California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

2005

Translingual literature: The bone people and Borderlands

Jill Marie Murphy

TRANSLINGUAL LITERATURE:

THE BONE PEOPLE AND BORDERLANDS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

English Composition

_____

by

Jill Marie Murphy

December 2005

TRANSLINGUAL LITERATURE:

THE BONE PEOPLE AND BORDERLANDS

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

by

Jill Marie Murphy

December 2005

Approved by:

Yvonne Atkinson, Chair, English

$\underline{\text{Dec 1, 2005}}$
Date

Rong Chen

Sunny Hyon

ABSTRACT

The following study explores how women of marginalized cultures can deconstruct how they are defined, both in the powerful metropolitan culture and in their 'own,' and negotiate their identities in context. Traditionally, with a history of colonial construction, they have been Othered as "of color" and as women. I propose that these women, named ethnofeminists herein, can and do empower themselves through their choices in language in context. Specifically, I examine how such women can use codeswitching in literary texts to place and define themselves.

The argument of this thesis is founded upon the position of the ethnofeminist in and between her worlds. The ethnofeminist lives in the Contact Zone, a theory espoused by Mary Louise Pratt. Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldua, in *This Bridge Called My Back*, define the negotiation of identity as "bridging by naming our selves and by telling stories in our own words." The key is "in our own words."

Language choices, then, are critical. The act of codeswitching at significant times is one method the ethnofeminist can use both to subvert others' construction of her and to redefine her identity. I am thus proposing

that by producing and existing within a translingual text, the ethnofeminist has found a way to assertively negotiate these worlds. I am particularly interested in how the ethnofeminist can select and reinvent meaning from the language system of the dominant culture while maintaining the language system of the "marginal" group. In combining two (or more) language systems within a literature, she has created her own language. And as language is a system of making meaning, the creation of a translingual literature solidifies the ethnofeminist's struggle to make meaning of and travel between her worlds.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

And to my family: Mom, Dad, Tom, Carol, Khym, Ellen, Kari, Jason and, perhaps most importantly, Owen: for understanding about all the time I "hid" and the get-togethers I missed, for the patience and the unending support, and for not rolling your eyes (very much) when I talked about my project. I am truly blessed.

Thank you all for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, I will explore how the marginalized

woman of color can challenge how she is defined in context.

In societies that have a history (or continued presence) of

colonization, in which a dominant group subordinates an

"ethnic" group, women of the "ethnic" group are often

marginalized in both communities. In the dominant culture,

they are "of color," and in their "own" cultures, they are

women. Each of these constructions all too often brings

with it a position of the "Other," the marginalized. To

deconstruct these marginal identities imposed on her, to

define herself, she must find her voice.

The ethnofeminist has always existed in different

contexts, communities and "worlds," as Maria Lugones terms

them. The argument of this thesis is founded upon the

position of the ethnofeminist in and between her worlds.

Maria Lugones (1994) theorizes the nature of the "world"

and what it means to exist in and negotiate those worlds.

Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldua (1981), in This Bridge

Called My Back, clearly define the conflict:

We are the colored in a white feminist movement.

We are the feminists among the people of our
culture.

We are often the lesbians among the straight.

We do this bridging by naming our selves and by
telling stories in our own words.

The key is "in our own words." Language choices, then, are
critical.

I argue here that the ethnofeminist, in combining two
(or more) languages within a literature, creates her own
language and literature. She can select and reinvent
meaning from the language of the dominant culture, while
maintaining the language of the marginalized group. Moving
between these languages in writing, in literature, creates
and expands a new genre in literature. "Translingual"
literature, then, is literature that crosses the bridge
between languages though codeswitching, code-mixing, and
borrowing. Gumperz, in 1982, defines codeswitching as "the
juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages
of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or
sub-systems" (in Romaine, 1995, p. 121). Of course, in
translingual literature, this codeswitching has been
transferred from oral discourse to written discourse. This
study will focus on the pragmatic aspects of the

codeswitching rather than on the grammatical constructions of them. The act of codeswitching at significant times is a pragmatic and effective method the ethnofeminist can use to both subvert others' construction of her and to redefine her own identity.

As language is a system of making meaning, the creation of a translingual literature exemplifies the ethnofeminist's struggle to make meaning of and travel between her worlds. I propose that the shifts in language document shifts in the identity of the ethnofeminist as she negotiates her "worlds." The goal implicit in the development of translingual literatures is that the ethnofeminist finds a language and a literature all her own.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The terms of this study have been chosen with great

deliberation. The term "ethnofeminist" arises from my

understanding of the debate that rages currently under the

flags of "Women of Color" or "Third World Women Writers,"

used by Anzaldua, Moraga, Madison, Angelou, Erdrich, Marmon

Silko, and many others (Madison, 1994). Traditionally,

these are women who have been outsiders in their worlds.

In this movement, they have shared their voices and defined

and redefined their positions, dealing with issues of

identity in and between their worlds. However, I have

chosen to use the term "ethnofeminist," rather than "Women

of Color" or "Third World Women Writers" because this

position suggests a very specific state of mind that goes

much deeper than the external manifestations of skin color,

sexuality and/or economics, though these all play important

roles in how she constructs herself. The "ethnofeminist"

position allows for movement beyond the stigma still

present in "Women of Color" and "Third World" identities,

for though these terms have been used to produce change,

they simultaneously reinforce the Object position for those women who fall within those parameters. Further, some "women of color" are not ethnofeminist; some "white" feminists are. It becomes then a fundamental question of where and how the ethnofeminist finds spaces of belonging. This distinction is critical because this thesis will work toward a theory of how the ethnofeminist places and moves HERSELF. But it is a theory of how she does that through language.

The term "translingual" partially arose from the theory of the "Contact Zone" espoused by Mary Louise Pratt. Of particular relevance to this study was Pratt's discussion of "*trans*culturation" (emphasis mine) which she describes as the process "whereby members of subordinated or marginal groups select and invent from materials transmitted by a dominant or metropolitan culture" (Pratt, 1992, p. 6). With such a definition, transculturation very much applies to the ethnofeminist. So through her movements between the dominant culture (colonizer) and her 'native' culture, through her negotiation of her position as a woman, the ethnofeminist deals with conflicts and contradictions implicit in her life. The ethnofeminist is the woman who lives in the Contact Zone, who embraces it

without surrender, who seeks out ways to define herself beyond assimilation. The ethnofeminist is the woman who speaks from multiple Contact Zones.

The review of the literature present below is an examination of the literature that focuses on Contact Zones and the position of the "Other," from both cultural and feminist perspectives. This is significant as it explores the contexts in which the ethnofeminist exists, between which she moves. Within that discussion, I explore the literature currently available on how language and identities interconnect and are negotiated. The focus, however, is on codeswitching research. This is particularly relevant to the identity and experience of the ethnofeminist, as she often lives in and has access to at least two languages. On to the research. . . .

Contact Zones

In places marked by imperialism, colonization and neo-colonization, power struggles are continuous and inevitable. While often dominance and subordination have long been in place, the power dynamic is there to be challenged. As Monica Heller suggests, most members of subordinate groups must deal with the issue of "coping with

today" (1992, p. 4).   In these spaces, groups and

individuals come together, boundaries are negotiated, and

definitions of power and identity are challenged.

Social Identities: Negotiation in the Contact Zone

Contact Zones, then, are spaces in which people,

theoretically at least, have the 'space' to negotiate or

redefine power relationships. To do this, participants

must examine how they are defined, as well as where they

would place themselves, as members of which particular

groups. Gumperz and Gumperz (1982) propose that in

intergroup communication, language impacts the "exercise of

power and control [as well as] the production and

reproduction of social identity." They suggest that the

parameters of social identities, such as gender, ethnicity

and class, are not constant but fluid as they change and

are changed by how people define themselves and others,

demonstrating those divisions as they communicate (p.1).

Researchers approach this idea from many different

vantage points. Some see these social identities as more

fixed. In Anthropology and the Western Tradition, Jacob

Pandian (1985) seeks to provide a theoretical framework of

Anthropology from a Western perspective. The majority of

his study focuses on the Mythological foundations of any

construction of The Other. He covers race (specifically

blackness), the "savage" (those with less technology),

abnormality (those different or strange), ethnography, and

fossils (fixed in time, antiquity). In "The Construction

of the Self and the Formulation of Ethnic Identity,"

Pandian argues that (Western) peoples define self in

context of others or in opposition to others. Ethnic

identity, on the other hand, reflects the individual's

acceptance of the characteristics of the group onto him- or

herself (1985).

Oliver and Williams (1981), editors of the <u>Oxford</u>

<u>History of New Zealand</u>, would likely agree with that

characterization. Their history offers a great deal of

information about the Maori people, their characteristics,

culture and traditions. Yet, this text offers a distinctly

anglocentric perspective. It subtly reinforces the

dominance/subordination dynamic and presents Anglo

(western) thinking as dominant. The Self/Other dynamic is

implicit in these texts. And as England has had so many

'colonies,' this anglocentric perspective is often

represented in Contact Zones around the world.

So how does the "Other" get placed in such a subordinate position? The answers to that question would require an extensive study itself. But for my purposes here, Simone de Beauvoir, in Second Sex, offers her understanding of this power dynamic. She argues that "the category of the Other is as primordial as consciousness itself," that "Otherness is a fundamental category of human thought" (1989, pp. xxii-xxiii). The implication of this is that people naturally define themselves in opposition to others, Self and Other. But it is not static; the character of the Self is determined by the social context. Whosoever has the power is the Self; the subordinated are thus, by definition, the Other[s]. Of course, she focuses on an analysis and evaluation of how women have been placed in the position of the Other.

De Beauvoir continues, building on the work of Levi-Strauss (1949). She suggests that shared experience, solidarity and organization offers ways to challenge the Self/Other false duality. She points out that people have multiple social identities as they move in multiple communities at once, and that sometimes conflicts between those identities require choices in solidarity to a particular identity/community/group. For example, she

claims that women are more likely to identify with and
reinforce solidarity with men of the same group rather than
with women of another group, whether the groupings are
representative of color, race or class (xxiii-xxv). The
implication is that women, as a whole group, are likely to
be alienated, divided from each other pointlessly, because
the construction of Woman as Other is merely a myth.

Women need, then, a way to combat that myth, and find
a way to reach each other. Helene Cixous (1988), in
"Sorties," introduces a theory of 'feminine' writing which
incorporates elements of psychoanalytic and
deconstructionist schools of thought. She focuses on the
false oppositions, dualities, created by and ingrained in
society, which serve to keep woman in her place. "Theory
of culture, theory of society, the ensemble of symbolic
systems - art, religion, family, language, - everything
elaborates the same systems. And the movement by which
each opposition is set to produce meaning is the movement
by which the couple is destroyed" (1988, pp. 287-288).
Thus, she argues, there's a need for a different way to
conceptualize complex issues and beings that doesn't place
them in dialectical or irreconcilable positions.

