MULTILINGUAL SPACES AS CONTACT ZONES: 'CRITICAL' THINGS WE NEED TO KNOW ABOUT CRITICAL LINGUISTICS

Prof Christine Anthonissen

April 2015

MULTILINGUAL SPACES AS CONTACT ZONES:
"CRITICAL" THINGS WE NEED TO KNOW ABOUT CRITICAL LINGUISTICS

Inaugural lecture delivered on 16 April 2015

Prof Christine Anthonissen
Department of General Linguistics
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Stellenbosch University

Editor: SU Language Centre
Printing: SUN MeDIA
ISBN: 978-0-7972-1546-7

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Christine Anthonissen verwerf die kwalifikasies BA cum laude (met hoofvakke Afrikaans-Nederlands en Geskiedenis), BA Honneurs cum laude (met spesialisasie in Afrikaanse Taalkunde) en MA in Algemene Taalwetenskap al drie aan die Universiteit Stellenbosch. Haar PhD behaal sy in 2001 onder studieleiding van prof Ruth Wodak aan die Universiteit Wene in Oostenryk. Sy doseer van 1992 tot 2002 aan die Universiteit van Wes-Kaapland, en is daarna, sedert 2003, verbonde aan die Departement Algemene Taalwetenskap, Universiteit Stellenbosch.

Haar navorsing fokus hoofsaaklik op diskoersanalise, kritiese diskoersanalise en sosiale aspekte van tweetaligheid en meertaligheid. Aanvanklik ondersoek sy hoe die Suid Afrikaanse nuusmedia streng perssensuur hanteer het deur mediadiskoerse van die laat 1980s te analiseer. Meer onlangse werk verwys na diskoerse wat ontstaan waar mense op gestruktureerde wyse traumatiese geskiedenisse verwerk, met spesifieke aandag aan verhore tydens die Suid Afrikaanse Waarheids- en Versoeningskommissie en aan die diskoerse tussen mediese personeel en pasiënte in MIV/vigs-klinieke. Plaaslik het sy projekte gelei wat ondersoek instel na eienskappe van taalverskuiwing van Afrikaans na Engels in aantal Wes-Kaapse gemeenskappe. Tans doen sy opname van die veeltalige repertoires van migrante in geselekteerde dele van die Wes-Kaap. Buiten die insig wat hierdie opname bied wat kwessies van taalbemagting (of ontmagtiging) betref, raak dit ook kritiese taalbeplannings- en beleidskwessies.

Sy is lid van die redaksionele komitee van Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics (SPIL), en die Journal of Language and Politics (Benjamins, redakteurs: Ruth Wodak en Paul Chilton).

MULTILINGUAL SPACES AS CONTACT ZONES: 'CRITICAL' THINGS WE NEED TO KNOW ABOUT CRITICAL LINGUISTICS

Ideally in an inaugural lecture one would like to give some kind of indication of 'the state of the art', some reflection on the discipline, which in the case of General Linguistics would be an overview of how Linguistics has developed across the past 50 to 60 years. One would also do well to reflect on where we are, what we are at as a discipline generally, but also as an area of teaching and research in South Africa, and as an established academic department at the University of Stellenbosch. Particularly, such reflection would have been a good idea because of the remarkable and interesting turns that modern Linguistics has taken; also because of the range of different themes and theories, ideas and interests that are in one way or another referred to as 'Linguistics'. This is a discipline in which one regularly has to distinguish between many popular (and sometimes superficial) impressions of this field of study and what some like to call 'Linguistics Proper'. However, simply because we do not have all day (or all week for that matter), but also because that would be rather overwhelming a task, I will settle for reflecting on one of my own areas of specialisation and, in the process, try to give an impression of where 'Critical Linguistics' fits into the bigger picture.

The Department of General Linguistics at Stellenbosch University was established in 1970 – just 12 years after Noam Chomsky (1957) published his *Syntactic Structures*, which became the marker of a turn in our understanding of grammatical structure in universal rather than specific language terms. His work triggered an interest in 'formal Linguistics', in the *forms* of language, in what used to be called 'underlying structures', in the nature of 'grammatical competence', in what it means to know a language, what kind of knowledge we have when we say we know English – or Afrikaans or isiXhosa. For quite a while, questions about 'performance', about how linguistic knowledge is put to work, were either put on the backburner, or discounted as trivial. However, as reflections on linguistic structure became more sophisticated, it also became clear that it would be a while before knowing fascinating stuff about language-in-the-mind would translate into answers for many very practical and sometimes burning issues, such as

- How do we successfully learn and teach a second language? or
- Why do first-language speakers of a language present with such a wide variety of forms? (consider the range of Englishes worldwide) or
- How do we distinguish and, if required, treat 'language impairment'? or
- How do we present evidence that a person using bad language actually meant what he said?

