elderly fluent speakers, for fear of being publicly corrected and shamed. In this type of language situation the majority language is often learned at the same time as the tribal language (Silver and Miller 1997:252). This language scenario may be associated with the collapse of traditional cultural norms. In the past, many generations lived together as a family and interacted on a daily basis, whereas nowadays young people go to school daily, instead of being trained by their relatives.

For the boarding school generation of Navajos, languages were strictly separated by interlocutor, function, and location, because only English was permitted in school, and only Navajo was understood at home. With the majority of the Navajo population now bilingual in Navajo and English, speech involving a switch back and forth between the two languages is almost universally understood, if not universally approved of. Both languages can be used with almost anyone, in any situation, and at any location. In this kind of situation a mixed code can easily develop, since the languages are no longer separated by use; the strict functional separation has broken down. Sometimes code-switching is seen in situations of stable bilingualism, "and [it] is by no means always diagnostic of imminent language shift" (Milroy 2001:61).

1. Comparisons

There are several ways in which the social situation of Bilingual Navajo differs from that of other American Indian and European language mixed codes, however. Media Lengua speakers apparently do not identify with either the monolingual Spanish-speaking community or the Quechua-speaking community (Muysken 1997:375), Bilingual Navajo speakers consider themselves part of the Navajo community, and separate from Anglo society. The monolingual Navajo speakers on the Reservation are almost all elderly; the bilingual population differs from the monolingual Navajo population mainly in age and

school experience. Although most Navajos have access to standard English through television, schools, and libraries, the residents of the Navajo Nation mostly carry on conversations with other Navajos, for whom there is no particular value placed on Standard English. In the Navajo community speaking this non-standard Navajo language is aptly called "talking bilingual," as understanding and speaking it implies access to at least some English and some Navajo. Although there may be somewhat of a continuum of codes available in the mixed language, the speakers categorize them into a standard usage and a non-standard or vernacular code, and switch from Standard Navajo to Bilingual Navajo according to interlocutor and setting. Bi-and multi-lingualism is the norm in the Navajo Nation; typical types of speakers are as follows (also in Chapter 1):

I. Navajo only

II. Navajo and English

III. Navajo, English, and Bilingual Navajo

IV. English and Bilingual Navajo

V. English only

In the Michif-speaking community, however, it is their mixed-background status that separates them from the Cree and the French, though they identify their language as closer to Cree.

On the other hand, the language situation among Chipewyan speakers is also very different from that of Navajo. Their language is undergoing structural convergence with English; rather than preserving a Standard and a bilingual mixed code, the variety of Chipewyan spoken by the Chipewyan-speaking community in Fort Chipewyan, Alberta has been found to have a drastically simplified phonology and syntax when compared to the language spoken there in 1928, so that whole structural systems of the language are "converging" towards English (Scollon and Scollon 1979: 96; 119-127). Though Standard Navajo is not spoken by the entire Navajo population the way it once was, its

structure has not changed significantly in recent times. In any kind of formal context, Standard Navajo is still required. When the Navajo Nation Chairman gives a public radio address no mixing can be heard at all, although it can be imagined that English words are edited out during his speech preparation. In many other broadcasts on the local station there is so much mixing listeners joke about Bilingual Navajo being the language of that radio station (re: KNDN Farmington, NM). Chapter House meetings are conducted in Navajo, as are many church services. Fluent speakers of the bilingual code are aware mixing in their own and others' speech; given example sentences of Bilingual Navajo Diné College students were able to label the English and Navajo components without hesitation, even when English words were nativized and spelled according to Navajo spelling conventions.[3] Many speakers who prefer to speak only Standard Navajo disapprove of the mixed code but will tolerate it in preference to English in speakers who refuse to speak or do not have perfect command of the Standard.

Some adult speakers of Navajo use both Bilingual Navajo and English for particular functions with their children, for example although they may converse regularly with their children in English, the children may be corrected or praised in Navajo. My son's first-grade teacher used this strategy with her students, which promoted good feelings about the Navajo language, rather than negative ones, even though all her course material was taught in English. The mixed code is perceived as being easier to understand than Standard Navajo for the children, though English is considered still easier. Parents of retarded children may raise them entirely in English, thinking it will be easier for them to learn. Age-grading among the codes is severe, and every single respondent asked on a survey noted that the bilingual code was spoken more by younger people than older.

Navajo people no longer live as isolated from the larger dominant society as they once did; although as recently as the late 1960's the correlation between access to paved roads and speaking English was studied (Spolsky 1970) nowadays most Navajos have

access not only to paved roads but also radio, television, and the internet. Already in 1982 Fuller repeated Spolsky's study and found that access to English could no longer be correlated to distance from a paved road; Navajo students were increasingly English-dominant even when they lived in areas "still relatively difficult of access" (Fuller 1982:30). Increased intermarriage has also increased the use of English in the home vis-à-vis Navajo (McLaughlin 2001:128). Not only when Navajos marry Anglos but also when members of two different tribes marry, the default language in the family tends to be English. Although many lament the decreasing use of the Navajo language, nobody would deny Navajo schoolchildren access to the internet, or paved roads, or any other modern amenity, just because they are not holding on to their ancestral language. This split has been observed by many in the educational system: although people say they should speak Navajo more of the time, very few are willing to actually do it (House 2001:100). Sasse (1992) comments on the typical attitudes toward the minority language in these types of situations, claiming that the attitude may be "schizophrenic in that the retention of the language is valued positively for one reason, and negatively for another" (Sasse 14).

2. Whose responsibility is language maintenance?

Although in the past it was the case that "Anglos" forced American Indian children to learn English, and there are documented histories of children being shamed and physically abused for speaking an indigenous language, now the pressure and scolding are in the opposite direction, and paradoxically seem to be coming from the same group of "Anglos." Surely these people are not obliged to maintain their own language at what they may see as at the expense of their children's success at education. They have the right to determine the costs and benefits themselves, and determine which language(s) to teach to their children. in the words of Ladefoged, "We should always be sensitive to the concerns of the people whose language we are studying. But we should not assume we know what is best for them" (Ladefoged 1992:810).

160

Dorian responds to some of Ladefoged's claims, pointing out that the reason many speakers of endangered languages don't seem to care if their languages are lost is because those same speakers tend to be struggling with basic issues of survival and very low social status. Her point is that, when these basic life issues are addressed, the speech communities will want to maintain their languages after all, and if work is not done now it may be too late by that time (Dorian 1993:576). It may indeed be the responsibility of linguists to explain to speakers of minority languages that their languages are as complete and complex as any of the ELWC's[4] which threaten them, and that being bilingual is good for children, and will not impede their progress in school. Even more importantly, she points out that: "...the linguist cannot enter the threatened-language equation without becoming a factor in it" (Dorian 1993:578). If a linguist has to make some kind of commitment to either support or ignore a struggling language, they are perhaps not "assuming they know what is best for the community" so much as obeying their own conscience.