In "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness," Elaine Showalter (1988) offers a survey of the multiple natures of feminist criticism. She touches on various schools of thought within feminist criticism, including pluralism (individuation of female experience), gynocriticism (toward a definition of "female writing"), the body, language, and culture. Her discussion of French feminism is most relevant to my purposes here, particularly in reference to language. It is, as Showalter cites Annie Leclerc, a call to women "'to invent a language that is not oppressive, a language that does not leave speechless, but loosens the tongue' [from Parole de femme]" (1988, p. 339).

This means, as I argue for a framework for "ethnofeminism," that only by ridding herself of defining terms which have historically been used as negative and devaluing terms can the woman "of color" or of the "Third World" redefine herself. In so doing, she releases her voice from the chains of subordination. She needs to move "Beyond Stereotypes" and speak for herself (Herrera-Sobek, 1985). Regardless of which ethnic backgrounds she identifies with or subscribes to, it is only by raising her voice that she can combat Silence and speak her peace, negotiate her "worlds," as Maria Lugones (1994) terms the

social spaces and roles she inhabits. Only then can the

ethnofeminist define herself and place herself in the

contact zones of the world.

"Speakers"

Many "ethnofeminists" benefit from the ongoing

research into identification of cultural differences, that

is, focus on identifying differences between cultures,

specifically in how they present and define themselves and

what they view as characteristics of their cultural and

linguistic practices. This research provides insight into

how cultural differences play out in language and

definition of membership (or non-membership).

Fundamentally, this research documents a continued search

for empowerment for a multiplicity of identities. For

example, in the case of Chicanos' language and identities,

Rosaura Sanchez (1994) develops a theory of <u>Chicano</u>

<u>Discourse</u>. Rafael Perez-Torres (1995), in <u>Movements in</u>

<u>Chicano Poetry</u>, presents his theory of negotiation of the

space between borders [i.e. Contact Zones]; he discusses

how "colonizer's" language may be appropriated, thereby

changing meaning. Ramon Saldivar works to validate the

differences he views as characteristic of <u>Chicano</u>

Narrative; to do so, he suggests, he and other Chicanos must challenge the dialectics of dominant American society.

This movement to identification of, respect for, and validation of differences in culture, demonstrated through language, whether speech or writing, is not unique to Chicanos. Quite a number of scholars approach this challenge of Contact Zone identities through exploration and discussion of "Borderlands" (Anzaldua, 1987; Omoniyi, 2004; and others). The problem is that these Contact Zones are not restricted to physical borders, but are, as Omoniyi points out, also potentially "emotive," based on kinship and culture, and therefore infinitely more complex to negotiate (p. 9). But there are shared experiences along with differences.

Many individuals are seeking to identify and validate difference, and hopefully, find ways to bridge those differences as will. MELUS, the Journal of the Society of the Study of Multi-Ethnic Literature of the United States, has made that its mission; its articles explore differences between cultural writings and identify common, shared experiences and practices across ethnic lines as well.

Henry Louis Gates (1986) explores "Race," Writing and Difference; he is concerned with the ways that language has

been used to colonize and isolate those outside the mainstream, as well as the ways those "Others" have reinterpreted and invented their own discourses. And Geneva Smitherman (1977) offers her vision of the unique nature of the language of Black America in <u>Talkin and Testifyin</u>. Multiciplicity of language, experience and social identity continues to be explored in the United States.

It continues in other parts of the world as well, other Contact Zones. In New Zealand, for instance, there is yet a domination/subordination power construct between New Zealanders of U.K. descent, commonly known as Pakeha, and Maori peoples. In "Aspects of Contemporary Maori Writing in English," Ken Arvidson presents a theory of difference between Pakeha and Maori writing. Covering the functions and nature of Maori literature in New Zealand, Arvidson characterizes Maori literature as having a tendency to focus on the "moral, political, and cultural." (1990, p.121). Ray Harlow discusses the realities of contemporary Maori, suggesting that the Maori language is in danger of being lost due to geography and use in limited domains. He argues for the expansion of use of the Maori language in New Zealand (1990). Whare Whakairo discusses

"Maori 'Literary' Traditions", presenting a theory of connection to writing in Maori as opposed to the alienation of writing in English. He argues for the expansion of a body of Maori literature written in Maori that will solidify the likelihood of the survival of the Maori language (1990). And the battles over language and identity rage on.

Voices are rising. Ethnofeminist texts, literature, and criticism are more readily available now. While many still fly under the flag of "women of color," the voices offer unique views into lives, worlds, contact zones and conflicts, internal and external, of identity. With ethnofeminist anthologies coming out, such as Moraga and Anzaldua's <u>This Bridge Called My Back</u> (1981), Madison's <u>The Woman that I Am</u> (1994), and Rebolledo's <u>Women Singing in the Snow</u> (1995), to name but a few, there is greater opportunity to explore the nature of the Contact Zones, for the women who 'speak,' but also for the women who listen, who are open to exploration of difference, even as they try to find shared knowledge, experience and solidarity. It's all there in the language; the more language she has access to, understanding of, the more she is enriched. And the only thing illegitimate is "dirty silence" (Manhire, 1990).

Language Choices

Language is a complex, social phenomenon. It affects
and is affected by identity and social contexts. For
bilinguals or multilinguals, the process is all the more
complex. Language learning and choices in code affect the
way they present themselves and are perceived in given
social contexts and communities. Code-switching [CS], as a
system or an approach to communication utilized by
bilingual peoples, has long been held in low esteem in the
wider public eye. Often, particularly by monolinguals, it
is assumed that the code-switching individuals either
demonstrate a lack of education or intend a personal
affront (Edwards, 1994). Some individuals, particularly
those who do not speak more than one language, view CS as
"gibberish" (Edwards, 1994, p. 78). Terms such as
"Spanglish" reflect such an attitude. Even within
bilingual communities, bilingual peoples that regularly
code-switch may still have a negative view of this act
(Bentahila, 1983, p. 233). CS is often (incorrectly) seen
as evidence that a bilingual individual is "'semilingual'"
(Romaine, 1995, p. 6). Attitudes about language often have
a great deal to do with the larger societal context. In
places where non-dominant languages are perceived as

threats to assimilation or cultural stability, code-switching as a system carries with it an even greater stigma which follows its users everywhere (Romaine, 1995).

In this portion of the literature review, I will present varying researchers' concepts of "code-switching," including their attempts to define or refine the term. I will briefly present an overview of the two major strands in codeswitching research. I will then proceed to delve into more detail on the research in the strand of research that has as its guiding interest the social aspects and motivations of code-switching in context.

Toward a Definition of Codeswitching

The reality is that CS is a familiar component of bilingual speech. But over the years of research, there has been significant disagreement over the nature of and the value of CS, so that it becomes critical to begin to understand CS by examining how it has been defined. The definition of code-switching offered by Bentahila (1983) is a promising place to begin thinking about this phenomenon of bilingual speech. He defines code-switching as "the alternation between two different languages within a single conversation" (p. 233). Generally, this conversation takes

place in verbal interactions between the involved parties. This means that code-switching, CS, can only occur in a social context in which there are at least two active bilingual participants. If either participant is inactive, or if either participant is not bilingual, this conversation would come to a halt.

Other researchers define code-switching similarly. Peter Auer (1998) defines code-switching as a "verbal action, the 'alternating of two or more "codes" within one conversational episode'" (p. 1). "Codes," as it is used in this context, refers to whole linguistic systems, otherwise known to the general public as languages. Both participants must then have at least a working knowledge of both codes, or languages. He continues on to suggest that the act of CS is a common practice in bilingual communities. Therefore, the use of CS requires, to some degree at least, that the participants in this communicative event have a shared understanding of not only the form and structure of each language, or code, but also the social and cultural norms present in each language.

This view of CS as the alternating use of two or more languages in a (verbal) conversational context does appear to be the most widely held and accepted definition of code-

switching. (Auer, 1998). And these are complex definitions; they lay the foundation for much of the research that will be reviewed herein. But CS is not the only term used for such an event. Some researchers prefer to term these actions "language shifts."(Sanchez, 1994). Others prefer the terms "code mixing"(Edwards, 1994) or "code shifting" (Sanchez, 1994, pp. 139-176) in reference to this act of bilingual speech. Weinreich, in referring to language use that deviated "from the norms of either language", named the event "interference." (Edwards, 1994, p. 72). Such a term carries a negative connotation. Edwards went on to state that theorists following Weinreich seemed to prefer a more neutral term, such as "transference." (p. 72). Different researchers prefer different terms for this event in bilingual speech; yet often, the above terms are used interchangeably with CS.

Despite these differences, researchers do seem to agree that there must be a distinction between CS and what is termed "borrowing." Borrowing is the use of a particular element or piece of one language in the context of the other language. Sometimes, the borrowed item is referred to as a "loanword." (Poplack, 1988, p. 220) This seems to be very similar to CS, but it is not really a

shift from one language to another. Borrowing requires that items of the lexical, phonological or morphological systems of one language are actually borrowed from one language and used in the other. This means essentially that, for example, a Spanish speaking person could say 'que quiere mirar una movie'. The use of the lexical item "movie" is an example of borrowing from English. It is likely that, in such a case, "movie" would also be borrowed phonologically, as it is likely to be pronounced in the phonological system of Spanish, as the majority of the sentence is formed in Spanish. Word forms, (morphology), such as prefixes and suffixes, can also be borrowed from one language to another. Thus, borrowing is the practice of importing one element of one language into the context of the other language (Traugott & Pratt, 1980).

The above distinctions between CS and borrowing are by no means exhaustive, but are merely intended to provide a foundation upon which we can stand as we begin to explore the body of research that has evolved around the common practice of CS in bilingual communities and contexts. The next step, therefore, must be to examine the field of research on CS. What are the areas of interest, the

approaches to studies of CS? How can we make sense of what is a rapidly growing, complex and rich area of research?

Schools of Research on Codeswitching

As noted above, research into CS practices is a rapidly growing field. Essentially, the research on code-switching has split into two strands of research. (Auer, 1995). One area of study is concerned primarily with grammatical forms and structure. There has been a great deal of research done roughly in the last thirty years that has revolved, and continues to revolve around researchers' desires to find structural patterns for CS, which would then lead to the development of CS structural models. More specifically, researchers then delve into studies that, for example, seek to analyze lexical, syntactic, morphological and/or phonological patterns of CS. (Muysken, 1995 ; Poplack & Meecham, 1995 ; Myers-Scotton, 1995).

Yet, it is the other complex body of research that is the focus of this literature review. I refer here to the faction of CS research that seeks to examine CS in social context. This view of CS focuses not so much on grammatical constraints, but on the social and psychological elements which influence CS and language

22

choice in context. Much of this body of research builds

upon Blom's and Gumperz' work of 1982 (Auer, 1998). Since

then, it has expanded and splintered into smaller groupings

of theorists. Some researchers chose to focus on the

implications of the relationship between CS and

Interlanguage (Gass & Selinker, 2001; Tarone, 1977). Other

researchers tended to focus on CS as a method of discourse.