The improved understanding of the universal and formal features of language changed forever the way in which we approach such questions, and contributed immensely to better practices in many applied linguistic domains. Even so, by the 1980s, scholarly interest in various kinds of 'Applied Linguistics' gained respect and have since been included in undergraduate and postgraduate curricula, to such an extent that more time in teaching and research currently goes to liminal areas on the interface between language and other mental capacities, between learning and using language(s), between speech acts and other kinds of human activity.

Against this background I shall introduce Critical Linguistics (CL) as an area of interest within Applied Linguistics, and give some pointers as to what it is that makes CL really 'critical'. Actually, one could give three short answers – but I shall elaborate a bit as well. The short answers are:

1. CL is 'critical' because it is embedded in Critical Theory and thus follows – and to some extent continues – a tradition that started out as an epistemological and methodological turn in the late 1920s and 1930s, and that has shaped much of the social theories that developed in the latter half of the 20th century.
2. CL is 'critical' because it addresses the ways in which language often is used very transparently to obscure the establishing, maintaining and perpetuating of (critical) social injustices.
3. CL is 'critical' because, at the moment, it is minimally taught and not often used as a framework for research in South Africa – despite there being no shortage of critical social justice issues.

CRITICAL LINGUISTICS WITHIN THE TRADITION OF CRITICAL THEORY

This section will consider CL to be 'critical' in that it follows the agenda of Critical Social Theory.

As linguistic theory that seeks to describe and explain how language shapes and is shaped by society, by social structures, social institutions and social events, CL could be taken as one of many theories within Sociolinguistics. However, when one considers that the main object of analysis is Discourse – spoken as well as written discourse, Discourse with a capital D as well as discourse with a lower case d[1] – then CL could be considered as a Pragmatic theory in which the main interest is language-in-use. In formal Linguistics, Pragmatics considers the way in which language interacts with context in making meaning. So, our first dilemma regarding CL is already in deciding where it should be positioned: is it a field in Sociolinguistics or is it Discourse in Pragmatics? Alternatively, we have to consider whether it can be a kind of hybrid that finds a home in either area, depending on where the particular scholarly interest is: are we (e.g.) looking at discourse for how it functions in distributing power in institutions such as government, big corporations and the media; or are we looking at language to determine what kinds of discursive structures achieve (e.g.) defamatory meanings, intentional ambiguity or indirect meanings, such as presuppositions or implicatures that are more salient than the direct and literal meaning?

I would like to provide some detail on the origin and intention of Critical Theory, first as a means of clarifying where the term "critical" in CL and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)[2] comes from, and second as a way of delimiting what it can sensibly be used to mean. I shall briefly highlight those aspects of Critical Theory that underpin CL and CDA. To appreciate the value of CDA for analysing discourses of power, a proper understanding is iarequired of how it is related to Critical Theory. What gave rise to Critical Theory in human and social sciences, what features set it apart from other theoretical approaches, are informative regarding the linguistic and sociolinguistic interests of CL.

This is an area that is often identified by the kinds of texts and discourses that it finds important to take note of and to analyse. CDA is upfront about its interest in the language of power, the language of powerful institutions, the form and function of discourses that promote (improper) ways of exercising power to the advantage of those already privileged, and that prejudice against those in society who are already at a disadvantage. So it takes an interest in discourses that structure society hierarchically, that work constructively in terms of identity and the distribution of opportunity. Particularly interesting are the most evident distinguishing features of those discourses that mark communicative processes of domination, but also the features of counter-discourses that facilitate not only the recognition of socially unjust practices of public communication, but also resistance to and change of such practices.

Relating critical linguistics to critical theory

Critical Theory[3] focuses on the structure of society and the kind of knowledge by which the arrangement and complexity of such structure can be disclosed and rearranged. This theory was introduced in the early 1930s and developed vigorously in the following decades by the group of German philosophers known as the Frankfurt School. They came up with the idea of a critical theory in reaction to a particular perception, prevalent in many scientific circles at the time, of what constitutes knowledge. Epistemologically, the Frankfurt School opposed a form of positivism or empiricism according to which only statements that potentially are true (or false) could be regarded as knowledge. Their opposition to the particular kinds of social practices to which positivist forms of knowledge gave rise was an energising driving force in their academic work. Positivism's narrow definition of 'knowledge', they felt, would exclude central aspects of societal life such as normative and metaphysical beliefs, preferences, attitudes and the like from the realm of rational discussion and evaluation. At a time when contemporary historical events were confounding the predictions of a prevalent social theory such as Marxism, and new forms of social injustice were threatening the ideals of peace after World War I, it was almost inevitable that there would be insistence on including the investigation of (e.g.) 'ideology' and other instruments in the social construction of reality as part of the scientific endeavour.

The essence of Critical Theory is to be found in the work of the founders and first associates of the Frankfurt School, namely Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse. They were scholars in philosophy and sociology with a particular interest in the ways in which social-historical theory had to be revisited in view of contemporary social, historical and political events. The work of these early scholars was taken further by various social theorists who joined later, such as the social anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss, who worked with the Frankfurt group at the Institute for Social Research in New York during their exile, and particularly Jürgen

Habermas, who started to work with them after World War II when some of the group returned to Frankfurt.