On the other hand, language is often used as a defining characteristic of people groups, i.e. people labeled as "Ethnic Group X" are those who speak "Language X" (Wardhaugh 1987:244) and the evaluation of speech communities tend to parallel the social evaluations of their codes. Even having "foreign" linguists studying your language can add to its perceived prestige, thus increasing the perceived prestige of the speakers themselves, which may be a valuable endeavor in itself. Craig discusses the Rama language project in Nicaragua, and comments on the improved social evaluation of the code: "The new awareness of the value of the language is palpable. This awareness can be articulated by some of the last speakers, as well as teachers, leaders, and community members-that the language is a 'good' language, that it has enough words for a dictionary, that it can be written, that it can be learned, that it has rules of grammar (Craig 1992:23).

161

3. Reversing language shift (RLS)

      Even with a wide range of ideologies regarding language endangerment, many linguists involved in the study of threatened indigenous languages work at efforts toward reversing the shift away from these languages and toward the languages of the dominant culture. All RLS efforts may be seen as policy rather than descriptive or analytical work on a language, even "an effort by someone claiming authority to alter the language practice or ideology of someone else" (Spolsky and Shohamy 2001:356). At their worst, RLS programs can be seen as a "confrontation, forced binary choice between incompatible monolingualisms" (Spolsky and Shohamy 2001:361). In the case of Navajo, however, the community still values the ancestral language, and members of the community and the school board are willing to work along for any kind of language revitalization efforts. Aiming for a best possible rather than worst possible scenario, in the Navajo Nation efforts are being made to train and hire Navajos as language teachers and RLS workers (Slate 2001:396), but these programs are exceptional. Slate sees the fact that RLS programs are "policy" rather than descriptivist in a positive light, claiming that efforts to maintain the language "...deserve more attention and resources than those which investigate Navajo as data for other concerns" (Slate 2001:391). England, working with Mayan language speakers, believes that linguistic work cannot be done outside a political and social context, that linguists should present linguistic data only according to the wishes of the speech community, and that linguists are responsible for training linguists who are speakers of those languages (England 1992:34).

      On the opposite side of the discussion, Winter (1993) puts the entire responsibility of language survival in threatened languages on their speakers. He points out the importance of motivation in language selection, or CHOICE. He claims that it is understood that each choice has its advantages and disadvantages, it is up to the community and individuals to make an informed choice (Winter 1993:313).

162

Winter worked with the Hualapai people off and on for over twenty-five years; although he begged the school administrators to put emphasis on language in the home rather than the school it was to no avail. Although during his time of observation and study there were still many fluent speakers of the language in the community, they did not pass on the language to their children, and no matter what programs operated in the schools they could not overcome the language loss (1993:305-308). He came to some startling conclusions, illustrated in the following chart:

CHOICE   Werner Winter 1993:314

1. "Languages are used because people want to use them; languages cease to be used when people cease to want to use them."

2. People will want to use a language when they find it to their advantage to use it.have recourse to it.

3. If ceasing to use a lect or language results from not exercising the option of continuing to use it, then "language death" really is speaker-initiated: it actually is rather "Language suicide."

4. If language retention seems a worthwhile goal (whether to a linguist or to members of a given speech community), the only way to safeguard it is to strengthen the motivation for the use of this particular language on the part of its speakers.

Figure 11: CHOICE

"Language suicide" is a harsh term, though the attitudes of the speakers of threatened languages definitely play the largest role in determining the survival of a minority language. It is difficult to fault indigenous speech communities for succumbing to the lure of an easier life and financial solvency at the mere price of English acquisition. It is more difficult still to blame them for wanting a more successful life for their children than they have had, and a less painful "Anglo" education process. Social factors regarding language maintenance issues are very important. Winter recognizes these social factors as follows:

5. Most of the time there will be conflicts of interest; it is the task of the individual speaker to determine for himself and in interaction with other members of the speech community how to rank the advantages deriving from decisions to be taken.

6. It seems possible to analyze decisions to be made and their possible consequences to such an extent that speakers can be induced to make decisions deliberate and not intuitive.

7. If it is basically the speaker's choice whether he wants to use a particular lect or a particular language, it becomes much less likely than commonly believed that suppression of the use of a lect or a language will succeed against the will of this speaker or group of speakers. To be sure, using a language in public may be forbidden by, say, a repressive government; continued private use, however, will essentially depend on the decision of the speakers. The chances that a language is "killed" are very small as long as its speakers want to keep it alive."   (Werner Winter 1993:314)

Figure 12: Social Factors in CHOICE

Indigenous people are human beings, and thus have free choice to choose an indigenous or a European language to speak with their children and in which to raise them, and a choice of which language to speak at home on a daily basis. The attitude that people from the dominant culture have a choice of how to run their families, but that indigenous people are at the mercy of everyone else in this kind of choice, is unfair and frankly racist. Although there is a correlation between the kind of historical oppression a European group has exerted on an indigenous group and the nature of the society's language usage, each person may choose the language they desire with which to speak to their children. Ladefoged points out that, "It is paternalistic of linguists to assume that they know what is best for the community" (Ladefoged 1992:810).

4. CONCLUSION

Although linguists find these kinds of bilingual mixtures and changes in progress fascinating and challenging, every Navajo speaker prefers the standard over the mixed code, which they see as inferior. For many there is an overwhelming feeling of helplessness about the language loss and shift towards English. This is true among those Navajo speakers who speak only English to their children as well as those who are involved in language maintenance programs and those who still raise their children to speak Navajo.

164

Some parents even among the Navajo language teachers raise their children to speak only English, although they are fluent Navajo speakers themselves. They feel they are putting their children's success in school ahead of their linguistic connections to the culture; often the perception in that part of the country is still that bilingual children are at a disadvantage in school (teachers' comments in NAV 289, Summers 1991, 1992). If it can be shown that attitude determines the survival or loss of a minority language, it must also be shown that it is not the attitudes of the linguists that count; rather it is the attitudes of the speakers themselves that will determine the future of Navajo, or any other threatened minority language.

As fewer young people learn Navajo in the home, they become less proficient at speaking the standard version, and as they use a non-standard version the elderly people tease them for "talking funny," as they are teased they become embarrassed to speak Navajo of any kind. It is unfortunate that the efforts of the elderly fluent Navajo speakers to interact with the Navajo young people are interpreted in such a way so as to discourage them from speaking their language altogether. Young people's attitudes towards English are surely colored by the history of forced relocation and cultural oppression associated with speakers of English, but the attitudes towards the Navajo language are also not always positive. More effort needs to be made to improve communication among the generations for the sake of preserving the Navajo language and the culture.