(Sanchez, 1994). Still others explored the influence of

social context of CS. (Auer, 1988; Bentahila, 1983;

Bonvillain, 1997; Gumperz & Gumperz, 1982; Heller, 1982;

Heller, 1988; Myers-Scotton, 1988). The researchers in

this final category then begin to examine what elements of

social and/or psychological context affect the CS choices

of bilinguals.

Much of this research on social motivations for CS

rests, sometimes uneasily, on the question of the fluency

of the bilinguals who utilize CS in social contexts. Thus,

the question of the nature and the fluency of the bilingual

participants must go hand in hand with the motivations for

the CS in context. For example, some people in the process

of learning a second language may achieve some degree of

fluency, but they may yet be in the process of

Interlanguage (Gass and Selinker, 2001). People in the

midst of an Interlanguage process do not have the same
sense of language, meaning in context, that native speakers
have. They are yet learning how to use the language to
convey meaning in a given context. Therefore, obviously,
people in the process of learning an L2 may not have the
same social motivations for CS as those Bentahila terms
"balanced bilinguals," those who have achieved established
fluency in both languages (1983, p. 233).

Codeswitching as a Communication Strategy

It has already been noted above that CS refers to the
alternation between two languages in a given conversation
between two (or more) participants. Thus, such a
conversation is a communicative event. Thus, both
participants must have sufficient communicative competence,
or the conversation will not exist (Canale & Swain, 1980).
Researchers, such as Tarone (1977), suggested that when a
learner is in the process of learning a second (or third,
etc.) language, and he or she seeks to continue a
conversation with a listener fluent in both languages, CS
can be an effective communication strategy. Thus, using
CS, the speaker theoretically has a way to maintain the

conversation and possibly reinforce the connection between speaker and listener.

But as we begin to examine language shifts (CS) as communication strategies, it seems clear that we must acknowledge the fact that people exert language choices even when not having a verbal interaction with other individuals. The issue becomes further problematized as we acknowledge that many researchers, in viewing CS as an alternation between languages or codes in a conversation or dialogue, have effectively disallowed discussion of CS, or "language mixing" (Omoniyi, 2004), in situations not conversational, the implication being verbal interaction between participants.

Language choice has increasingly become a significant communication strategy in writing as well as in conversation. Researchers such as Traugott and Pratt (1980) have worked to acknowledge the presence of CS, or more broadly language choice, in literature. If we view literature, or any writing for that matter, as a discourse action with the audience as "listener," then it is effectively a dialogue. Thus, even if there is not CS in verbal interactions within the text, if language shifts are

25

used, there yet remains language choice as a strategy of communication focused on the audience as listener.

Social Motivations of Balanced Bilinguals

Many researchers are fascinated by the social aspects of CS. They seek to answer the question of WHY balanced bilingual individuals choose to switch between languages. In this section, I will focus on three proposed "models" of social motivations for CS. Each of them seems to create a sort of dialectical approach to distinguishing between motivations for CS. The first study, conducted by Bentahila (1983), proposed that CS is often influenced by either "external factors" or used as a rhetorical device. Blom and Gumperz (1982) presented a model of social motivations for CS revolving around the distinction between what they term "situational" versus "metaphorical" codeswitching. (in Auer, 1998; Wei, 1998, pp. 156-176). The final social model to be reviewed herein is Carol Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model, (Myers-Scotton, 1988; Wei, 1998), which is concerned with the marked or unmarked nature of a language choice as bilinguals use CS to bring about desired outcome.

Social Motivations for Codeswitching: External Factors vs. Rhetorical Devices

Bentahila (1983) makes a distinction between the "external factors" of CS and CS as a rhetorical device. In his study, he recorded seven and a half hours of conversation between a very limited number of participants. The speakers of Arabic and French, all balanced bilinguals, did not know they were being recorded. Bentahila suggested that many instances of their CS were due to external factors, that is, factors outside their control, factors having to do with contextual clues in the conversation. He found that many switches were related to changes in the topics of their conversations. Some topics tended to be discussed in one language rather than the other. For example, anything related to medicine or anything educational was referred to in French. Bentahila concluded that, because all such topics were covered in French at school, topics learned at school were more likely to be discussed in French. Transversely, Arabic was used more with topics related to home life or nationalism. Thus, vocabulary, topic and domain seem to go hand in hand as they influence CS and represent, for Bentahila, some external factors that influence CS.

Bentahila further characterized other social reasons for CS external factors. He claimed that bilinguals chose to CS often in speech acts such as religious rituals, insults, swearing, and stereotyped phrases in order to use to correct language for those events. For example, he concluded that Arabic was evidently the language of choice for the above speech acts. He also placed denotation and connotation in his category of external factors that influenced code switching, suggesting that the bilingual speaker would choose terms specifically to construct desired meaning, whether denotative or connotative. (pp.234-236). It is at this point that Bentahila begins to have a problem isolating his terms. When he delves into connotation and intended meaning, he effectively problematizes his own model of the influences of "external factors" and "rhetorical devices" on CS.

Bentahila also suggests that bilinguals can use CS as a rhetorical device to achieve a desired effect in a social context. (pp. 236-240). He describes the use of repetition as a rhetorical device, offering several possible motivations for such as CS choice. Ultimately, he suggests that the use of CS to repeat a particular point serves to emphasize it. Also in this category are the use

of CS as a device to create or limit social distance or to
negotiation power in a given social context.

One very interesting element of Bentahila's
presentation is that he actually cites two works by
Gumperz, studies done in 1975 and 1976. (pp. 234-235).
However, Bentahila does not mention Gumperz' theory or
model of CS as situational versus metaphorical. Some
motivations for CS that Bentahila refers to as external
factors, Blom & Gumperz (1982) have labeled "situational
codeswitching." (in Heller, 1988). These motivations for
CS are "rooted in a social separation of activities (and
associated role relationships), each of which is
conventionally linked to the use of one of the languages or
varieties in the community linguistic repertoire." (p. 5).
This means, essentially, that for a bilingual individual,
the very nature of certain social contexts, events, and
activities, are associated with one language or the other
based upon norms or the person's experience in the context
of said bilingual community. Thus, the individual is more
likely to code-switch when confronted with those given
situations.

Wei (1998) expands on the above definitions. He
characterizes Blom and Gumperz' definition of situational

codeswitching as switching that is "triggered by a change in the situation." (p. 156). This means that a situational motivation for CS rises exclusively out of the external social context. Situational or contextual clues, such as topic, domain, changes in or additions of participants, etc., are what guide or influence shifts in language. This implies also that the situational reasons for the CS are perhaps beyond the speaker's control. But this is only part of this picture.

Wei continues, presenting his understanding of Blom's and Gumperz' vision of metaphorical codeswitching. He contrasts it with situational CS, explaining it as "changes in the speaker's language choice when the situation remained the same." (p. 156). Traugott & Pratt (1980) concur, suggesting that "metaphorical" CS could also be called "attitudinal" CS, as choice of language reflects attitude as well as situational circumstances. (p. 375). Metaphorical CS can signal a participant's involvement in the interaction, but it can also be used to create or reinforce social distance. It is essentially an issue of sharing or bonding. The question the speaker must ask himself or herself in a given social context or situation is what he or she wants to have/create/take away from a

given situation. The speaker must decide what role he or she would play in the context… whether or not he or she wants to assume the role assigned in the social interaction.

And this is the very question that brings us to Carol Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model of CS. In Myers-Scotton's article, "Code switching as indexical of social negotiation" (1988; cited in Heller, 1988), Myers-Scotton builds upon her own 1983 presentation of what she called the "Markedness Model". The markedness model of CS is based upon principles of negotiation in conversation. This suggests that there are certain "rights and obligations" present in any conversation, and it further suggests that these rights and obligations apply to both speaker and listener in context, as well as that each understands their position in the conversation. Thus, the Markedness Model revolves around the idea that the participants will actively, and according to the understood set of rights and obligations, participate in the dialogue. "Markedness", then, refers to the message's place on the continuum of expectations and/or desirability of responses based upon the relationship between the participants. This means that, essentially, a message is most "unmarked" when it is

the expected or desired option in the situation. The most "marked" message is the message least expected given the circumstances. Markedness, as a concept, exists as a gradient, moves on a scale (Myers-Scotton, 1993).

CS, or language choice, can reinforce or derail a dialogue depending on the marked (or unmarked) nature of the choice made. This means essentially that a bilingual person can effectively reinforce intimacy or end a conversation just by the choice of language they make in a given context. In the dialogue, the participants have come to expect certain responses, depending on their sense of the rights and obligations of the conversational participants in context. If the response is expected, it is unmarked; if it is unexpected or if it brings about undesirable consequences, it is clearly a marked choice. Thus, in CS conversations, language choice, or the markedness of language choice, has a direct impact on the outcome of the interaction and possibly the identities of the participants in context (Myers-Scotton, 1993).

Monica Heller, in her article "Negotiations of Language Choice in Montreal" (1982), presented a strong example of a marked response demonstrated through CS. As reported in the Montreal Star in 1978,

I walk up to the counter, intent on buying

some socks. "Bonjour," says the woman behind the

counter, smiling. "Est-ce que je peux vous

aider?" "Oui," I smile back. "Je voudrais

acheter des bas comme ca." I point to some socks

on display in the showcase. "En beige, s'il vous

plait." "Yes, of course, Madame," she responds

in English. "What size?" "Er…," I pause, "nine

and a half, please." (p. 108).

In this case, the saleswoman's shift to English was a very

marked communicative choice; the customer did not expect to

be answered in English. The fact that the saleswoman

shifted to English in that context essentially broke down

the communication. It effectively and instantly created for

the customer a sense of greater social distance from the

other participant, the saleswoman. Such a marked,

unexpected switch can be taken as a sign that the other

participant finds the speaker somehow lacking in the other

language and can, therefore, make an insulting impression.

Thus, every CS choice becomes, in any given social context,

a negotiation of identity for each participant. Some

choices will reinforce a sense of sharing or bonding; other

choices will reinforce or create social distance between participants in the conversation.

In some social situations, particularly in bilingual communities, CS itself can be the most unmarked choice, rather than choosing one language or the other, as in the case above. In such a situation, a participant's decision to communicate in only one language or the other, whichever it may be, is a marked choice and determines to a great degree how he or she will be perceived or identified in that context. Thus, the Markedness Model is all about presentation of self in context and subsequent negotiation of position or identity in a given social context.

Conceptual Distance and Codeswitching

Codeswitching can be used to express linguistic, social and conceptual distance in a given conversation. Speakers, or writers for that matter, can use language choice, marked or unmarked, to create or limit conceptual distance, social distance between participants in a dialogue. Under this idea, choices in language are made deliberately to bring about a particular outcome. One choice of CS in a given social context can affect the speaker's position or identity in the context. Are they

associated more intimately with the listeners? Or by the shift in language, have they effectively distanced themselves from the group? The concept is simple: will the speaker be accepted or not as a member of the group? The anticipated (and desired) outcome affects the speaker's choice of language in the given context.