Habermas (1973:263-268) found that positivism leaves us without guidance about important parts of our form of consciousness, and thereby "abandons whole areas of our life to mere contingent taste, arbitrary decision and sheer irrationality". Thus Critical Theory developed as a response to an epistemological tradition that dealt insufficiently with particular social concerns. According to Adams and Searle (1986), after 1965, the term "critical theory" has mostly been used in North America in reference to a form of literary criticism, which includes the reception theory of Jauss (1982) and Iser (1974; 1978), and the reader-response theory of scholars such as Fish (1980).

This indicates that the term "Critical Theory" does not refer to a single unitary and integrated body of ideas, and it does not mean the same thing to all its adherents. Key theorists used this label to describe their particular academic enterprises since the mid-1930s; however, it does not denote approaches and ideas with no internal differences. Held (1980:14) divides this tradition of thinking into two branches, namely (i) the work centred around the Institute of Social Research established in Frankfurt in 1923, and (ii) the later work of Jürgen Habermas, who moved to Frankfurt only in 1964. For Calhoun (1995:xviii), Critical Theory encompasses more than work related specifically to the Frankfurt School. He recognises the role founders of the Frankfurt School played in making the term Critical Theory "a catch word of the mid-twentieth century". Nevertheless, he includes earlier traditions that gave rise to the social and philosophical premises of Critical Theory of the 1930s and 1940s, indicating the relationship between twentieth-century critical theorists and prominent European philosophers of previous eras, such as Kant and Hegel. He also finds the work of some of the critics of the Frankfurt School to be a continuation of what Critical Theory started out with. Particularly, he argues (Calhoun 1995:98, 99) that the differences between 'modernism' and 'postmodernism' are not so radical as to justify the claim that there is an 'epochal break' between the two. So, for Calhoun, the contribution of late-20th-century philosophers and social scientists such as Bourdieu, Derrida and Foucault should also be considered when we attempt to characterise Critical Theory.

The term "positivism" covers a range of philosophical positions on the nature of knowledge. However, Critical Theory responded mostly to the positivism of the Vienna Circle, which maintained that facts have to be based in experience and that meaning has to be based in observation. Such an approach gives observation an authority above other forms of reason and imagination, and does not afford the status of knowledge to values or value judgements. Critical Theory finds that positivism failed to comprehend that the process of knowing is not to be severed from the historical struggle between humans in the world. Critical theorists find that their research is intertwined with social processes to such an extent that they cannot remain detached. They find it impossible to contemplate, reflect on and describe society or nature passively.

When Held (1980:15) lists the central figures in Critical Theory as articulated within the Frankfurt School, he also refers to other contributors, such as Pollock, Fromm, Neumann, Kirchheimer and Löwenthal, who specialised in areas as disparate as psychology, political science, literature and popular culture. These key figures, taken to be the founders of 20th-century Critical Theory, preserved the concerns of German idealist thought, i.e. they took an interest in the nature of reason, truth and beauty. In addition, they placed history at the centre of their approach to philosophy and society. However, their focus was not on the past, but on how insight into past events and processes could shape future possibilities. Those working within the Institute of Social Research shared the intention that their differing efforts cumulatively would contribute to the making of history in which imbalances and injustices of the past would be avoided.

Following Marx, the critical theorists of the first generation of the Frankfurt School were pre-occupied with disclosing the forces that move society towards rational institutions. Their interest was in (perhaps idealistically) finding means by which to change societal structures so that a true, free and just life would be ensured for all members of society, and not just for the small, select group who had obtained power. They intended to identify, analyse and expose the obstacles to such radical change in society. Thus they were concerned with the interpretation and transformation of dominating and oppressive social institutions. They maintained that what is seen as objective and fixed knowledge is historically conditioned. This did not discourage them from pursuing new ways of dealing with knowledge: they believed that truth claims could be adjudicated rationally and independently, and not only through experimentation and empirical research.

Critical Theory's contribution to our understanding of ideology is important. Thompson (1990) discusses the ways in which the concepts 'ideology' and 'culture'

are related to certain aspects of Mass Communication. He points out that the concept 'ideology' first appeared in late-18th-century France and thus has been in use for about two centuries. The term has been afforded changing functions and meanings at different times. After relating the historical development of the concept, Thompson characterises the study of ideology as a study of "the ways in which meaning is constructed and conveyed by symbolic forms of various kinds" (1990:6-7).

Attention to a considered understanding of 'ideology' is central not only to critical theorists since the 1930s up to the present, but also to critical linguists, as it is taken to be an important aspect of establishing and maintaining unequal power relations and one that is largely linguistically mediated. Critical Linguistics takes a particular interest in the ways in which language mediates ideology in a variety of social institutions. For Eagleton (1994), the study of ideology has to bear in mind the variety of theories and theorists that have examined the relationship between thought and social reality. All the theories assume "that there are specific historical reasons why people come to feel, reason, desire and imagine as they do" (1994:15).