Having Navajo in the schools is a positive measure for maintaining the language. Students who speak Navajo at home have the opportunity to learn to read and write their language, and Navajo students who don't speak Navajo at home have the opportunity to learn it. Even if the variety the students speak at home is not the standard variety, speaking any kind of Navajo at home will increase the students' ability to learn to speak Standard Navajo when they take it as a class in school. The distance between even the most non-standard dialect of Navajo and Standard Navajo is much shorter than the distance between

165

Standard Navajo and English. To keep the language going, though, someone has to speak it. Even if the variety the young people speak among themselves sounds terrible to the adults around them, they should be encouraged to keep speaking it. Their only alternative may be English, rather than Standard Navajo.

On the other hand, because of the history of Navajo-Anglo contact, speaking Standard English makes young people feel like traitors to their own people; and because identification with their elderly pastoral relatives reminds them of past times of poverty and illiteracy, speaking Navajo makes them feel inadequate as American teenagers. As contact between the majority and minority culture increases, these issues are exacerbated rather than lessened. As long as learning Navajo continues to be highly valued, and as Standard Navajo continues to be taught in the public and private school systems, and students and teachers continue to notice that the students who already speak some kind of "bad" Navajo learn the "real thing" much more easily than those who know no kind of Navajo (in-class experiences at Diné College, Shiprock, NM 1989-1992), speaking the bilingual code maybe seen as a useful skill, and acknowledged as a "step-up" towards complete fluency in the Navajo Language. As long as young people speak Bilingual Navajo, they have some access to "real" Navajo, and improving their knowledge of the standard code is possible either by practicing with elderly relatives as well as by taking courses at high school or the tribal colleges. If they are discouraged from speaking Bilingual Navajo, they turn not to Standard Navajo but to English.

Codes used as ethnic identity markers make themselves useful enough for a speech community to maintain them. Positive attitudes among the youth toward an endangered language give it its best chance for viability in the future. Whether any of the speech varieties spoken today on the Navajo Reservation can endure against the flood of Standard English in schools, media, and the surrounding culture depends on the attitudes the speakers hold towards them.

Chapter 9: Endnotes

[1] "K'é" (briefly) is the familial relationships among all Navajos and the responsibilities entailed in those relationships.

[2] The four Sacred Mountains define and bound the traditional Navajo homeland. They are Blanco Peak in the East, Mt. Taylor in the South, the San Francisco Peaks in the West, and Mt. Hesperus in the North.

[3] See Chapter 4 regarding the Diné College survey, 2002.

[4] European languages of wider communication (term used by Wardhaugh)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arviso, Marie and Wayne Holm. 2001. Tséhootsooídi Ólta'gi Diné Bizaad Bíhoo'aah: A Navajo Immersion Program at Fort Defiance, Arizona. from: Hinton, Leanne and Ken Hale, ed.s The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. Academic Press. San Diego.

Bakker, Peter 1997 A Language of Our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Métis. Oxford University Press. New York, Oxford.

Bakker, Peter and Robert A. Papen. 1997. Michif: A mixed language based on Cree and French from: Thomason, Sarah G., Editor Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Bakker, Peter. 2000. Convergence Intertwining: An Alternative Way Towards the Genesis of Mixed Languages. from:Gilbers, Dicky, John Nerbonne, andJos Schaeken.Languages in Contact.Studies in Slavic andGeneral Linguistics, vol.28. Amsterdam.

Barss, Andrew, Ken Hale, Ellavina Tsosie Perkins, Margaret Speas. !984. Aspects of Logical Form in Navajo. from: Cook, Eung-Do and Keren Rice, ed.s. Athapaskan Linguistics: Current Perspectives on a language Family. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin and New York.

Bartelt, H. Guillermo 1980 Rhetorical Redundancy in Apachean Interlanguage . from: Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication 13 (4).

Bartelt, H. Guillermo 1981 Some Observations on Navajo English. from: Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication, 14 (3).

Basso, Keith 1990 Western Apache Language and Culture: essays in Linguistic Anthropology. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Bonvillain, Nancy. 1993. Language, Culture, and Communication: The meaning of messages. Prentice Hall. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Brandt, Elizabeth A. 1982. A Research Agenda for Native American Languages. from: Bilingualism and Language Contact: Spanish, English, and Native American Languages. edited by Florence Barkin, Elizabeth A Brandt, Jacob Ornstein-Galicia
Teachers College Press, New York.

Campbell, Lyle and Martha C. Muntzel. 1989 The Structural Consequences of Language Death. from: Dorian, Nancy C. 1989. Investigating Obsolescence: Studies in Language Contraction and Death. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Canfield, Kip. 1980 Some Notes on Code Switching in Navajo. Anthropological Linguistics vol.22 218-220.

Clyne, Michael. 1997. Multilingualism. from: Coulmas, Florian, ed. The Handbook of Sociolinguistics. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK.

Collins, Wes. 2004. Spanish translator.

Cook, Mary Jane. 1973. Problems of Southwestern Indian Speakers in Learning English. from: American Indians: Language resources and Development. Part II.

Craig, Colette. 1992. A Constitutional Response to Language Endangerment. Language, Vol.68, No.1 (Mar., 1992) 1-42.

Crawford, James. 1996. "Seven Hypotheses on Language Loss: Causes and Cures. from: G. Cantoni, Ed. Stabilizing Indigenous Languages. Flagstaff Center for Excellence in Education, Northern Arizona University.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1997 The Rise and Fall of Languages. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Dorian, Nancy C. 1993. A Response to Ladefoged's Other View of Endangered Languages. Language, Vol.69, No. 3 (Sep. 1993), 575-579.

England, Nora. 1992. Doing Mayan linguistics in Guatemala. Language, Vol.68, No.1 (Mar., 1992) 1-42.

Escobar, Ana Maria 1999. Handouts and class notes from SLI class.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. Diglossia Word 15.325-40.

Field, Margaret. 2001. Language Change, Language Shift, and Language Ideology in the Navajo Community. Presented at AAA November 2001. Washinton, D.C.

Field, Margaret. 2004. Changing Navajo Language Ideologies and Changing Language Use.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1967. Bilingualism withand without Diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues 23(2).29-38.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1993. Reversing Language Shift: Successes, failures, doubts, and dilemmas. from: Jahr, Ernst Håkon, ed. Language Conflict and Languauge Planning. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin and New York.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1999. Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Multilingual Matters, Ltd. Clevedon. U.K.

Fishman, Joshua A. 2001 Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective. Multilingual Matters LTD. Clevedon.

Flanigan, Beverly Olson.1985. American Indian English and Error Analysis: The Case of Lakota English. from: English World-Wide. 6:2 217-236 (1985) John Benjamins B.V., Amsterdam.

Foster, Singer, Benally, Boone, and Beck. 1989. Describing the Language of Navajo Children "Journal of Navajo Education" Fall 1989 Volume vii, Number 1. Rock Point, Arizona.

Francis, Norbert. 1996/1997. Language Maintenance and Vernacular Literacy in the "Journal of Navajo Education" Volume XIV. Daniel McLaughlin, editor. Tsaile, Arizona.