But the concept of distance is viewed differently by some researchers of code-switching. Sociolinguistic researchers such as Elizabeth Traugott and Mary Louise Pratt (1980) are interested in examination of distance in situations of code-switching. They suggest that languages used in code-switching do tend to serve different purposes. They offer, "[o]ne language is nearly always the public, official language, the other the language of intimacy" (p. 374). Thus, the 'native' language often, "signals involvement and expectation of involvement on the part of the hearer, confidentiality, and intimacy of ingroup bonding…. [whereas the public language] expresses distance, nonsharing, and lack of bondedness" (p. 376). This suggests that people will switch to the 'native', shared language to create or reinforce connections, to lessen a sense of conceptual distance.

So what would happen, potentially here, is that the more linguistic distance there is between linguistic elements in the official language used in CS situations, the more information offered in the language of intimacy, the *less* conceptual distance there would be. In other words, the more the language of intimacy is used, the more connected the participants are to the message, to the action.

Traugott and Pratt offer some further insight into this question of distance in code-switching. Drawing information from multiple studies on code-switching in English and Spanish, they present some conclusions on the grammatical/metaphorical choices people often make while code-switching. They suggest that the language of intimacy will be used for the following:

> 1. Personal names and place names, if associated with Chicano people; thus Juan will not be switched to John, though there may be some flexibility here; terms of endearment, such as mija "daughter," and papa, pronounced the Spanish way; the term *chicano* is also nearly always pronounced the Spanish way.

36

2. Tag questions, the function of which is to engage the speaker's attention and reaction, as in *It's about the same, no?*

3. Connectors between sentences, such as *pero* "but," *pues* "then."

4. Interjections and exclamations like *mira* "look," *andale pues* "OK swell."

5. Evaluative adverbs, as in *'Ta bien easy'* "it's real easy" (375).

Thus, the language of intimacy is used to draw participants closer, draw elements closer, not to increase distance.

Omoniyi (2004) explores the Contact Zone of the Nigeria/Benin border in West Africa. He suggests that language mixing is a natural manifestation in what he refers to as the "contact situation," that such mixing may even contribute to a sense of community identity (p. 85). He builds upon much of the research also discussed herein, particularly works by Gumperz (1982), Myers-Scotton (1993, 1995), Heller (1995), and Poplack and Meecham (1995). Membership in a given community, which he refers to as "solidarity", as well as and distance, or "exclusion," can be negotiated through language choices, mixing and CS (p. 106).

And building on Gumperz' theory of speech community, among other research, Polly Sterling points out that language choices represent how people place themselves in context, how they see themselves "in relation to others." She suggests that people negotiate power relationships, specifically development and maintenance of respect and solidarity, through their choices in language. She is concerned with a broader scope of linguistic variations than is the focus here. But the suggestion that people establish and negotiate community membership and position through choices in language is useful as it applies to the use of CS as a negotiating strategy for membership, belonging, or reinforcement of distance.

Toward a New Theory of Translingual Literature

So having covered much of the research on CS, there remain, as I see it, two fundamental flaws in any attempt to routinely apply CS theories to literature. The first flaw is that all the research that has been done on CS deals exclusively with oral discourse. The problem with that is that oral discourse is immediate and there is, theoretically at least, an opportunity to adjust meaning or

misunderstanding in context. In written discourse, there is no such opportunity. Written discourse is more permanent, and thus, requires more deliberation on the part of the writer. Though with the rise of the Internet, there is more room for change, there yet remains a sense of the permanence implicit in the written word that does not apply to the spoken word.

The other significant challenge is that theories of CS define it as a switch between two (or more) codes, or linguistic systems. The ideological reality of the idea of switching reflects an assumption of fragmentation, that is, that there is an abrupt disconnection between the two systems. It's jarring. I would argue, instead, that we need a theory to focus on the space between the languages, between the identities, a space which values both but sees value also in the blending of the two identifications, a space in which code-switching becomes its own system, a space in which the speakers of the system revel in the "dirty language" (Manhire). This requires that "Translingual literature," as I see it, is more than the application of theories of CS, discourse theories, or literary theories, to written texts. Translingual

literature is one approach to writing from the Contact

Zone. The following analyses are merely a beginning. . . .

CHAPTER THREE

THE BONE PEOPLE: A TRANSLINGUAL EXPLORATION
OF LIFE IN THE CONTACT ZONE

The Bone People, first published in New Zealand in

1983, offers the audience an account of the intersection of

three lives: three people searching for themselves,

connections to others, and an alternative to the isolation

they all live with. These three people, the alienated

woman, the grief-stricken man and the starved-for-love boy,

come together, battle in their Contact Zones, and change

each other's lives forever. Whether isolated by choice or

by circumstance, each character searches for a place to

belong, for people to belong to. They face the layers and

multiplicity of identity: uncertainties or conflicts in

gender, sexuality, family, blood, nationality, culture,

language and silence; they are alienated, searching for

definition. They are "outsider[s]" (101). They each seek to

define self in context. However, they are not really

"outside;" their context is in the space between male and

female, between English/Irish/Pakeha ['white' New

Zealanders] and Maori, between member of or stranger in

community, between speaker and listener. They live in the

Contact Zone. There are no distinct borders, and the search for self-definition is painful. This exploration of the space between identities and the creation of new identities makes The Bone People an ethnofeminist, translingual novel.

Keri Hulme's world, Aotearoa [trans. New Zealand], has a history of colonization; echoes of this history reverberate to this day in this Contact Zone. Hulme explores identity negotiation for people of Maori and/or "mixed" descent, presenting it as layered and complex; she provides us with evidence of English~Maori transcultural, translingual identity negotiation. English and Maori, the two languages that dominate here, are represented as separate linguistic systems. But going back in history, we find that the distinction, or "border," between the languages is not clear. Prior to the arrival of the English in New Zealand, Maori was an oral language. Thus, the writing system was created by approximating Maori sounds to written English (McKenzie, 1985). There are anomalies, of course, such as the "wh" making an English "f" sound (personal experience), but there is no way to completely know how that has impacted the Maori language over the last couple of centuries. So, essentially, writing in Maori rose from the relationship between the

Maori and the British [Pakeha] who settled there. In the
last three decades, there has been increasing debate about
the nature and value of Maori in New Zealand society (<u>Dirty</u>
<u>Silence</u>, 1990). We have also to consider that each
language has changed over time, as well as the evidence of
borrowing terms from one language to the other; it works
both ways. Even Pakeha greet each other with "Kia ora"
regularly; it has become a standard greeting in New Zealand
(personal experience). These realities blur the line
between English and Maori, language and identity. This is
truly a translingual text.

The ethnofeminist nature of this text is equally
complex. Below the surface, we have the voice of author
Keri Hulme; she herself has asserted her place in this
Contact Zone, demonstrating her commitment to self,
community, and Maoritanga [Maoriness], for one example,
through her conflict with South Pacific editor C.K. Stead
over respect and self-definition of Maori writers (Stead,
1994). Objecting to editor Stead's vision of Maori writers
and writing, citing his history of "'insult and attack'" on
Maori and Polynesian writers, Hulme, together with three
other well known South Pacific writers, Albert Wendt,
Patricia Grace, and Witi Ihimaera, pulled their submissions

43

from a South Pacific anthology he was editing. Evidence of the conflict, this skirmish in the Contact Zone, was offered by Stead in his opening "A Note on Absences," in Contemporary South Pacific Stories. She asserted Maori writers' voice and authority to self-define, and Stead retaliated, including Hulme's letters to the editor in his introduction (Stead, 1994, pp. vx-xvii). Through her willingness to participate and engage in this Contact Zone, Hulme demonstrates that she does not hesitate to assert her voice.

Hulme has also negotiated her ethnofeminist position through this text. She plays with contradictions as she develops her three primary characters, Kerewin, Joe and Simon. Keri Hulme offers us protagonist Kerewin Holmes; the similarity in names is no accident. Through her very naming of her protagonist, who functions as a catalyst-to-change in the novel, Hulme's investment in Kerewin's search for identity is implicit. So we are audience to Kerewin's search for and assertion of self in the Contact Zone.

Kerewin Holmes embodies the struggles of the ethnofeminist. Native of New Zealand, she is alienated from her family. She has traveled the world, searching for answers to herself. Implicit in that is the belief that

her ethnofeminist position is neither indicative of ignorance or lack of education; in fact, it is the opposite, that her ethnofeminist position rises from education and conscious movement to find and define self. She searches for an empowered identity, a sense of belonging that eludes her. She has studied aikido in Japan, which lays the groundwork for physical assertion of power and self. She presumably speaks multiple languages and is apparently educated in such diverse fields as architecture and art. She is seemingly capable of anything, yet is alienated from the Maori world she claims as her own.

Kerewin is an amalgam of seeming contradictions. She is a woman, yet she describes herself as a sexual "neuter," uninterested in the appeal of Joe as a man (266). She acknowledges that, though her family members were physically demonstrative of love, she always avoided it (265-266). She is also primarily ambivalent to the charm of the boy, Simon; the mother is buried within her. She is Maori, self-identifies as Maori (62), yet withholds that as she appears Pakeha, "blue-eyed, brown-haired, and mushroom pale" (61), until she chooses to reveal herself. She acknowledges her lineage, "the knowledge of my whakapapa

and solid Lancashire and Hebridean ancestry. Stout commoners on the left side, and real rangatira on the right distaff side. A New Zealander through and through" (99). The roles and nature of woman, most specifically that of sexual being and mother, are challenged and problematized; the identifications, characterizations and conflicts of Pakeha and Maori are also core issues in the text. Yet, these seemingly oppositional identities of woman and "neuter," Pakeha and Maori, are flawed. She, the ethnofeminist, can be one, the other, both and/or neither at the same time. There are no real, delineated boundaries between them, however much they may be socially reinforced. These identity constructs are played with and negotiated through the text.

Hulme also challenges flawed social definitions through Joe and his adopted son, Simon; they, too, are presented as conflicted characters, alienated and searching for themselves. Joe is a loving father; his love for Simon is present throughout, yet, he is very violent toward him. He is a man, formerly a husband and a biological father, apparently heterosexual; yet, it is hinted to us that he had a sexual relationship with another man (133). And though he clearly defines himself as Maori, he too found it

a conflicted identity (227). He, like Kerewin, sees himself as "an outsider" (101) and so relates to her. He negotiates his own identity with Kerewin as he puts her in the positions of Simon's mother, his lady, his friend, and his conscience as he relates to Simon. It is a fundamental negotiation of identity in context.

Simon is more of a mystery; found washed up on shore at the age of four, he was adopted by Joe and his wife, his origin a mystery as he did not speak. He is raised by Joe, with love and violence and Maori traditions; he relates to Kerewin, for one reason, because her "cream" skin is like his. He does not like getting beaten by Joe, yet he instigates it. We find that he was likely abused by his "real" father, and he may be Irish nobility. He has a voice, yet cannot speak. He is both silent and loud when he wants something. Simon/Sim/Haimona/Himi/Clare is the most mysterious personae offered in this text. Yet, the contradictions of and in his character are not really contradictory but rather evidence of the fluidity and negotiation of his power and self-constructed identity/ies. Without a "voice," Simon screams from the Contact Zone.