The ways in which Critical Linguistic research is directly and indirectly related to the research produced in the tradition of Critical Theory are particularly evident when one considers the central concepts with which the various areas work and the social phenomena on which they focus. Examples of these are pertinent in four specific areas, namely in their approaches to

- what constitutes knowledge;
- how discourses are constructed in and constructive of social institutions;
- how ideology functions in social institutions; and
- how people obtain and maintain power within a given community.

I shall elaborate on each of these areas to illustrate how notions introduced by Critical Theory have informed CL.

The Nature of Knowledge

The connection between Critical Theory and CL on the question of the way knowledge is constituted becomes clear in the CL consideration of processes of classification and categorisation. Critical Theory has long noted that there are struggles over classification within each discipline. The categories presented to learners are those that classify culturally relevant and valued knowledge. Through learning, a subject discovers the significance of power in the construction of knowledge: the powerful can and do enforce their classifications as 'knowledge'. This is clearly illustrated in the classification of various forms of language within one social group. Each form is placed in relation to the others in a hierarchy of social valuation. 'Speaking nicely' is valued by a variety of different groups of speakers, although speakers rarely question the basis on which distinctions are made between 'good language' and 'bad language'. Even where people notice that such distinctions have social rather than linguistic bases, the distinctions are rarely challenged. CL consistently enquires into this particular sociolinguistic phenomenon.

The way knowledge is organised crucially affects how it can be used, and what it can and cannot do. The form and function of language in the presentation of knowledge have been noted by Critical Theorists as well as Critical Linguists. In the representation of knowledge, language may seem transparent, but in fact it organises content in such a way that it is more than just a neutral instrument that gives access to scientific data. Language is always in part also constitutive of knowledge.

Various Critical Linguistic studies have focused on what have been termed "institutional language" and "bureaucratic language"[5]. This interest is related to the interest various scholars in Critical Theory took in the structure and operation of institutions, and to the way in which bureaucracies develop to establish and sustain dominant institutions. Kress (1989:57, 58) noted similarities between "institutional language" and the "language of science", indicating how in both cases forms of language become conventionalised that obscure arbitrary positions by presenting them as natural and therefore unalterable. He also noted (1989:59) the monologic character of "bureaucratic language", which often is disguised behind a dialogic form. Recently images in discourse and in new forms of literacy have also been attended to as textual components that co-construct social experience and the concomitant distribution of power (cf. Kress and Van Leewen, 1996).

Language in Institutions

The constitutive role of language in institutions is acknowledged in Critical Theory and has become a central area of research in CL. Wodak (1996:17) indicates how the power of individual leaders has to a large extent been replaced by the power of institutions. Institutional discourse, along with how it is shaped conservatively to maintain structures that obscure the inflexible nature of institutional management, is an enduring interest of Fairclough (1989; 1992; 1995;

2003). This endorses a social-organisational position that holds that "power in the form of repetitively activated controls, is what differentiates institutions from other social constructions" (Phillips et al. 2004: 635). Due to the power invested in modern institutions, CL has a special interest in communication within public institutions such as courts, schools, embassies, psychiatric institutions and hospitals, the media, employment agencies, governmental offices and the like (cf. Wodak & Reisigl 2001; Wodak & Van Dijk 2000).

This function of language is related to the adage 'saying it makes it so' in that the agency of institutional discourses in 'making things happen' is recognised. Kress (1989:61) shows how words that name actions bring such actions into consciousness. Social actions cannot be prohibited nor encouraged, condoned nor ignored without naming those actions. He illustrates how social practices are related to language in attending to actions that involve responding to and expressing feeling, intuition or emotion. This supports the view that the social world is constructed by language, particularly by the language of institutional discourses.

Language and Ideology

In considering what constitutes knowledge, the way truth is determined, and the way social structures develop and function, Critical Theory holds that there are always a number of points of view with respect to particular issues. The existence of such a variety of perspectives instead of a single universally accepted one is due to the ordering effect of ideologies. One of the well-known effects of an ideology is that it imposes a prior and systematically organised set of values on nature and on objects of culture as though the values too were natural. Ideology affects textual and syntactic form: an ideology that places concern for the environment first will reflect this concern in its textual or syntactic forms. The position taken by an advocate for a (contested) position will be embedded in a discourse that carries certain assumed, taken-for-granted and therefore more or less implicit knowledge. This will affect decisions about what becomes thematic in a text, and what becomes a leading topic in a particular discourse token.