Freimark, Peter. 1979. Language Behaviour and Assimilation: The Situation of the Jews in Northern Germany in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century.
Fuller, Eugene Earl. 1982. A Study of Navajo Language Maintenance and Shift. 1984 University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Goldtooth, Tony. Navajo Language Consultant and Navajo Language Teacher at Diné College, formerly called: Navajo Community College, Shiprock, NM. Personal communication 1989-present.

Grimes, Barbara F., editor. 1996. Ethnologue: Languages of the World. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Inc. Dallas, Texas.

Gynan, Shaw N. 2004 El impacto de la convergencia del guaraní y castellano sobre la panificatión linguística en el Paraguay. Western Washington University.

Hale, Ken. 2001. Navajo I, II, III. from: The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice, Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, editors. Academic Press.

Hill, Jane H. 1989. "The social functions of relativization in obsolescent and non-obsolescent languages." from: Dorian, Nancy C., editor. 1989. Investigating Obsolescence. Cambridge University Press.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. Principles of Historical Linguistics. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin and New York.

Hock, Hans Henrich and Brian D. Joseph 1996 Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin and New York.

Holm, Agnes, with Wayne Holm and Bernard Spolsky 1971. "English Loan Words in the Speech of six-year-old Navajo Chidren." Navajo Reading Study Progress Report No.16 The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Holm, Wayne and Paul Platero: Navajo-English Fluency Testing (1992-1993) Rock Point, Arizona.

House, Deborah. 2002. Language Shift Among the Navajos: Identity politics and cultural continuity. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Hudson, Alan. 1991.Toward the Systematic Study of Diglossia. Southwest Journal of Linguistics: Studies in Diglossia. Volume 10(1). University of North Texas Press. Denton.

Huffines, Marion Lois. "Case usage among the Pennsylvania German sectarians and nonsectarians." from: Dorian, Nancy C., editor. 1989. Investigating Obsolescence. Cambridge University Press.

Iverson, Peter. 1981 The Navajo Nation. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Kahane, Henry and Renée. 1979. Decline and Survival of Western Prestige Languages. Language, Volume 55, Number 1 (1979).

Keiser, Steven Hartman. 2001. Language Change Aacross Speech Islands: The emergence of a midwestern dialect of Pennsylvania German. PhD Thesis. The Ohio State University.

Krauss, Michael. 1992 from: Hale, Ken. Endangered Languages: On endangered languages and the safeguarding of diversity. Language, Vol.68, No. 1 (Mar., 1992), 1-42

Kroskrity, Paul 1982. Language Contact and Linguistic Diffusion: The Arizona Tewa Speech Community. from: Bilingualism and Language Contact: Spanish, English, and Native American Languages. edited by Florence Barkin, Elizabeth A Brandt, Jacob Ornstein-Galicia Teachers College Press, New York.

Ladefoged, Peter. 1992. Another View of Endangered Languages. Language, Vol. 68, No. 4 (Dec., 1992), 809-811.

LaFont, Robert, 1971. "Une problème de culpabilité sociologique: la diglossie Franco-occitane" from: Langue Francaise Larousse.

Leap, William L. 1981 American Indian Language Maintenance. Annual Review of Anthropology.

Leap, William L. 1982. The Study of Indian English in the U.S. Southwest: Retrospect and Prospect. from: Barkin, Florence, Elizabeth A. Brandt, and Jacob Ornstein-Galicia. Bilingualism and Language Contact: Spanish, English, and Native American Languages. Teachers College Press. Columbia University, New York and London.

Leap, William L. 1993 American Indian English. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Lee, T. and Dan McLaughlin. 2001. Reversing Navajo Language Shift, Revisited. from: Fishman, Joshua A.,ed. Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective. Multilingual Matters LTD. Clevedon.

Lefebvre, Claire. 2004. Issues in the Study of Pidgins and Creoles. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Lehiste, Ilse. 1988. Lectures on Language Contact. M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass.

LePage, R.B. and Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. Acts of Identity. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Liebe-Harkort, Marie-Louise.1984. Contrastive Pragmatics. from: Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics 1984 v.19 p.23-28.

Lipski, John M. 1994. Latin American Spanish. Longman, London; New York.

Mazel, J. 1982 Vous avez dit "Francitan"? *Cahiers de Linguistique Sociale* 4 - 5:98-106

McConvell, Patrick. 1996. Language Contact, Mixed Languages and the MLF Model in Aboriginal Australia. Presentation for the Workshop on Comparative Linguistics: Language Contact and Language Change, OSU November 1996.

McDonough, Joyce and P. Ladefoged. 1996. The Specification of Stop Contrasts in Navajo. Dam Phonology edited by Marina Nespor and Norval Smith Holland Institute of Linguistics. Phonology. Vol 3 HIL Publications. Holland Academic Graphics.The Hague.

McLaughlin, Dan. 1992. When Literacy Empowers: Navajo Language in Print. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, NM.

Migge, Bettina. 1997, "Substrate Influence."

Milroy, Lesley. 2001. Bridging the micro-macro gap: social change, social networks and bilingual repertoires. from: Klatter-Folmer, Jetske and Piet Van Avermat, editors. Theories on Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages. Waxmann. Münster/New York; München/Berlin.

Mithun, Marianne. "The incipient obsolescence of polysynthesis: Cayuga in Ontario and Oklahoma." from: Dorian, Nancy C., editor. 1989. Investigating Obsolescence. Cambridge University Press.

Mous, Maarten. 1994. Ma'a. from: Bakker, Pieter and Maarten Mous, ed. Mixed Languages: 15 Case Studies in Language Intertwining. CIP-Gegevens Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Den Haag.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2003. Language Endangerment: What Have Pride and Prestige Got to Do with It? from: Joseph, DeStefano, Jacobs, and Lehiste, editors. When Languages Collide. OSU Press.

Muysken, Pieter. 1994. Media Lengua. from: Bakker, Pieter and Maarten Mous, ed. Mixed Languages: 15 Case Studies in Language Intertwining. CIP-Gegevens Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Den Haag.

Muysken, Pieter. 1997. Media Lengua. from: Thomason, Sarah G., editor: Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Muysken, Pieter. 2000. Bilingual Speech. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Myers-Scotton. 1993. Duelling Languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol.1997 "Code-switching" from: The Handbook of Sociolinguistics. Coulmas, Florian, editor. Blackwell Publishers. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1998 "A way to dusty death: the Matrix language turnover hypothesis" from Grenoble, Lenore A. and Lindsay J. Whaley, editors. Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response 289 - 316. Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002 Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

Pavlik, Steve 1990 Climbing Manuelito's Ladder: Navajo Indian Education Since 1868 from "Diné Be'iiná" Fall 1990 Volume 2 Number 1. Published by Navajo Community College, Shiprock, New Mexico.