We have, then, in The Bone People, an ethnofeminist text that plays with the negotiation of identities in

context. It is a negotiation that consistently takes place in the space between supposedly dichotomous identity constructs. Kerewin is Pakeha and Maori at the same time, as are Joe and Simon. Then we must consider blood, culture, nature, etc., in how we define who belongs and who does not. So how, then, do we determine belonging? Or does the person/character negotiate that?

Language itself is the way that we negotiate identities in context. In the case of The Bone People, Hulme offers her audience a translingual text. It is an ideal way for an ethnofeminist to negotiate identity and position in context. Exploration and movement between languages (here, literally, "translingual") allows the ethnofeminist to subvert societal constructions of her self, if she chooses, and to negotiate her identity as she defines herself. If she can move between languages at will, (in other words, codeswitch), she is not locked into one social, racial, or cultural identification. She can use codeswitching to negotiate feminist identity as well. Thus, when she is constructed in a way unacceptable to her, she uses language choice to deconstruct and reposition herself.

As with ethnofeminism, the translingual nature of The Bone People is layered. On one level, Keri Hulme offers us a text which is predominantly English, yet offers glimpses into other worlds with particular references in languages such as German, Latin, Japanese, etc. It also offers a significant view into the Maori language, life, traditions and identities. Basically, she offers a predominantly English text with embedded Maori. Offering the text as her message, Hulme is the speaker/writer and, presumably, we are the audience, English speakers of the world. As the majority of the narrative is offered in English, we are allowed a view into this world she has created. And for those of us who are not speakers of Maori, nor knowledgeable about the realities of the Maori experience in New Zealand, the embedded Maori requires us to make an investment in the experience, to try to understand her on her own terms, in her own terms, literally and figuratively. It is a hongi, a Maori greeting, a reaching out, but we must meet her halfway.

There is hospitality in Hulme's offering, but there is also assertiveness and the implication that whatever she offers, she does so on her own terms. She offers a narrative mostly in English, but, like her life and the

life of her protagonist, it is framed by a dedication in Maori for people presumably of English descent. "Ki a taku whanau – Mary, Bill, Raynee, Diane, John, Mary, Andrew, Kathryn, Bob, Robyn, Wesley, John, Barry, Patrick, Maryann, John Peters: ki a nga whanauka mate – ki a aku morehu tupu – tenei pukapuka, he maimai aroha." There is no translation, so this message clearly was not meant for those outside the community, outside the circle of intimacy. This must have been done as an intimacy for those mentioned, a heartfelt respect; it also serves to establish her ethnofeminist self-identification from the beginning, and it lays the groundwork for the story she tells. Hulme identifies as Maori; we know that, quite literally, up front.

The other piece of Hulme's frame, the "Translation of Maori Words and Phrases," is offered to us Anglophones at the very end of the text. It is evidence that she wants to reach out to the audience, to be understood. The phrases offered provided some understanding of context not always readily available within the text. It was a very useful offering. The challenge is that the audience only becomes aware of it at the end; Hulme does not tell us up front of its existence. Unless her readers jump to the back of the

text early on, it offers nothing to the first reading. And

some Maori terms, such as "taniwha" and "ponaturi,"

mythical beings in Maori mythology, are only given brief

translations with no context or referent, so for those

intrigued, it offers a challenge to learn more about Maori

cultural traditions (Orbell). For those Anglophones not

intrigued, the reading is fractured. Hulme's Maori-dominant

framework is thus simultaneously a gift and a challenge to

the audience.

Internally, Holmes' voice dominates the text. The

internal narration is primarily English and the shifts to

Maori serve to negotiate identity and role in context.

Language and cultural attitudes are supplied early in the

text, in "Season of the Day Moon." English is presented as

the "language of information," established as the

colonizer's language, solidified by a song about the

arrival of the Endeavor, Captain Cook's ship of 1769, which

was the start of British discovery and colonization of

Aotearoa, known now as New Zealand (Oliver and Williams,

1981); the song concludes that the "world is never what it

seems," likely a reference to the injustice of the Treaty

of Waitangi, by which Maori tribes lost connection to the

land (McKenzie, 1985). "And the sun is dying" is seemingly

a reference to the resulting impact on the long and proud

traditions of the Maori peoples (Hulme, p. 11). It judges

the behavior of the British as colonizers as it asserts the

injustices suffered by Maori people, without even

mentioning them. Yet, the English language as narrative

medium is dominant. It is seemingly contradictory,

definitely ironic.

Language and cultural attitudes are further

established by the introduction of Maori to the narrative.

Again, on the first page of Chapter 1: "Season of the Day

Moon," Holmes introduces us to a drunken Maori man, whom we

later find out is Joe. His initial characterization,

solidified in its Maoriness, is hardly complimentary or

positive. Holmes has nothing but contempt for him, but

this contempt does not apply to the Maori language. In

fact, Maori is characterized as more valued than English,

as she offers, "You hate English, man? I can understand

that but why not do your conversing in Maori and spare us

this contamination? No swear words in that tongue… there he

goes again. Ah hell, the fucking word has its place, but

all the time? aue" (12). This offers Maori as the higher

language, the language with more status, with English

represented as having less status, being more common.

Holmes also makes it clear that she is versed enough in Maori to know and qualify it as having no swear words, and she punctuates that identification by closing with a common Maori tag. Yet, she shows no compunction in using the more vulgar aspects of English. Holmes finds identity and power in both English and Maori; choices in language are then made to serve a purpose. She makes choices that clarify and make concrete her choice of identity in context. She can fit anywhere, and she places herself through her choices in language.

Holmes uses English for the majority of her narrative. It is the language of the metropolitan public, the status quo in New Zealand, so its use is generally pragmatic. She uses English throughout the book to convey information, rather than to form bonds of intimacy with others. She also uses English to maintain distance from others, those she is potentially emotionally bonded to. In her early interactions with Joe, she uses it exclusively, concealing her knowledge of Maori. She works to maintain distance, alienation from Joe, perhaps even from herself. Likewise, she uses English almost exclusively in her interactions with Simon. The use of English coincides with her need not to care. The continued use of English serves to mark the

emotional distance she feels, or wants to maintain, from Simon. She also uses English when she meets her brother (241); long alienated from her family, she demonstrates that alienation and the awkwardness of the unexpected meeting through her language choice, even though she has previously identified her family members, including this brother, as Maori (112). Given her assertion of Maori self-identification, these uses of English in these contexts are unexpected, marked choices.

But the pragmatic reasons for and consequences of codeswitching between English and Maori throughout this text reveal much about the movement between communities, identities, aspects of self in context. In any given interaction, the characters may codeswitch for different reasons, anticipating different outcomes. When their goals are at odds, the codeswitching marks the conflict; when they have shared understanding, codeswitching is more likely evidence of cooperation and reinforcement of community. Codeswitching is often the negotiation of membership in a given community or alienation from it. The speakers place themselves as they negotiate that space between community and alienation through their choices of/in language.

Kerewin's first codeswitching dialogue with Joe is an ideal representation of this conflict/community negotiation. Kerewin has, up to this point, spoken to Joe and Simon exclusively in English; because of this and given her Pakeha appearance, Joe believes she is Pakeha, that she will not understand Maori. He, therefore, chooses to use Maori in front of her as he scolds Simon for stealing from Kerewin. He codeswitches to Maori to be secretive, to create privacy; his goal is to have a private interaction with his son in front of Kerewin. Kerewin, on the other hand, hears this, and, as her goal is in conflict with Joe's, decides that she will "not disclose in the meantime that [she] speak[s] Maori" (57). For her, knowledge held back is power. She is in on the secret, and they do not know it yet.

But from these conflicting goals, these secrets, rises a bond between the three participants: two active, Kerewin and Joe, and one passive, Simon. Kerewin and Joe are the characters interacting at this point; Simon is observing, and yet, they have a stake in the outcome of the interaction. The revelation that Kerewin understood Simon's scolding in Maori is a surprise; that she answers initially in English makes her knowledge even more surprising. Joe

follows, "E korero Maori ana koe?," testing Kerewin; "He iti iti noa iho taku mohio," she offers, "blandly" (57). It immediately creates a bond as it establishes shared knowledge and experience, at least in language. That Joe's subsequent response is in English is more a mark of feeling caught off guard, perhaps of embarrassment, than a rejection of the connection between them. Here, codeswitching to English evidences strong emotion. So though it may superficially appear that English and Maori are languages of information and intimacy, respectively, context offers more than yet another false dichotomy (languages of information versus intimacy: Romaine). So CS is used to change or negotiate the dynamic, the power relationship between individuals. CS becomes a bridge between identities.

Codeswitching to Maori can also be used to create a sense of community. Kerewin uses Maori to greet Joe's family upon her first meeting with them. She does this to establish a relationship with them, to place herself as a member of their community. When introduced to them by Joe, Kerewin finds that "the brown faces stare at her with bright unfriendly eyes. 'Tena koutou, tena koutou' she says, 'tena koutou katoa'" (112). They have read her skin

color as evidence of her being an outsider, Pakeha in a Maori space. She greets them in Maori, knowing her Pakeha appearance makes her an outsider. The switch to Maori becomes a way to prove herself, to establish her membership position.

But it is not a simple negotiation. Kerewin approaches the interaction on the defensive. She acknowledges her feeling of awkwardness in the situation, the feeling of needing to prove herself as she considers her desire to "whip out a certified copy of her whakapapa [lineage], preferably with illustrative photographs (most of her [family members] on her mother's side, are much more Maori looking than she is. 'Look, I really am one of you,' she could say…" (112) It is telling that in acknowledging her internal feeling of isolation, she uses English. It is a conflicted experience. Then, to reinforce her status as belonging, yet feeling awkward and on the defensive, she completes her greeting in Maori; " 'Tena koutou katoa,' she says again, lamely" (112). She then leaves herself vulnerable, waiting, as she must, to see if she will be accepted and acknowledged as belonging to the Maori community.

This interaction as a negotiation of identity is especially complex when played out in a group. Group dynamics, status, and authority play fundamental roles in the resolution of the interaction. Luckily for Kerewin, particularly as she desired acknowledgement of membership, she is accepted as one of them. She gets a smile, a laugh, and then, formal acceptance; Joe's cousin, Pi, "comes across and hongis… 'Tena koe, kei te pehea koe?' he says, hugging her" (112). Pi doesn't wait for an answer to his greeting. It is the hongi ritual itself that carries the message; she has passed the test, by language rather than skin color. Ritualized exchanges, such as the greeting above, are thus crucial in the negotiation of identity via CS because language choice becomes more than just choice of language.

Ritualized exchanges are usually less marked than the above. They most often take the forms of ritualized greetings between people whose shared translingual experience and status has already been established. Once bonded, these English-Maori translingual people regularly offer greetings a la Maoritanga. Upon meeting, they often hongi, the ritual of greeting another by approaching, touching nose to nose; it is a marker of warmth, intimacy

and respect (88, 112, throughout text). "Hello," "goodbye" and similar sentiments are generally then offered in Maori, imbued with somewhat more intimacy and warmth; for example, framing meetings of people of a translingual Maori-English nature are such offerings as "Kia ora koe" (30) [trans., "Good health to you"], "Kia ora korua" (77) [trans. "Good luck, you two"], and "Haere mai" (185) [trans. greeting and "Come here"], etc. Such rituals of courtesy habitually punctuate meetings throughout the text and make concrete the connection the participants feel to each other and to the Maori parts of themselves, as well as their value of the past, Maori traditions.