Metaphor is a potent factor in ideological contention. Kress (1989:70-72) draws attention to the way metaphor provides a means to bring an area into one rather than another ideological domain. Metaphor works at all levels of language, from the largest textual or generic units to the phonological features. Metaphorical activity often occurs at sites of difference, in struggles over power, where there is contention of an ideological kind, when an attempt is made to assimilate an event into one ideological system rather than another. Metaphor is both ubiquitous in all linguistic activity and essential to social life and to conceptual activity. In science and in all attempts to construct knowledge, metaphor is a necessary strategy. It provides a means to step from the known into the unknown, from the well established into the new and the hypothetical. This function of metaphor is one force in the discursive and ideological process of 'naturalising' the social, of turning that which is problematic into the obvious. To illustrate, Martin Rojo (2010:1-3) refers to research as a journey and to the process of observation as gazing. Citing Luis Martin Santos, "the gaze is halfway between knowledge and inquiry", she describes the researcher as traveller in a way that captures many of the important activities involved in ethnographic research and critical theoretical reflection. I shall return to her work in the illustrative discussion below.

The constant dialogue between the way things are organised in practice, the way they are perceived to be organised, and the way they could be organised differently or more suitably, accounts for a number of seeming paradoxes. Often a language community (e.g.) simultaneously accepts the stability of the language system and its constant change; the autonomy of language and its dependency on the social system. Ideology is seen as a mechanism that blinds subjects to contradictions that, if recognised, could be resolved in a way that mobilises against offensive stagnation and facilitates change.

Interdisciplinary Research and Intertextuality

In Critical Theory, a number of scholars argued for and indeed took an interdisciplinary approach to answering questions related to the functioning of individuals in society. CL similarly emphasises the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to research questions. In Language as Ideology, Kress and Hodge (1979) illustrated how it is both possible and necessary to link language and history in an interdisciplinary way – they specifically related forms of thought to the forms of existence of the producers of those thoughts. CL investigates the way linguistic forms function in political and social life. It follows the tradition of Critical Theory in providing a starting point for developing a theory of linguistic forms that, different to a purely formal approach, will explain how grammar, text and genre carry social meaning.

The inevitability of an interdisciplinary approach is explained by indicating how language is the medium in which most organised thought and communication proceed. According to Kress and Hodge (1993:1),

language should be included in any "humane education designed to lead to an understanding of one's self and one's world". For them, CL will be concerned vitally not only with the relationship between language and society, but also with the relationship between language and the mind. Language is given to an individual by the society in which s/he lives. It is a key instrument in socialisation, the means whereby society forms and permeates the consciousness of an individual. Then CL may inform and be informed by received knowledge and research endeavours of, for example, sociology and psychology.

Work in the framework of CL and CDA entails recognising the intertextual nature of discourses. Intertextuality is described as an activity of readers. Authors find ways of signifying the way they want their texts to be read, i.e. they draw on more texts than their own and indicate to readers which intertextual meanings should be activated in the process of reconstructing the meaning of a new text. Critical Linguists are explicitly interested in the analysis of texts that illustrate the variability of functions and meanings in different contexts, different places, different social histories and different social structures. In this way they illustrate, perpetuate and develop the perspectives of Critical Theory, namely that post-World War II societal structures have become so complex that an awareness of intertextual relationships is essential to a proper understanding of the significance of existing and new texts.

Where the interdependence of language and power, meaning and social process is taken for granted it is important to question received notions of power and the ways it operates in social life and in the social production of meaning. Foucault (1980:119) argued against a simplistic notion of power that identifies it only with oppression operating from above:

> What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than a negative instance whose function is repression.

Although the interest of CL remains more dedicated to those spheres in which power is used in processes of domination and manipulation, it also considers strategies that respond critically and correctively to such domination and manipulation. CL uses texts produced in contexts of conflict and confrontation as a basis for exploring issues of method and examining the fundamental assumptions about language and society on which such methods rest.

IN SUMMARY, early Critical Theory worked with a notion of 'critique' that considered the work of social scientists of the 18th and early 19th century with the aim of exploring particular societal questions of the 20th century in an interdisciplinary context. These theorists wanted to gain an understanding of how society is (also discursively) reproduced or transformed, what the meaning of culture is, and what the relationship is between individuals, society and nature. It is in such a sense that, as a scion of Critical Theory, CL and CDA gained the modifier "critical", and my suggestion is that this reminder of the roots of CDA in social theory be used directively in our discourse analytic endeavours.

CRITICAL LINGUISTICS IN RESEARCH ON LANGUAGE, POWER AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

This section will consider CL to be 'critical' in that it takes a decided interest in critical, contemporary social processes and events.

To illustrate the ways in which CL turns to critical social issues in recent research, I shall refer to the work of two colleagues who are not cited as often as the founders of this tradition, but whose work has touched and inspired me. First there is work of Mary Louise Pratt (1991; 2008) as part of a project on demystifying imperialism through the analysis of the discourse of travel writing, and also of colonial subjects 'talking back' to power. This prompted reflection on what she has termed the "contact zone" and provides a critical framework for investigating current discourses on migration, alienation and integration, which are processes that continue into the present, also in South Africa. Second there is a project supervised by Luisa Martin Rojo, starting in 2000, in which linguistic practices were followed over the course of a year in four multilingual schools in Madrid. This prompted reflection on policy and practices in multilingual schools in South Africa – which in fact are the local norm in much the same way linguistic diversity has become prevalent in large parts of southern Europe.