Peterson, Leighton C. 1997 from: Reyhner, Jon, editor: Teaching Indigenous Languages. Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ. (Chapter 17 pages 214-221).

Powell, J.W. 1991. Indian Linguistic Families of America North of Mexico.Preston Holder, editor. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London.

Ramos-Pellecia, Michelle. 2004 Spanish in Lorain County, Ohio.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1992. Theory of language death. from: Brenzinger, Matthias, editor. Language Death: Factual and Theoretical Explorations with Special Reference to East Africa. Mouton de Gruyter.

Schiffman, Harold F. 1991. Swiss-German Diglossia. Southwest Journal of Linguistics: Studies in Diglossia. Volume 10 Number 1. University of North Texas Press. Denton.

Schmidt, Annette. 1985 Young People's Dyirbal. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Scollon, Ronald and Suzanne B.K. Scollon. 1979. Linguistic Convergence: An Ethnography of Speaking at Fort Chipewyan, Alberta. Academic Press, New York, San Francisco, London.

Silver, Shirley and Wick R. Miller. 1997 American Indian Languages: Cultural and Social Contexts. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.

Slate, Clay. 2001. Promoting Advanced Navajo Scholarship. from The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice, Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, editors. Academic Press.

Spears, Arthur K. and Donald Winford 1997 The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Spolsky, Bernard 1970. Navajo Language Maintenance: Six-year olds in 1969. Language Sciences (Dec.) 13:19-24.

Spolsky, B. and E. Shohamy. 2001. Hebrew after a Century of RLS Efforts. from: Fishman, Joshua A., ed. Can Threatened Languges be Saved? Multilingual Matters LTD. Clevedon.

Telushkin, Rabbi Joseph. 1991 Jewish Literacy. William Morrow and Co. Inc., New York.

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988 Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Thomason, Sarah Grey. 1999. Notes from SLA 1999 "Language Contact" at University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.

Thomason, Sarah Grey. 1997. Mednyj Aleut, Ma'a, from:Thomason, Sarah G., Editor 1997 Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Thomason, Sarah G.1997. A Typology of Contact Languages from: Spears, Arthur K. and Donald Winford 1997 The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. Language Contact: An Introduction. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.

Vakhtin, Nikolai. 1998 Copper Island Aleut: a case of language "resurrection" from: Grenoble, Lenore A. and Lindsay J. Whaley. Endangered Languages. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Voser, Hans Ulrich. 1985. Anmerkungen zum Zeerfall unserer Sprachkultur. from: Des Schweizers Deutsch. Hallwag AG Bern.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1987. Languages in Competition: Dominance, Diversity, and Decline. Basil Blackwell.

Wexler, Paul. 1981. Jewish Interlinguistics: Facts and Conceptual Framework. Language, Vol.57, No.1 (Mar., 1981), 99-149.

Winford, Donald. 2003. An Introduction to Contact Linguistics. Blackwell Publishing. Malden, MA.

Winter, Werner. 1993. Some conditions for the survival of small languages. from: Jahr, Ernst Håkon, editor. 1993. Language Conflict and Language Planning. Mouton de Gruyter Berlin and New York.

Woolard, Kathryn A. "Language convergence and language death as a social process." from: Dorian, Nancy C., editor. 1989. Investigating Obsolescence. Cambridge University Press.

Young, Robert W. and William Morgan 1987 The Navajo Language: A Grammar and Colloquial Dictionary University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque.

Young, Robert W. (date unknown) A Contrastive Overview of Certain Features of the English and Navajo Languages: Phonology from ESL for Navajos.

APPENDIX A

BILINGUAL NAVAJO DATA

The following data set includes all of the Bilingual Navajo and code switching data found in this dissertation, plus a few sentences not used or analyzed at this time. Sentences are organized by source; examples from Foster et al., Canfield, Holm, Holm, and Spolsky, Field, and McLaughlin are followed by sentences frommy data. Examples below are discussed mainly in chapters 3, 4, and 5.

1. Everydayísh náníłtéééh doo?   'will you bring him/her every day?'
   every day.Q. 2nd.sing.bring.3rd. fut.   (Foster et al. 1989:16)

2. Da' Roy bisister?   'do you mean Roy's sister?'
   Q.part. Roy 3rd.poss.sister   (Foster et al. 1989:16)

3. Shí one bale bá nináshjoł   'I repeatedly give it [horse]one bale[hay]'
   I one bale 3rd.ben. 1st.repeatedly move fluffy object   (Foster et al. 1989:15)

4. Nancy bich'į' show ánílééh!   'show it to Nancy!'
   Nancy 3rd.to show 2nd.make or prepare   (Canfield 1980:219)

5. Hait'éigo doo dust anáhół'įį da   'how come you never dust?'
   why.sub. neg. dust 2nd.iterative.make neg.   (Canfield 1980:219)

6. Swimming asht'į   'I'm swimming'
   swimming 1st.sing.do   (Canfield 1980:219)

7. na'iish-crash lá   'I'm about to pass out'
   1st.pass out-crash emphatic   (Canfield 1980:219)

8. Shił naweasy   'I feel sick (queasy)'
   1st.with 3rd.sick   (Canfield 1980:219)

9. Shiłééchąą'í anáyííł-turn   'my dog died'
   1st.poss.dog 3rd.die   (Canfield 1980:219)

10. Dóó coyote dóó ma'ii dóó ná'áshjaa'   'and coyote and coyote and owl'

and coyote and coyote and owl   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:7)

11. Jump íyiilaa   'he jumped'

    jump 3rd.perf.make   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:7)

12. Áádóó nihi room clean ádahwiilnééh   'and then we clean our room'

    1st.pl.poss. room clean 1st.pl.make   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:7)

13. Dóó swing bee ásht'íį nít'ę́ę́'   'and I was swinging'

    and swing 3rd.instr. 1st.do past   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:7)

14. Bertha háádą́ą́ lá éiyá take picture ánihilaa 'when did Bertha take the picture?'

    Bertha when.past emphatic.dem.take picture 3rd.perf.make (H.,H.,&S. 1971:149)

15. "Spank you," níi łeh   'he usually says, "Spank you"

    spank you 3rd.say usually   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:7)

16. "Get in line" shidii'ní   'Someone says to me, "Get in line"'

    get in line 1st.to.3rd.say   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:7)

17. Elephantyę́ę ch'il néidiljooł   'the elephant is eating plants'

    elephant plants 3rd.eats fluffy matter   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:149)

18. Ha'át'íí biniiyé tape recorder si'ą́?   'what is the tape recorder sitting there[for]?'

.....what   3rd.for that reason ... s.o. in position   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:149)

19. Dóó four-o'clock-go tłóo'di naashnée łeh   'and at 4-o'clock I usually play outside'

    and.....   -sub. outside.at 1st.play usually   (H., H., & S. 1971:87)

20. Record player yę́ę   'the previously-mentioned record player'

    .....   previously mentioned   (Holm, Holm, and Spolsky 1971:9)

21. Siiké łeh, gohwééh dóó cookies-da níléí náyíídįįh-go

    1st.dual.sit usually, coffee and cookies, too dem.we customarily enjoy (to eat)-sub.