Naming in Maori is the most significant motivation for codeswitching as it provides us a view not only of present transcultural (English~Maori) life and customs but a memory of the past, the rich traditions of the Maori people. Cultural icons are only named in Maori. Tales of the "taniwha" (168), "taipo" (198) and the "ponaturi" (233) are mentioned to establish to the movement to keep traditions alive for successive generations;(they are each mentioned when the speaker is speaking to/thinking about Simon). They also serve to offer hints for further study for those who know little to nothing about traditional Maori stories

(Orbell, 1992). The three possibilities for the afterlife
according to Maori "truth" are named through experiences
with "Te Reinga," "Tuapiko and Tuwhaitiri"; "Ohau" and "Te
Honoiwairua in Irihia"; or "Papa," "Rangi" and "Rehua"
(354). Though the stories are briefly offered in English,
the depth of the background information needed to really
understand and envision the icons is such that the only
people who will completely understand the stories are those
who were raised with the tradition; translation of such
terms is impossible because, although the names might
literally be translated, the quality and vision of the icon
cannot be translated. The use of Maori here is more than a
choice; it is a necessity.

Tribal icons, practices, and terms of status and
respect are also named exclusively in Maori. The "marae"
is the meeting house, ceremonial house of a tribe (3, 227).
"Maoritanga" is Maori culture, traditions and values (62).
The "whakapapa" is a family tree; referenced in Maori, it
refers to the Maori lineage rather than Pakeha (99).
"Rangatira" (99) and "Kaumatua" (313) are terms of status
and respect in the tribe; Joe discovers the wisdom of the
kaumatua as he seeks, later in the text, to reconnect to
himself, who he really is. Traditional Maori weapons (33)

and "ketes" [traditional Maori baskets] (124) are named in Maori. And the "moko," a facial tattoo, is designed in different patterns to identify the person's tribal affiliation. Again, it is not just language choice that evidences belonging in a community; in this way also, the body itself is written as text, not just by skin color but by design. Naming these icons in Maori solidifies both Holmes' and Hulme's affiliations, deep connection to their Maoritanga, so, in that, it was a telling choice; but it was also a necessity to offer them in Maori... they can be approximated, but they do not really translate. The Pakeha have no exact equivalent.

Naming connections to the land, Aotearoa [trans. New Zealand], is also only offered in Maori. We can infer from the text that, in Maori cultural tradition, respect for the land is great; the "kaumatua" as the "keeper" (345) embodies the tie to the land inherent in the old ways. Those who wish to maintain or respect the old ways here reference apparently indigenous flora and fauna by using their original Maori names. Certain indigenous plants are named in Maori, as are indigenous fish and animals, which is logical given Maori commitment to the land and its inhabitants as representative of their desire to hold on to

their traditions ("Maori customary use" NZCA). Basically,
it appears that native species are named in Maori and
introduced species (or species originally named in English)
have kept their names. Whether or not the species named in
Maori have English (or Latin) equivalents seems irrelevant;
they are named in Maori to mark the connection to the past,
to tradition, to Maoritanga, as much as possible, just like
the people.

So naming cultural icons and traditions in Maori seems
completely logical, intuitive, but the naming and thus
placement, identification of people is more complex.
Particularly fascinating is Kerewin's naming of Simon.
From the time of first meeting (16), Kerewin uses English
to name the child. This may be partially due to the fact
that she was introduced to him in English. As he does not
speak, she was introduced to him with the label, "1 PACIFIC
STREET WHANGAROA PHONE 633Z COLLECT   SIMON P. GILLAYLEY
CANNOT SPEAK" (17). As it is the language used in the
introduction, the continued use of English is a logical
choice as the relationship develops. However, it is more
complex than that, as she does not only refer to him as
Simon. She also names him "Sim," "it" (16), "ratbag child"
(19), "little bastard" (19), "guttersnipe" (21),

"numbskull" (23), "brat" (26), etc. Very few of her names

for him are complimentary; throughout the text, she almost

always names him in English. She uses this strategy of

naming in English to create and reinforce distance between

her and others, especially Simon. English use continues to

document the negative. However, that does not mean she

despises Simon. In fact, it may be that she is so extreme

and negative in many of her English names for him because

she views him as a threat. He appeals to her, and so she

must create distance. She is conflicted.

Her naming of Simon in Maori is evidence of her

feeling emotionally close to him. The only times she

refers to him as "Haimona" or "Himi," "transliteration for

Sim" (42) are times she seems to be feeling maternal. Her

first reference to him in Maori was when she arrives home

and sees "the shape of the child kneeling on the sheepskin

mat, head on his arms, arms resting on the hearthbox.

'Haimona? Simon?'" (114). She softens, and for a moment,

she forgets to keep distance. She reverts to English with

"Simon" and then "Stupid kid" (114). Her codeswitching

action of naming him in Maori demonstrates here the

deepening of the relationship, the emotion she does not let

people see. Not comfortable with this vulnerability, she

codeswitches back to English and distances herself from Simon. Then, "Hey, Haimona," as she wakes him up, reinforces the bond she feels but is uncomfortable with (115). Then, Kerewin, when discussing Joe's violence with Piri, Joe's cousin, she twice calls Simon "Himi," and, in so doing, asserts her care for and solidarity with the child (286-7). The episodes in which Kerewin names Simon in Maori are linguistic representations of her inner conflict over emotional bond to and emotional distance from those close to her. Her choices in naming reflect her desire to place herself in the context of her relationships with others. For Kerewin, codeswitching choices and naming are about control.

Hulme's character, Joe, has rather a different approach to translingual, transcultural identity. His codeswitching most often revolves around his naming of Simon, whom he refers to as "Simon," "Sim," "Haimona," and "Himi" throughout the text. There does not appear to be any particular pattern or reason for the choices in context. It appears that he uses the names interchangeably, making no distinction between them. That suggests that, though Joe acknowledges to Kerewin that he is conflicted, that he is Maori but feels an outsider, he

is more at ease somewhere in the middle of the space between English and Maori identities. Better yet, it is a marker of how he views Simon as his son, "Haimona/Himi," but not, "Simon/Sim" as he found him washed up on shore. Joe is definitely conflicted about Simon's presence in his life; he's loving yet violent. He even acknowledges that he "resented [Simon's] difference…and [Joe] loved and hated him for the way he remained himself" (381). The codeswitching practice of naming Simon is like the wind, infinitely changeable, just as conflicted and seemingly contradictory as Joe's feelings. Maybe that is the point.

Joe is generally clearly pragmatic about codeswitching when he seeks to make amends for his errors in judgment. He codeswitches to Maori when he needs to charm someone from the Maori community. He uses Maori to make emotional appeals to both Kerewin and Simon. He uses it apologize for his violent behavior, to solicit support, and to assert love and affection. He often refers to Kerewin as "e hoa" [trans. friend] (69); though he sees her as more, he knows she does not feel that way for him. He regularly calls Simon "tama" [trans. son/kid/boy], using it as an affectionate name (79); he uses "tama" most often when touched or exasperated with choices the child has made.

For most of the narrative, these codeswitching choices are made to guarantee Joe a position of love and acceptance. They serve as bargaining tools for his sense of belonging.

Simon did not have the same tools, the same approach to negotiating identity and position. Mute, he had different codes he used to negotiate position; generally, switching between English and Maori was not at issue. He clearly understood both as listener, but, as speaker, his codes differed from Kerewin's and Joe's. He is the wild card.

All three of these characters "talk," not only to others, but also to themselves. The above analysis has focused on interactions between individuals, codeswitching that was interactive, that required dialogue. But what of the internal dialogues, what I call "self talk," that each character in the text uses to establish himself or herself apart from interactions with others. In Simon's self talk, he calls himself "Clare," particularly when in hospital on his own (388); then, naming of self becomes a way to reinforce the connection to someone else. " 'Well, my real name is Sinclair, Sinclair Fayden,' Sinclare? Clare? My name?" (397). This naming of self is especially important at a time Sim feels lost and alone. We, like Kerewin, may

guess he's lost Irish nobility. Yet, his origins, along with whoever gave him that name, remain a mystery, just as he does.

Kerewin, in her self talk, calls herself the "Te Kaihau," [trans. windeater] (12). From the beginning, she defines herself as a "windeater," a wanderer, someone continuously moving against the wind, without a place to belong. In naming herself so, she approaches the world accordingly. Joe, in his self talk, names himself "Ngakau" (369 etc.); never does he name himself this aloud. It remains inner speech. Translation of the name is never offered to us.

There are also layers beyond the Maori~English transcultural, translingual experience. Maori and English are not the only codes represented in this text. Each character codeswitches to other codes as well. Kerewin switches to multiple other linguistic systems as a hint to her extensive worldwide education. She speaks repeatedly to "herr Gott" [trans. "Lord God" or "My God" in German] in times of stress (12). She has a "tatami" [trans. Japanese martial arts mat] in her Tower, as she practices aikido. She is familiar with both Viking and Greek mythology, as she draws life connections to "Valhalla" (36) and the

"kraken" (233); both these references are closely related to discussions of Maori myth as well, perhaps an internal comparison, a search for the Truth? With brief references included in Latin (67) and French (209), combined with those above, Kerewin leaves no doubt as to her extensive education. In so doing, Hulme subverts any possibility that this codeswitching persona can in any way be thought of as "semilingual," as codeswitching bilinguals often are (Romaine). This strategy of codeswitching to so many other languages also has the effect of providing evidence for Kerewin's naming of self. With all this knowledge and travel, she is definitely reinforced as "Te Kaihau," the "Windeater," which is what she names herself (12). She is constantly moving, cannot settle down.

Simon has multiple codes that he uses to combat the silence, to connect to others, and he codeswitches continuously as he seeks ways to reach others, to establish and reinforce bonds, to find a place to belong, people to belong to. He uses his codes to create a home. He sings, and it enchants Kerewin; he screams when in pain. He uses sign language when he is being listened to, theft and violence when he is not. His behavior is his discourse. He also uses writing to communicate, although we are not often

shown exactly what he writes, only the reader's understanding of it. And all of his linguistic choices revolve around his desire to be heard. They all revolve around his need to be validated, powerful.

Hi adopted father, Joe, also employs extra-linguistic methods of communication; he uses violence as another code to which he can and does switch at will. Throughout the text, he and Simon are locked in a vicious cycle of 'speaking' and violently 'not speaking.' They both use this strategy to confront each other, to get conflicts out in the open, to resolve disagreements (190). It is the code that, at once, both separates them and ties them together. Kerewin also participates in this code as she weighs in when she fights Joe over his abuse of Simon (pp. 190-192). When she joins this battle, she defeats Joe and gains his respect; following her win, she solicits a promise from Joe that he won't hit Simon without her permission. Thus, Kerewin's shift to the code of violence wins her power over both Joe and Simon; Simon also benefits.