Language, Transculturation and the Contact Zone

Marie Louis Pratt is well known for work she did in linguistic pragmatics, which she also geared towards students of literature. As a professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Stanford and New York

universities, she has a special interest in how travel writing constructed colonials, particularly in the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries of South America and Africa. Since the 1990s she has turned attention to, on the one hand, how travel writing gave European readers "a sense of ownership, entitlement and familiarity" with respect to distant countries and the colonised peoples (Pratt 2008:3) and, on the other hand, how colonial subjects developed counter-discourses, challenging and correcting the perspectives of the conquerors, partly in their own language and in genres formerly used only by the colonial masters (Pratt 1991).

Here I shall give a highly condensed version of her analysis of one very remarkable discourse of a subject speaking to power. This will be done with a view to highlighting a number of critical linguistic considerations that I suggest our own work can incorporate. Pratt (2008) takes up a number of travel accounts, written records of what foreigners made of the distant places and peoples they encountered, and selects specifically those that coincide with historical transitions. She looks at them because she believes they show us how certain linguistic codes have produced, constructed, "the rest of the world" (Pratt 2008:4). Pratt introduced the concept of the 'contact zone' as the liminal space where the occupiers and the occupied meet. It is "the social space where disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination … and their aftermaths as they are lived out across the globe today" (Pratt 1991:34). She takes this further, identifying also the reversal of the 'colonial spread' in the form of the labour migration of the past 20 to 40 years into the first world as creating such spaces. In analysing the discourse of a 17th-century manuscript written by an Andean, probably of noble Inca descent, she gives a critique of the social structures not only of the time of the production of the text, dated 1613, but also of the time of its reception by 20th-century scholars. In the process she gives analytic instruments that can be useful in analysing (e.g.) migrant discourses of foreigners now making their way into our communities and settling here, probably for longer than most anticipate.

Before I list some of the features of the 1 200-page letter Guaman Poma had addressed to the King of Spain, but which the King apparently never got to read, I would like you to bear in mind a contemporary narrative: the story of Jacob,[4] a man we came across in our research on migrant discourses. Four hundred years after Guaman Pomas' letter had been written, Jacob is a hairdresser who hails from the DRC and has been living in Cape Town since 2003. He started life in a multilingual context and, in finding his way into what had to bring him better life chances, he added three if not four more languages: he thus knows Bembe, Kikongo, KiSwahili, French, Lari and Lingala. Recently he added Portuguese, English, isiXhosa and even a smattering of Afrikaans. Languages that he uses regularly at the training centre of which he is a founding partner are English, French, Kiswahili, Bembe and isiXhosa. Although he has been in the country for 13 years, he has no more than refugee status. He not only provides for himself and his family, but also facilitates skills development (hairdressing and sewing) at the training centre for "whoever comes", i.e. foreigners as well as local unemployed persons. Two things he left us with in passing after we had taken his language biography have stuck with me. First, he mentioned how he had tried to use his language skills in getting employment as an interpreter.

> "They asked me 'are you a citizen'? I don't know why. … Even at court, I dropped my CV.
> But they never contacted me. People are sitting in their offices. They know nothing then
> they just say 'you are taking our jobs'."

Second, he referred to his son, who was born in Karl Bremer Hospital and now is seven years old, who, on the basis of his father's status, has a birth certificate that identifies him as a refugee.

> "Do you think my child, when he turns twenty years, will accept that? Nobody is thinking of that. … You are creating a war. It will cost the government millions. … These children, they will be angry."

And also in reference to his son:

> "Who helps them with their homework? We (the parents) are supposed to help them. But we are broken …" (referring to his non-standard English).

Now with Jacob's language biography and his self-reported social status in mind, let us consider the features of Guaman Poma's letter talking to a disinterested government.

The manuscript is written in a mixture of Quecha and Spanish. The author was an autodidact, who had probably become literate through the assistance of a mestizo half-brother. It was written in a genre that could only have been learnt and adapted through contact with and knowledge of the governor's literary practices. The Aztecs did not have a writing system, and did not write the records and regulations of their society in any similar way. The document has two parts; the first, titled Nueve

Coronica (New Chronicle), gives a reconstruction of the history of colonisation from the perspective of the Andeans; the second, titled Buen gobierno y justicia (Good governance and justice), gives a critique of colonial practices, many grossly abusive. The power relations between the writer of this text and the intended reader are hugely asymmetrical. Yet the subject takes an opportunity to resist, to give a revisionist account. This is what Pratt identifies as an 'auto-ethnography': the author engages with representations others have made of him – thus selectively collaborates, and yet speaks back.