'we usually sit at home, enjoying coffee and cookies there'   (Field 2004)

22. Lahdi éiyá six months-da nahidéél-go nináhasht'a łeh.

[there.at specifically ...iter.connected objs.pass.sub 1st.iter.fly usually]

'I usually fly back every six months'   (Field 2004)

23. díkwííshį́į́ questions......   '(I don't know) how many Q.s'

   how many.probably   ...   (Field 2001)

24. t'óó ahayóí, seven pages   daats'í   'A lot, maybe seven pages'

   quite many,   ...   maybe   (Field 2001)

25. graphs, dóó, áádóó nda łahdó' formulas   'graphs, and then also some formulas'

        and and then but some also ....   (Field 2001)

26. Ndi the last one-ígíí two pages multiple choice

  but ....   -nom. ....

'but the last one [in particular] was two pages multiple choice'   (Field 2001)

27. Néínídzáago índída, hazhó'ó nił hodeeshniih. **Lady-to-lady talk-**go.T'áásh áko.

  2nd.sing.arrive.sub. then carefully 2nd.with it.fut.1st.tell   .....   -sub. OK? Q.enc.

I'll tell you all the details, lady-to-lady, when you get back, OK?   (McLaughlin 1992:143)

28. Public Meeting deiil'aah k'ad **Thursday**-go, naadiin táá'góó yoołkááł góne'.

    ... pl.fut.1st.put up   now ....-sub. twenty three-direction night is passing inside it

we'll be having a Public Meeting this coming Thursday the twenty-third [at five o'clock]...

                                           (McLaughlin 1992:27)

29.   áłtsé wait!   'wait up!' (informal)

30.   díí'go June fourth góne'   'on June fourth (KNDN 2002)
      four-sub.............inside it

31.   T.L.C.   'come on, let's go'
      tį' let's cruise

32.   Ééshją́ą́shí   Paul   call ásh¬ééh   'I guess I better go call Paul' (L.S.)

"I better"   Paul   call 1st.sing.-make

Standard Navajo: Ééshją́ą́shí Paul bich'į'   hashne'
                    "I better"   Paul   3rd.toward   call

33. Paper plates beisénah   "I forgot the paper plates' (L.S.)
             perf.1st.forget

Standard Navajo: naaltsoos łeets'aa' beiséenah
                   paper   dishes   perf.1st.forget

34. Shi-relatives   bił cookout baa   nisiikai   'We went to a cookout with my
1st.poss-relatives 3rd.with...3rd.about   dual.perf.go   relatives'

Standard Navajo: Shi-k'éí   bił cookout ada'iilyaa
                  1st.poss-relatives   3rd.with .... recip.plural.perf.prepare
'my relatives and I prepared a cookout for ourselves'

35. Shi-łį́į́'   hay bá   nishjool   'I give my horse hay'
     1st.poss-horse   3rd.for   1st.move fluffy object

36. Pen shaa   nítįįh   'hand me the pen'
        ... 1st.to 2nd.move slender stiff object

37. Tłinic-di check-up biniyé all day sédá-.
Clinic-at check-up 3rd.for that reason...1st.perf.wait
'I went to the clinic for a check-up and waited [there] all day'

Standard Navajo: Tłinic-di check-up biniyé sédáa-go shei'íí'áh
Clinic-at check-up 3rd.for that reason 1st.perf.wait.rel 1st.obj.3rd.perf.went down
'I went to the clinic for a check-up and waited until it [the sun] went down with me'

38. shį́į́-go temperature   ayóo high   nádleeh   'it gets really hot in the Summer'
     Summer-adv   ......   really high 3rd.changes

Standard Navajo: shį́į́-go   ayóo deesdoi   náhádleeh
                Summer-adv really   3rd.hot customarily.changes
'it usually gets really hot in the Summer'

39. Abe' fridge biih naní'aah   'put the milk back in the fridge'
     milk fridge 3rd. into it revers.2nd.put solid object.

Standard Navajo: Abe'   bee ask'azí biih naní'aah
                   milk   3rd.instr. cool 3rd.into it revers.2nd.put solid object
'put the milk back in the refrigerator'

40. Computer roomgóó   dishwod   'I'm going to the computer room'
                    -direction   1st.future.go

41. Da'   díí   ni-school?   'Is this your school?'

Q.particle dem.2nd.poss.school

(examples 34-41 are from a survey administered at Diné College Summer 2002)

42. leave it by the gate on the north side, by that tire b-íighah-gi   t'áá kwe'é"
                                                      3rd-next to it-at right there

43. ...chidí gas biih   náákááh   I washed my car
   car   3rd-into it   1st put liquid
'I put gas in my car and washed it'

44. "...twenty-five cents bą́ą́h ílį́į́-lá   áádóó aaji-ígíí fifteen minutesjį' náábąął.
                         3rd.costs-particle and over there-the one   runs (turns)

 '[the dryers] cost twenty-five cents and the ones over there run for fifteen minutes'

45. "Telecommunication béésh bee dahane'íjí díí kǫ́ǫ́ bąąh ílį́ dóó service ałdó nááná

insurance agents and companies dóó áadi kǫ́ǫ́ chidí tsídá ayóo bee hasinda

transportation company hashiinéelą́ą́ ´nléí ts'ídída ííyisíí nihaa ndishnish truly a

full-time position ní"

46.   Ute Mountain Casino díí 2nd Annual Native American Music Arts and Crafts

deiilíin-go eidíí Festivalígíí t'ei aa díí k'ad Dziłígíí tsosts'idgóó áádóó tseebíígo

yoołkáałgo. Áko índa'iiníishnee dóó tsosts'idóó díí tseebíí bik'idahazkę́ęz-go

abínídą́ą́ t'áá diné dooleeł. Áádóó MC Kerry Knight dóó koji díidi Ute Mountain

Tribal chairman éidi Judy Knight Frank [ídi] dahadziih dooleeł dóó kojí díkwííshį́į'

 nahada'iiłdeeh daaní eidí. Danagai Apache Crown Dancers ádaat'éhígíí da.

47.   Breastplategóó éiyá sizį́ righteousness akót'áo kót'éego biniinaanígíí éí bee yáłti'.

Diyin God bidiné'é-nt'éé' breastplate jó ałk'idą́ą́' priests danilǫ́ jó Aaron éí
holy   God 3rd.poss.people-past ....   you see long ago ... 3rd.pl.be ....   dem.

dahoolzhiizh. The priest wore a breastplate; bikáagi éiyá precious stones
so it was.   ....   3rd.on it-at dem. ....

dabi'dii'ní gold is one of them óola wolyé-hígíí.
we said that about it   ....   gold 3rd.is called-nom.