Yet later, she reverses her influence when she gives Joe permission to beat Simon after he steals a valuable keepsake from her (307). Joe beats Simon badly, and Simon stabs Joe (308-309). Violence was a regular code they all

used to communicate. It tied the three together and tore them apart at the same time.

This ethnofeminist, translingual text is an artistic, complex narrative about three lost people who find each other, negotiate, battle, and through their interactions, end up finding each other as place to belong, people to belong to. Through that discovery, they each end up finding themselves, distinct and isolated from each other, individuals; and yet, they come together to make a whole, a family. Through switching between all the codes at their disposal, they negotiate a space to identify themselves in context, a space to belong. It becomes their own, a whole rather than conflicted and disjointed language, life.

CHAPTER FOUR

BORDERLANDS: FLUID IDENTITY AND VOICE
FROM THE CONTACT ZONE

Though we move from New Zealand to the United States,

despite the change of venue, the ethnofeminist struggle for

identity and power remains. Gloria Anzaldua, Chicana

lesbian feminist, deals with a struggle for ethnofeminist

identity, construction of self, as does Keri Hulme. In

Borderlands/La Frontera, Anzaldua offers her vision of her

Self, which is inextricably connected to the context of her

life "between," between cultures, between borders, just

between. So her exploration of Self must, then, revolve

around movement in this life between, life in the Contact

Zone.

Published in 1987, Borderlands/La Frontera is a text

comprised of poetry and prose, which revolve around the

construction of identity, border identity, Anzaldua's own

identity. It is an exploration of what it means to combat

Silence in the "Contact Zone," this space between worlds,

cultures, languages and identities. It questions the

standards used to legitimize membership in a community or a

culture. It questions the construction of

dichotomies/dualities, false "borders." It appeals (and applies) primarily to Others who speak the "same language," this language of the borderlands, even as it acknowledges that this language is individual and regionally contextual. It is the language of the between, legitimate primarily for those who live there. But this text offers more than that, this ethnofeminist, translingual text.

Borderlands Anzaldua defines, discusses, explains her position as a Woman of Color. She describes how she has been traditionally Othered through sex, gender, sexual preference, religion, "race," education, physical location (the "border"), even connection to her own body. As she discusses how she sees and has dealt with these conflicts for herself, she uses switches and mixes codes to emphasize it, make it concrete. Acknowledging her approach in the Preface, she states, "The switching of 'codes' in this book from English to Castillian Spanish to the North Mexican dialect to Tex-Mex to a sprinkling of Nahuatl to a mixture of all these," she is sharing a "new language, the language of the Borderlands." By offering that language in this text, Anzaldua creates more than a text that "switches" between codes; it becomes a complex, chaotic text, a voice that explores the space and movement between codes, between

identities, and, in so doing, becomes a negotiable code distinct all on its own. It is difficult, chaotic and sometimes disjointed, but somehow, it works.

As Anzaldua shifts between codes: English, Spanish, Nahuatl, she explores the construction her identities. The movement between codes actually marks shifts in the identification of Self, how it is constructed in the context of external influences and societies. Some shifts between codes are single terms, lines, extended passages. The nature of the shifts reflects the expectations she has for her potential/projected audiences and determines her success in reaching them, as well as their comprehension of and connection to her argument. She is determined for her audience to take her on her own terms… to invest, to meet her halfway or lose out on what she has to say (Preface). It is a text both of reaching out and of defiance as it embraces contradictions and ambiguities, making it uncomfortable for those who insist on absolute borders.

Borderlands is offered as a personal narrative/selective revisionist history and poetry collection that is predominantly offered in English. Thus, because this text is a creative play with combining genres, more monologue than dialogue, analysis based on theories of

oral CS is more challenging. There is no "answer" offered

in a monologue. It is not obviously an exchange between

established participants in the dialogue. Because that

fundamental parameter of codeswitching research is not

there, interaction, it is necessary and more useful to

examine the changes themselves to see how the text

demonstrates Anzaldua's changes in expectation or

perception of audience.

The text is, as I have said, predominantly presented

in English. The extensive use of the medium of English

ensures that her text, her ideas, will reach a wider

audience, theoretically at least. However, the use of

Spanish is extensive enough that it is integrated,

inextricable from the nature of the text. And the use of

Nahuatl, while limited, is crucial to the constructions of

identity and Anzaldua's placement of Self in context.

Anzaldua has offered this translingual text as a whole, not

readily allowing for evaluation of CS based upon patterns

of shifts by topic or by non-existent dialogue negotiation

(unlike Hulme). But she does make a clear distinction

between the languages (and presumably the identities) by

offering English in regular typeface and Spanish and

Nahuatl in italicized typeface. Thus, the CS within

sentences and between sentences is easily distinguished by the audience. We can infer from this pattern that she views Spanish and Nahuatl similarly, and the two fundamentally separated or distinguished from English.

Furthermore, we might see her offering CS in this way as indicative of the way she views the languages and the underlying identities. Spanish and Nahuatl are typographically represented in italics, perhaps suggesting that those languages (and identities?) are more fluid. English, on the other hand, is presented in regular typeface, which is upright and rather stiff looking, especially in comparison. Whatever the reason for the distinction between the languages, it serves to create a visual pattern of difference.

Generally, the ethnofeminist qualities of the text are wrapped up with Anzaldua's shifts between codes. She clearly places her Self as ethnofeminist when she explores the identity constructions of skin color. She characterizes herSelf as having "brown blood" (2). That characterization, coming as it does in the first pages of the text, serves to create a bond between her and others with "brown blood in [their] veins" (2). She establishes membership or belonging with people who live in the same

space. It also provides a contrast to her construction of "whites" in the text. The "whites" or "gringos" are those who have power, who make the 'rules' (3). Presenting this dialectical construction so early in the text, Anzaldua allows her audience to understand that she places herself clearly on the side of the disempowered, or perhaps rather that she acknowledges how those "in power" will likely view her, based upon the color of her skin. In so doing, she identifies a conflict that exists between how she places herSelf and the context in which she lives.

The irony in this construction is that, theoretically at least, the purpose of this text is to challenge the artificial "borders," not to reinforce them. Or perhaps the text is supposed to be an exploration of how to negotiate the "borderlands." What makes this construction more telling is that the codeswitching to "gringo" remains in regular typeface rather than the established pattern of Spanish or Nahuatl offered in italics (p. 3). This suggests that the reference "gringo," is marked because not only is it an insult, loaded with connotation of arrogance and cruelty as well as pale skin, but also marked as an anglicized term, creating further separation from how she identifies Self as being 'of color.' Thus, on two levels,

it creates a value judgment even as it establishes her placement of Self as a person "of color." Yet, it reinforces the flawed dialectical thinking she clearly desires to identify and challenge.

Anzaldua uses CS to highlight the uncertainties of her identity in the Contact Zone. Sometimes, this uncertainty is a result of the generational differences in ideology and experience. This is something common around the world; parents are supposed to want 'better' for their children. But here, Anzaldua offers these remarks of her mother in order to highlight the perception many people have that English, "proper" English, is a/the language of upper social mobility (Heller, 1995). "'I want you to speak English. *Pa' hallar buen trabajo tienes que saber hablar el ingles bien. Que vale toda tu education si todavia hablas ingles con un* 'accent'? [in order to find a good job, you have to know how to speak English well. What is all your education worth if you still speak English with an accent?], my mother would say, mortified that I spoke English like a Mexican" (pp. 53-54). In order to have power and success, her mother wanted her to perfect her accent. Language attitudes have great impact on perception of self and others.

And yet, her mother codeswitches, which, at that time, was often seen as evidence of lack of education. For many from both 'sides' of the border, that perception or attitude still persists today (Romaine). Of course, this was a home-oriented interaction, which would not generally require the formality of the public sphere. What is even more interesting, though, is that Anzaldua here quotes her mother as using the regional Northern Mexican dialect or Tex-Mex rather than Standard Mexican Spanish or Castillian Spanish. The drop of "ra" from "para" to open the advice at once announces this advice as informal, but also rushed, as her mother scolds her. So this interaction would likely create a conflicted response, affecting self-image in context, characteristic of Contact Zone experiences.

Language choices, especially when one has at one's disposal a number of registers available, including a "bastard language," reflect where one places Self in connection to others. "But Chicano Spanish is a border tongue which developed naturally. Change, *evolucion, enriquecimiento de palabras nuevas por invencion o adopcion* [evolution, enrichment of new words through invention or adoption] have created variants of Chicano Spanish, *un nuevo lenguaje. Un lenguaje que corresponde a un modo de*

78

vivir. [a new language. A language that corresponds to a way of life.] Chicano Spanish is not incorrect, it is a living language. (p. 55). But all language is living; all language changes in context, with use. On the surface, it doesn't say much. However, the fact that this "bastard language" is named Chicano Spanish is significant. It is not Spanish; nor, for that matter, is it English. It is both and neither at the same time. To further problematize the identification of this language and identity, if we view her text as having been written in this language, Chicano Spanish is more English than Spanish. And yet it is named as Spanish, which definitely reflects loyalty to the 'native' tongue.

Anzaldua also uses CS to mark a call to arms. This is what Heller viewed as a call to mobilize, a response to subordination. The switch to Spanish builds upon the message in English, which was less, well, inflammatory. "Yet the struggle of identities continues, the struggle of borders is our reality still. One day the inner struggle will cease and a true integration take place. In the meantime, tenemos que hacer la lucha. Quien esta protegiendo los ranchos de mi gente? Quien esta tratando de cerrar la fisura entre la india y el blanco en nuestra

sangre? El Chicano, si, el Chicano que anda como un ladron en su propia casa [we have to struggle. Who is protecting the ranches of my people? Who is trying to close the fissure between the Indian woman and the white man in our blood? The Chicano, yes, the Chicano who walks like a thief in his own house]" (p. 63). The message offered in Spanish is definitely, deliberately more emotive, providing great imagery and soliciting an emotional response. The use of "we" reflects the community Anzaldua identifies with, and the fact that she doesn't explain in English suggests that her audience members who don't understand Spanish are left out, alienated from the call.

Anzaldua's choice of the term "blanco" was marked, unexpected. More common terms may have been "gringo," which she uses often in various parts of the text, "juero," "anglo," etc. Why she would do this is uncertain; I could speculate that she may have done it to return to the images and assertive of skin color (earlier her own "brown") in blood.

She definitely finds more sense of her Self beyond the dominant American culture, with the communities of the border space, the Contact Zone. She identifies as mestiza, literally 'mixed.' She places herself in conflict with the

white man, here American. "The Gringo, locked into the fiction of white superiority, seized complete political power, stripping Indians and Mexicans of their land while their feet were still rooted in it. Con el destierro y el exilo fuimos desunados, destroncados, destripados – we were jerked out by the roots, truncated, disemboweled, dispossessed and separated from our identity and our history" (pp. 7-8). And here, she does translate her message. She wants English speakers to understand the depth of her response. But though Anzaldua sets herself up in opposition to the white culture, she has no problem learning and making use of Western ideologies as it suits her. She really lives Pratt's conception of the Contact Zone, if she can be taken at her word.