Jacob was one of a group who were simply asked to give us a profile of their multilingual repertoires. The whole group gave meticulous descriptions of which languages they knew and how their life trajectories had generated these kinds of knowledge. They self-assessed their levels of proficiency in terms of where their various skills were useful and where not. When all was said and done, we thanked them and started saying our goodbyes. Then, reluctant to let the researchers just leave, the participants resisted our narrow agenda and insisted that we hear some of their autobiographical narratives. They told stories that had been triggered by our discussion of language, and that would have been improper to silence. For now we continue drawing the profiles and charting the changing patterns of multilingualism of local communities. But we need to reflect on the discourse of resistance in which the participants reminded the researchers and one another of the social realities and the interconnected discourses within which quite remarkable language repertories are embedded.

Constructing Inequality in multilingual classrooms

Luisa Martin Rojo (2010) reports on the outcome of a study that started out recognising changes in the school population, first after the end of the Franco dictatorship in the 1970s, when the Spanish educational system became reflective of a more egalitarian, more democratic, more secular and also more prosperous society. Separation in schools on the basis of gender was done away with, and formerly disfavoured social and socio-economic classes as well as ethnic minorities, such as the Roma, were now – at least in policy – afforded equal opportunities. To achieve the intended measure of inclusion, certain transformations were a prerequisite. Then, to complicate matters, Spanish society was confronted with a further challenge before the social transformation had been consolidated, namely having to integrate the children of foreign workers into the education system (Martin Rojo 2010:3, 4).

Thirty years after the educational overhaul had started, Martin Rojo's research team started the project of recording and analysing the change in progress. Earlier projects had established inequalities; the question now was how such inequalities were constructed within multilingual, multicultural classes (Martin Rojo 2010:221 ff). The main research question referred to how linguistic diversity was being managed. Was it being accepted, integrated, rejected or marginalised? The study put linguistic phenomena at the core of social practices. It used Chouliaraki and Fairclough's (1999) definition of 'linguist practices', namely "habituated ways, tied to particular times and places", illustrating in the end how schools act as institutions of social selection. In Bourdieu's (1991) terms, the study illustrated how symbolic capital is managed – some languages, language varieties and the forms of knowledge they represent are valued, while others are devalued in everyday practices in schools (Martin Rojo 2010:345).

Here, as a means of showing where the Madrid study could inform our own work, I will mention only two interesting points. The first, perhaps more trivial matter, is one of teacher (and wider community) attitude. Teachers, Martin Rojo (1910:4) finds, at times "seem transfixed by a longing for the past where difficulty of gaining access to further education prevented overcrowding and ensured the social prestige of the educational institutions". The second, much more pertinent matter, is one of more and less visibility of certain kinds of knowledge and identity. Practices in multicultural classes showed that cultural and linguistic differences "had virtually no visibility, except on very sporadic basis or as a sideshow" (Martin Rojo 2010:10).

The South African constitutional provisions for eleven official languages, and the Language in Education policy, are, in law, some of the most liberal state provisions on language rights in the world. In practice, however, we are battling to put the recognition of the full range of widely used indigenous languages into practice. In Stellenbosch, much time and attention has been dedicated to the use of two languages in higher education. As do other universities in their language policies, we pay lip service to the multilingualism of our community and allow 'where practicable' for the use of the regional African language (isiXhosa). Such policy actually obscures an important fact, namely that no student who is a first-language (L1) speaker of isiXhosa has officially been educated through the medium of their L1 beyond year 3 of primary school. There is no tradition of secondary education where any of the African languages is used as medium of instruction.

What we have attended to very limitedly is how the use of African languages in primary and secondary schools, which persists widely, goes unrecognised – we turn a blind eye or put the practices down as educationally bad.

And to compound the difficulties, as in many other parts of the world, South Africa also has a growing population of foreigners, notably from other African countries. Jacob's story, of a child whose home language and language-of-learning are never going to be a neat fit, but who will claim some kind of residence rights and life chances, is pertinent here. It is a tall order, but if social justice is a concern, the needs of such groups cannot be constructed as marginal and too much for the system. In the words of Cat Stevens: we have to find way.

Scholarly reflection on the hazards of managing linguistic diversity and on the critical relationship between language and developing new knowledge in young learners could turn to the critical linguistic work done elsewhere. There of course are local contextual differences, but there also are important areas of overlap. We could do with the traveller's taking a step back and spending time gazing, allowing ourselves "to be startled by the unusual, the hitherto unknown, by the hard to reach" (Martin Rojo 2010:1).

CRITICAL LINGUISTICS IN SOUTH AFRICA

This section will consider CL to be 'critical' in that it needs some intensive care in South African Applied Linguistics studies.

As I was reflecting on the kinds of Discourse Analysis (DA) and CDA that our Department has been doing in the past 8 to 10 years, I thought it would be good to have more than just an estimated impression of what the state of this approach to discourse is in the South African academic landscape. So I sent out a very short questionnaire to roughly 40 colleagues in departments of languages and linguistics across the country. The survey went out to 14 different departments at 10 different universities. In all, 27 responses were returned – in some cases one answered on behalf of all the surveyed colleagues. At undergraduate level, four offer some form of discourse analysis at third-year level; two actually have a full term module dedicated to the field. Two mentioned some reference to discourse in their second-year programmes, but gave little indication as to exact content. At postgraduate level, five indicated that they offer some form of discourse analysis at Honours level; two indicated a full 20-credit module dedicated to CDA; others either embedded CDA in other modules such as media studies, or offered discourse studies only sporadically as an elective.