48.   Ephesians 4 áádóó verse 4 góne' : ei biniinayę́ę áko díishjį́į-di we need to make a
                  and then   in it   : dem. 3rd.because of it-past thus today-at .....

choice today dííshjį́į́di áko who are we going to serve? Diyin God daats'í?
                today-at thus   .....   holy God   maybe?

49. Coffee nizhóní-go   íłʼį   nisin.   'I think she makes good coffee'
     ...   3rd.beautiful-adv. 3rd.prepare 1st.think

Gohwééh nizhónígo   íłʼį-gi átʼé   'I think she makes good coffee'
coffee   3rd.beautiful-adv   3rd.prepare-at 3rd.be

50. Ei biyáázh bee átʼé she doesnʼt have a job. 'Because of her son she doesnʼt have a job'
    dem. 3rd.poss.son 3rd.inst. 3rd.be .....

51. I like him doo biyoochííd da.   'I like him because he doesnʼt lie'
    ....   neg. 3rd.lie   neg.

52. Ashkii medicine man yileeh   'the boy is beecoming a medicine man'
    boy (hataałii)   3rd.become

53. Ei casino-ji ndeeshnish   'sheʼs going to work at the casino'
    dem. .....-at 3rd.future.work

54. daadíílkaał door-ísh close   adaiilaah   'they closed the door, didnʼt they?'
     door   -Q.particle ...3rd.pl.perf.close

55. "CD-ísh   record íínílaa?"   'did you record a CD?'
CD-Qparticle   2nd.perf.make

56. Bi-face   tłiin   doo bee   áshłééh   da. 'I didnʼt wash his face'
   3rd.poss.-face   clean   not   3rd inst. 1st.sing.-make   not

57. Computer use   ásh-łééh   'Iʼm using the computer'
           verb   1st.sing.make   (Diné College survey, 2002)

58. Bookshelf   ła'   shá   save   ání-łééh.   'Save me (one) bookshelf'
    bookshelf   one   for me   save   2nd.sing.-make

59. Bi-'éé'   change íí-lééh   'we are changing her clothes'
    3rd.poss.-clothes   change   1st.dual-make

60. Washmachine   táá'   use íshłaa   'I used three washing machines'
    washing machine   three   use 1st.sing.perf.-make

APPENDIX B

IRB PROTOCOL AND DINÉ COLLEGE SURVEY

Charlotte Schaengold
126 Ritchie Ave.
Cincinnati, OH 45215

Behvioral and Social Services
Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

RESEARCH PROTOCOL:

02B0101 INVESTIGATION OF BILINGUAL NAVAJO, Brian D. Joseph, Charlotte C. Schaengold, Linguistics.

To whom it may concern:

I have revised my paperwork to satisfy the committee's conditions. Enclosed please find a revised questionnaire for written response; I have received permission from Diné College to administer the questionnaire in the Navajo Language classes there. I hope to receive as many questionnaires back as possible, however I do not expect to receive more than fifty, therefore the limits of questionnaire use will be between 20 and 50. The written questionnaire will take less than one class period, even with questions and discussion.

I will tape-record Navajo radio stations KNDN (960 AM) and KTNN (660 AM) for samples of Bilingual Navajo, which should not require permission of any kind. When I ask permission to tape record Bilingual Navajo speakers, I will ask their permission to use the tape for my research on the tape, and I will explain that the tapes will go to the Diné College archives when I am finished. If they are not comfortable with this arrangement, I will not tape record. They will have the opportunity to remain anonymous, identify themselves fully, or identify themselves by pseudonym. Tape-recorded interviews will be open ended, lasting from fifteen minutes to one hour. If participants have further questions they may reach me at (513) 821-6380. Enclosed is a sample sheet each speaker will be given explaining my project, with my telephone number and that of the Office of Risks Protection at (614) 688-4792.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to waive the requirement of written consent. Many Navajo people prefer not to sign their names, and, as the Bilingual Navajo code has a strongly negative evaluation in the community, they might prefer not to have their names associated with their speech samples.

Thank you for your concern regarding my project and the sensibilities of the Navajo people.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Christ Schaengold
126 Ritchie Ave.
Cincinnati, OH 45215
charlch@ling.ohio-state.edu

Yá'át'ééh!

shí éiyá Bilagáana nishłį́, Swiss diné'é báshíshchíín, Béésh bich'ahí dashicheii áádóó Swiss diné'é dashinálí. Charlotte yinishyé. Diné bizaad bíneeshdlį́įgo t'ahdii bóhoosh'aah. Neeznáá nááhaidą́ą́' Diné Collegedi íínishta' nt'éé' (íídą́ą́' éí NCC wolyé). Táá' shį́į' nááhaigo áadi ííłta'. Mr. Benally dóó Clay Slate dóó Martha Austin-Garrison dóó Tony Goldtooth bá'ííníshta'nt'éé'. Ayóo baa ahééh nisin. Díkwííshį́į nááhaigo saadígíí be'iiná baa ííníshta'. Ha'át'íísh biniiyé saad ła' hiiná, áádóó ła' éí saadígíí doo hiináa da. PhD biniyé binaashnish. Shiká anilyeed, daats'í.

I am working on the kind of Navajo nobody likes, called "Boarding School Navajo", "Bad Navajo", or "Bilingual Navajo." Maybe we should just call it "B. Navajo." We have all noticed that the people talk at least three ways in Navajoland: t'áá Dinék'ehjí, t'áá Bilagáana, and Bilingual. The problem is that nobody likes it when the children speak Bilingual Navajo. I would like to study Bilingual Navajo more, and I would like to encourage you to allow the children to continue to speak it. Nobody prefers it to Standard Navajo; I don't prefer it to Standard Navajo, either, but it makes me sad to think that some of the teenagers will give up on Navajo altogether if they are not encouraged to speak whatever kind of Navajo they can. It has been found that speech communities which are relatively flexible about their children's speech are more likely to maintain their own language than speech communities who take a strict and corrective view of the way their children talk. Purity does not insure the survival of a language in a minority context. Bilingual Navajo is still mostly Navajo, not mostly English. As you have probably noticed from the example sentences, the phonology, morphology, and syntax of Navajo is maintained in the bilingual language. Young people who can really talk Bilingual Navajo can use it as a step up to learn the real thing in Navajo language class or from their grandparents, but it is so much harder to learn it starting with only English. If you are worried about the survival of your language, the question must be asked: is it better for the young people to speak Bilingual Navajo, or only English? Or: is it worse for the young people to speak Bilingual Navajo, or only English? Is it the purity of the language that is important, or is the culture maintained by the fact that the people still speak it? I would like to encourage everyone to continue to speak to their children and grandchildren in Navajo, because I think it is a beautiful language, but if you hear the young people speaking Bilingual Navajo, please encourage them, too, because speaking that way may be the only way they are going to learn Standard or "real" Navajo. Ahéhee'.