Spirituality she seeks in Nahuatl and in Mexican Spanish. She appears to search for the mystical part of herself through the *india*. "*La madre naturaleza* succored me, allowed me to grow roots that anchored me to the earth. My love of images – mesquite flower, the wind, *Ehecatl*, whispering its secret knowledge[. . .]" (Preface). Some such images are fluid, magical.

Others images, symbols, are more abrupt. The Aztec God of War, for example. *Huitzilopochtli* was a central

81

figure in guiding the indios to a place, later known as Mexico City, where an eagle clutched a serpent; together, the eagle and the serpent symbolize the "struggle between the spiritual/celestial/male and the underworld/earth/feminine" (p. 5). Like Hulme, Anzaldua names her connections to the land and to her spirituality in the language(s) of intimacy (Traugott & Pratt).

And it is through her sense of the spiritual that she connects the india, the Nahua to the Spanish and the mestiza; it is through the spiritual path of Mexico. This sense of her spirituality is also inextricably linked to her traditions and to her sense of family. "*Mi mamagrande Ramona toda su vida mantuvo un altar pequeno en la esquina del comedor. Siempre tenia las velas prendidas. Alli hacia promesas a la Virgen de Guadalupe*[all her life, my grandmother Ramona maintained a small altar in the corner of the dining room. She always had the candles lit. There she made promises to *la Virgen de Guadalupe.*] My family, like most Chicanos, did not practice Roman Catholicism but a folk Catholicism with many pagan elements. *La Virgen de Guadalupe*'s Indian name was *Coatlalopeuh*. She is the central deity connecting us to our Indian ancestry" (p. 27). In this one passage, Anzaldua provides many insights

into how she constructs her own identity. Of course, the Aztec goddess would be named in Nahuatl. And as Anzaldua is clearly fascinated by her Indian heritage and traditions, this is hardly a surprise.

What is unexpected here is the assertion of what is effectively a partnership between Nahuatl and Spanish/Catholic images. By asserting that *La Virgen de Guadalupe* and *Coatlalopeuh* are the same character, Anzaldua demonstrates there must be strategies subordinated peoples can use to empower themselves and "select and reinvent" what is imposed on them by colonizers (Pratt). Were that not the case, there could be no sense of value and equality in identifying this persona as the same, whether named in Spanish or Nahuatl. Finding equal status in religious beliefs, people can see that empowerment is possible.

Also, Anzaldua's offering of her account of her grandmother's spiritual customs in Spanish suggests that she remembers it in the terms by which she experienced it. So it is likely that childhood memories will be remembered and disseminated in the language in which they were experienced. Of course, there is not way to be sure, but it seems a logical conclusion, particularly given the fact

that this experience is identified as a tradition, a
ritual.

I could go on, providing examples of Anzaldua's CS in
this Borderlands. They abound. But the truth is that it
matters less to examine the individual examples of the
switching than to acknowledge what she attempts to do with
it. She has much to say about politics, history,
spirituality, living with multiple identities in a space
where said identities are layered, indistinct, changeable.
And she not only talks about the issues, the conflicts over
language and identity, she demonstrates them through CS
throughout the text.

She presents her ideas in her own terms, on her own
terms. Only people who speak the same "language" will
completely understand her argument, having shared knowledge
of the space which she seeks to identify and negotiate.
She presents her vision of her worlds without apology,
without surrender. She does reach out to audiences less
familiar with her space; she reaches out by occasionally
repeating or extending an idea in English, for those who
don't speak Spanish. She offers history and research for
those unfamiliar with them. But she doesn't overextend.

Her audience has to meet her on her own terms. They have a choice… invest or not.

There are patterns Anzaldua commits to; naming is the most critical. Naming of self, naming of symbols and representations of cultural or communal value, naming the land, these are all keys to negotiation of the Contact Zone. The ethnofeminist must be able to name and place herself. She must be heard.

Borderlands is, in my opinion, a fascinating text, a frustrating text, a truly and fundamentally ethnofeminist text. The CS patterns offered in the text are elusive. But maybe that is the point. We are not supposed to be able to completely objectify it, classify it, put it under a microscope. This text is a visceral, chaotic experience. It's uncomfortable. Perhaps that is what Anzaldua intended. Because it is not just about her exploring and placing herself. It's also about what she can reach in her audience.

Strangely, I do not know what more to say. Maybe silence isn't always "dirty" after all.

REFERENCES

Anzaldua, G. (1987). Borderlands/ la frontera. San

    Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Arvidson, K. (1990). Aspects of contemporary Maori

    writing in English. Dirty silence: aspects of

    language and literature in New Zealand. Auckland:

    Oxford University Press.

Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a

    sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken

    (Eds.), One speaker, two languages (pp. 115-135).

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (1998). Introduction: bilingual conversation

    revisited. In P. Auer (Ed.), Code-Switching in

    Conversation (pp. 1-24). London: Routledge.

Beauvoir, S. de (1989). The second sex. New York: Vintage

    Books.

Bentahila, A. (1983). Motivations for code-switching among

    Arabic-French bilinguals in Morocco. Language &

    Communication, 3 (3), 233-243.

Bonvillain, N. (1997). Language, culture, and

    communication. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall,

    Inc.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of
communicative approaches to second language teaching
and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1, 1-47.

Cixous, H. (1988). Sorties. Modern criticism and theory.
London: Longman Group UK, Ltd.

Edwards, J. (1994). Multilingualism. London: Penguin
Books, Ltd.

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2001). Second language
acquisition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates,
Inc.

Gates, H. L. (1986). Writing 'race' and the difference it
makes. "Race," writing and difference. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press.

Gumperz, J. J. & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1982). Introduction:
language and the communication of social identity. In
J.J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and Social Identity (pp.
1-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harlow, R. (1990). Contemporary Maori language. Dirty
silence: aspects of language and literature in New
Zealand. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Heller, M. (1982). Negotiations of language choice in
Montreal. In J.J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and Social

Identity (pp. 108-118). Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Heller, M., Ed. (1988). Codeswitching: anthropological and

sociolinguistic perspectives. Berlin: Mouton de

Gruyter.

Heller, M. (1995). Code-switching and the politics of

language. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), One

speaker, two languages (pp. 158-174). Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Herrera-Sobek, M., Ed. (1985). Beyond stereotypes. New

York: Bilingual Press.

Hulme, K. (1984). The Bone People. Auckland:

Spiral/Hodder & Stoughton.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1949). Les structures elementaires de la

parente. English edition: The elementary structures of

kinship. (1969). Cited in S. de Beauvoir. (1989).

Second sex. New York: Vintage Books.

Lugones, M. (1994). Playfulness, 'world'-traveling, and

loving perception. The woman that I am. New York:

St. Martin's Press.

Madison, D. S., Ed. (1994). The woman that I am. New York:

St. Martin's Press.

Manhire, W. (1990). Dirty silence: impure sounds in poetry.
In McGregor, G. & Williams, M. (Eds.) <u>Dirty silence:</u>
<u>aspects of language and literature in New Zealand.</u>
Auckland: Oxford University Press.

<u>MELUS, The journal of the society for the study of the</u>
<u>multi-ethnic literature of the United States.</u> 21
October 2005. 16 April 2004.
www.boisestate.edu/english/melus/

Milroy, L. & Muysken, P., Eds. (1995). <u>One speaker, two</u>
<u>languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-</u>
<u>switching.</u> New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moraga, C. & Anzaldua, G. (1981). (Eds.), <u>This bridge</u>
<u>called my back.</u> New York: Kitchen Table.

Muysken, P. (1995). Code-switching and grammatical theory.
In L. Milroy and P. Muysken's <u>One speaker, two</u>
<u>languages.</u> Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). Code switching as indexical of
social negotiation. In M. Heller (Ed.),
<u>Codeswitching: anthropological and sociolinguistic</u>
<u>perspectives.</u> Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (pp. 151-
186).

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Social Motivations for

    Codeswitching. New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1995). A lexically based model of code-

    switching. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken's One speaker,

    two languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oliver, W. H. & Williams, B. R., Eds. (1981). The Oxford

    history of New Zealand. Auckland: Oxford University

    Press.

Omoniyi, T. (2004). The Sociolinguistics of borderlands:

    two nations, one community. Trenton, NJ: Africa World

    Press, Inc.

Pandian, J. (1985). Anthropology and the Western

    tradition. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Perez-Torres, R. (1995). Movements in Chicano poetry.

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poplack, S. (1988). Contrasting patterns of codeswitching

    in two communities. In M. Heller (Ed.), Codeswitching

    (pp.215-244). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Poplack, S. & Meecham, M. (1995). Patterns of language

    mixture: nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-

    French bilingual discourse. In L. Milroy and P.

    Muysken's One speaker, two languages. Cambridge:

    Cambridge University Press.

Pratt, M. L. (1992). Arts of the Contact Zone. <u>Imperial</u>

    <u>eyes: travel writing and transculturation</u>. London:

    Routledge.

Pratt, M. L. (1986). Scratches on the face of the country;

    or, what Mr. Barrow saw in the land of the Bushmen.

    In H. L. Gates, Ed., "Race," <u>Writing and Difference</u>.

    Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rebolledo, T. D. (1995). <u>Women singing in the snow</u>. Tucson:

    University of Arizona Press.

Romaine, S. (1995). <u>Bilingualism</u>. Oxford: Blackwell

    Press.

Saldivar, R. (1990). <u>Chicano Narrative</u>. Madison:

    University of Wisconsin Press.

Sanchez, R. (1994). Theoretical assumptions. <u>Chicano</u>

    <u>Discourse.</u> Houston: Arte Publico Press.

Sanchez, R. (1994). Code-switching discourse. <u>Chicano</u>

    <u>Discourse.</u> Houston: Arte Publico Press.

Showalter, E. (1988). Feminist criticism in the

    wilderness. <u>Modern criticism and theory</u>. London:

    Longman Group UK, Ltd.

Smitherman, G. (1977). <u>Talkin and Testifyin</u>. Detroit:

    Wayne State University Press.

Stead, C. K. (1994). Contemporary South Pacific studies.

    London: Faber and Faber.

Sterling, P. Identity in language: an exploration into the

    social implications of linguistic variation. Texas A

    & M University.

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in

    interlanguage. In H.D. Brown, C.A. Yorio & R.C. Crymes

    (Eds.), On TESOL '77: Teaching and learning English as

    a second language: Trends in research and practice

    (pp. 194-203). Washington D.C.: Teachers of English to

    Speakers of Other Languages.

Traugott, E. & Pratt, M.L. (1980). Linguistics for

    students of literature. San Diego: Harcourt Brace

    Jovanovich.

Wei, L., Ed. (1998). The bilingual reader. London:

    Routledge.

Whakairo, W. (1990). Maori 'literary' traditions. Dirty

    silence: aspects of language and literature in New

    Zealand. Auckland: Oxford University Press.