Regarding the use of CL or CDA as a framework for postgraduate research, colleagues at seven of the 10 surveyed institutions indicated that, at some stage, they themselves or one of their colleagues had supervised such work. Across four departments, 13 MA theses using some version of CDA have reportedly been delivered since 2008. The same four reported delivering 15 PhD dissertations using CDA as their theoretical point of departure since 2006.

Of the 27 colleagues who replied, seven reported that they themselves had brought out publications in which this framework had been used, although two said they had for a long time been working in other areas and no longer counted themselves as critical discourse analysts. Of the remaining five I would say two are fairly well established in that they have a number of international publications or chapters in edited collections, two are well established locally and one does work of a hybrid nature, combining CDA with other approaches in which the interest is slightly removed from the critical social aspect.

This is just to emphasise that, considering the size of the General Linguistics community in South Africa, CL is not doing badly, but it also is not entirely well. Given the range of social institutions in which language is a critical component of the established discourse, I would like to see this endeavour continued and extended.

.....

1 This refers to a distinction made by James Gee (2011) between discourse as language-in-use and Discourse that is ordered according to themes in which different positions are presented by various voices, sometimes over a long period of time.
2. The term CDA is used interchangeably with CL because, in the past 30 years, it has become the term with the strongest currency in naming this field.

3. Where no specific citation is given, this section is based on the reading of Held (1980), Geuss (1981), Thompson (1990), Eagleton (1994) and Calhoun (1994, 1995).

4. Jacob is not his real name.
5. On the specific interest CL has in institutional discourse and its distribution of power, see also Fowler (1991), Fowler et al. (1979), Kress (1990), Van Dijk (1985, 1993), and Wodak (1998, 1995).

REFERENCES

Adams, H. & Searle, L. (eds) 1986. Critical Theory since 1965. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. Language and Symbolic Power. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Calhoun, C. (ed.) 1994. Social Theory and the Politics of Identity. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Calhoun, C. 1995. Critical Social Theory. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Chomsky, N. 1957. Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.

Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. 1999. Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Eagleton, T. (ed.) 1994. Ideology. London, New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 1989. Language and Power. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 1992. Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. 1995. Critical Discourse Analysis. London, New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 2003. Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. London: Routledge.

Fish, S. 1980. Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Foucault, M. 1980. "Two Lectures" In C. Gordon (ed.) Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 – 1977. Brighton, UK: Harvester.

Fowler, R. 1991. Language in the News. London, New York: Routledge.

Fowler, R., Kress, G., Hodge, R. & Trew, T. 1979. Language and Control. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Gee, J.P. 2011. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method. London, New York: Routledge.

Geuss, R. 1981. The Idea of a Critical Theory – Habermas and the Frankfurt School. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University press.

Habermas, J. 1973. Theory and Practice. (transl. J. Viertel) Boston: Beacon Press.

Held, P. 1980. An Introduction to Critical Theory. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Iser, W. 1974. The Implied Reader. Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins.

Iser, W. 1978. The Act of Reading. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Jauss, H.R. 1982. Toward an Aesthetic of Reception. (transl. T. Bahti) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kress, G. 1989. Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice. 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kress, G. 1990. Critical Discourse Analysis. In Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 11: 84-97.

Kress, G. & Hodge, B. 1993. Language as Ideology. Rev.ed. London: Routledge.

Kress, G. & Van Leeuwen, T. 1996. Reading Images – The Grammar of Visual Design. London: Routledge.

Martin Rojo, L. 2010. Constructing Inequality in Multilingual Classrooms. Berlin, New York: DeGruyter Mouton.

Phillips, N., Lawrence, T.B. & Hardy, C. 2004. Discourse and Institutions. In Academy of Management Review 29: 635-652.

Pratt, M.L. 1991. Arts of the Contact Zone. In Profession (1991): 33-40.

Pratt, M.L. 2008. Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. 2001. Discourse and Discrimination – Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism. London, New York: Routledge.

Thompson, J.B. 1990. Ideology and Modern Culture. Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Van Dijk, T.A. (ed.) 1985. Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to Mass Media Discourse and Communication. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Van Dijk, T.A. 1993. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. In Discourse & Society, 4(2):249-285.

Wodak, R. (ed.) 1989. Language, Power and Ideology. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R. 1995. Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In J. Verschueren, J-O. Östman & J. Blommaert (eds) Handbook of Pragmatics, pp. 204-210.

Wodak, R. 1996. Disorders of Discourse. London: Longman.

Wodak, R. & Van Dijk, T. (eds) 2000. Racism at the Top. Klagenfurt: Drava.