If you have further questions about this project or about Bilingual Navajo, you can reach me at (513) 821-6380 or by e-mail at: charlch@ling.ohio-state.edu. If you have questions about the rights of a research participant you may reach the Office of Research Risks Protection at (614) 688-4792.

thank you very much for your time and participation!

Chair, Behavioral and Social Sciences IRB
Office of Research Risks Protection
Room 310, Research Foundation Building
1960 Kenney Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1063

To whom it may concern:

      I have known Charlotte Christ Schaengold for over ten years and have given her permission to administer her questionnaire in my classes. I am aware of her project involving Bilingual Navajo and have encouraged her to present the information to the Diné Studies Department classes. She has assured me that she will send all her research materials (tapes, etc.) and her final work toward the PhD. degree back to the Diné College Archives when she is done.

(signed by: Tony C. Goldtooth, Chair of Diné Studies, and Berneice Casaus, Dean of Instruction, Diné College, Shiprock, New Mexico)

Yá'át'ééh!

shí eiyá Bilagáana nishłį, Swiss diné'é báshíshchíín, Béésh bich'ahí dashicheii áádóó Swiss diné'é dashinálí. Charlotte yinishyé. Diné bizaad bíneeshdlįįgo t'ahdii bóhoosh'aah. Neeznáá nááhaidą́ą' Diné Collegedi íínishta' nt'éé' (íídą́ą' éí NCC wolyé). Táá' shį́į' nááhaigo áadi ííłta'. Mr. Benally dóó Clay Slate dóó Martha Austin-Garrison dóó Tony Goldtooth bá'íínishta'nt'éé'. Ayóo baa ahééh nisin. Díkwííshį́į nááhaigo saadígíí be'iiná baa íínishta'. Ha'át'íísh biniiyé saad ła' hiiná, áádóó ła' éí saadígíí doo hiináa da. PhD biniyé binaashnish. Shiká anilyeed, daats'í.

Thank you for helping me. It shouldn't take more than half an hour. I will read you some sentences in Bilingual Navajo, then you can circle which parts are English, underline those that are Navajo, and write the same thing in Standard Navajo and Standard English. You don't need to put your name on the paper. If you have more questions you can reach me in Cincinnati at (513) 821-6380. My advisor is Professor Brian Joseph, you can reach him at: (614) 292-4981. Ayóo baa ahééh nisin.

1. Éé' datłiinígíí lower drawer góne' bii' iishnííł.

t'áá Dinék'ehjígo_____

Bilagáanak'ehjí _____

2. Biface t'áadoo tłiin áshłééh da.

t'áá Dinék'ehjígo _____

Bilagáanak'ehjí _____

3. Bookshelf ła' shá save ánílééh

t'áá Dinék'ehjígo _____

Bilagáanak'ehjí _____

4. Bi'éé' change íilnééh

t'áá Dinék'ehjígo _____

Bilagáanak'ehjí _____

5. Washmachine táá' use ííshłaa

t'áá Dinék'ehjígo _____

Bilagáanak'ehjí _____

6. Towngóó niséyá

t'áá Dinék'ehjígo _____

Bilagáanak'ehjí _____

KEY IN ENGLISH:

 Hello. I am "Anglo", my father's people are Swiss, my maternal grandfather's people were German, my paternal grandfather's people were also Swiss, my name is Charlotte. I am still enthusiastically learning Navajo Language. About ten years ago I was studying at Diné College, then called Navajo Community College. For several years I studied there. I studied under Mr. Herbert Benally, Clay Slate, Martha Austin-Garrison, and Tony Goldtooth. I am grateful to all of them. For a number of years I have been studying how languages continue to live, why it is that some languages continue to thrive, while others do not continue on. I am working on a PhD. about it, maybe you will help me.

Thank you for helping me. It shouldn't take more than half an hour. I will read you some sentences in Bilingual Navajo, then you can circle which parts are English, underline those that are Navajo, and write the same thing in Standard Navajo and Standard English. You don't need to put your name on the paper. If you have more questions you can reach me in Cincinnati at (513) 821-6380. My advisor's name is Professor Brian Joseph; you can reach him at: (614) 292- 4981. Ayóo baa ahééh nisin.

1. Éé' datłiinígíí lower drawer góne' bii' iishnííł.
    clothes plural.clean.NME   lower drawer   inside   3rd.into   1st.sing.carry away

        plural   objects 'I'm putting the clean clothes into the lower drawer'
(compare: Éé' daalchí'ígíí ts'aa' góne' bii' iishnííł. 'I'm putting the red clothes into the basket')

2. Biface t'áadoo tłiin áshłéeh da.   'I didn't wash his face'
    3rd.poss.-not   clean   1st.sing.-make   not

Standard Navajo: Bi-nii'   doo tanézgiz   da.
                  3rd.poss.-face not   1st.sing.perf.wash   not

3. Bookshelf ła' shá save ánílééh   .   'save me (one) bookshelf'
    bookshelf   one for me   save   2nd.sing.-make

Standard Navajo: Naaltsoos biih ná'niłí ła'   shá   hasht'e'   niní'ah
                  bookshelf   one for me   in storage(adv.) 2nd.sing.move.s.o.

4. Bi'éé' change íilnééh   'we are changing her clothes'
    3rd.poss.-clothes   change 1st.dual-make

Standard Navajo: Bi'éé'   łahgo át'éhí bii   ndeezhteeh.
                  3rd.poss.-clothes different one 3rd.into   1st.dual move animate being

5. Washmachine táá' use ííshłaa   'I used three washing machines'
     washing machine   three   use 1st.sing.perf.-make

Standard Navajo: Táá' bida'iigisí   bee   daségis
                  three washing machine 3rd.inst. 1st.sing.perf.wash clothes

6. Towngóó   niséyá   'I went to town and came back'

   town-toward 1sg.perf.went and returned

Standard Navajo: Kin- tah-   góó   niséyá
                 house-among-towards   1sg.perf.went and returned

Attitude Survey

1. Do you, or does anyone you know, speak like this? _____

2. How do you feel about this kind of language? _____

_____

_____

3. When do you feel it is appropriate to speak Bilingual Navajo? _____

_____

4. How do speakers of Bilingual Navajo learn to talk that way? _____

_____

_____

5. How old are you? _____ Do younger or older people feel differently about it? _____

_____

_____

6. Do you know anyone who speaks both Standard Navajo and Bilingual Navajo? _____

7. How do they decide which kind of language to speak at a certain time? _____

_____

_____

8. Do you feel like the use of Bilingual Navajo is increasing or decreasing right now? ___

_____

_____

9. How does Bilingual Navajo relate to the boarding school system? _____

_____

_____

10. Is speaking Bilingual Navajo better or worse than speaking only English? _____

_____

[Bilingual Navajo] Sentences you have heard: _____

_____