AN APPROACH TO LANGUAGE PLANNING
IN EARLY MODERN ENGLISH

Susana Doval Suárez
Universidad Santiago de Compostela

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to make an analysis of some of the Language Planning (henceforth LP) activities which were carried out in England from the 15th to the 18th century. The starting point of the discussion is the consideration of LP as a discipline closely vinculated to *Applied Linguistics*. In this respect we follow the approach taken by Haugen (1966), Ferguson (1968), Daoust & Maurais (1987) and Fernández Pérez (forthcoming). The first section of the study will deal with a description of the planning processes (i.e. processes concerned with the standardization, normalization and normativization of the English language) in early Modern English. The second section is an approach to the early Modern English example in the light of LP. For this, we suggest the application of the theoretical frameworks designed by three 20th-century authors: Haugen (1966, 17 and ff.) describes LP as a four-stage process (*selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance*). Haugen's (1983) model incorporates an important distinction (*corpus planning vs. status planning*; cp. Kloss, 1969, 81 and ff.) which cuts across those four stages (see below). Nahir's (1984) approach gives due consideration to another aspect of LP, the one concerned with specific planning goals. Finally, Haarman (1990) introduces a third element: *prestige planning*, which has the advantage of emphasizing the importance of the individual as far as evaluation measures are concerned (see below). *Section 2* will show whether these models prove useful when applied to eModE.

The novelty of the approach lies in the fact that those eModE activities shall be made to refer to specific LP frameworks. This means that they can be explained with the help of a well-established linguistic discipline. If the historical approach taken in this study is sufficiently supported in the literature, ours may be proved to be a feasible task. Generally speaking, most of the experts in Sociolinguistics and in LP refer to the existence of planning activities previous to the linguistic consolidation of LP as a discipline in our century. Fodor (1983), for instance, deals with the phenomenon of *Lexical Modernization*. His intention is to prove that this phenomenon is not exclu-

sive to certain languages. On the contrary, he argues that it has affected all of them (including English, French and German) in the course of history. Therefore, he is stating the existence of language planning in the past. Coulmas (1989) remarks on the fact that *Language Adaptation* is a phenomenon common to the history of all languages and not a feature of underdeveloped countries. This enhances an egalitarian concept of languages. In order to illustrate this idea, he describes a relatively recent adaptation process (that of India in Gandhi's time) and two adaptation processes in the past, one affecting German and the other one affecting English in the Renaissance, when many Englishmen realized that their mother tongue was not adequate for literary purposes. In this respect, Coulmas says that "it is not surprising that from that time on many learned men raised their voices, calling for a conscious regulation of English" (op. cit., 19). He points out the importance of writing in the process of language adaptation as "...it provides the attitudinal and technical prerequisites that make language adaptation possible" (op. cit., 15). The attitudinal prerequisites he mentions are connected with the prestige which results from introducing writing in a language of low status. Technical prerequisites are connected with codification and lexical enrichment. To illustrate the role of writing in the process of language adaptation he uses the example of English:

> ...the English example illustrates a rather general phenomenon, the need or desire to use a language in writing produces an awareness of its shortcomings relative to a standard defined by the usage of another advanced language. Writing, in turn, produces *the remedies by stimulating the production of reference works whose authority is reinforced by the prestige of the model language*.
>
> (The underlining is mine, op. cit., 20)

There is also an allusion to the feasibility of the historical approach in Haarman's (1990) suggesting the application of his typology to the study of the historical development of a language (see below). From a sociolinguistic point of view, Leith (1983) also remarks on the importance of the writing system in the standardization of English, which "proceeded in four inter-linked and often overlapping stages" (Leith, 1983, 32). The stages he refers to are *selection, acceptance, elaboration and codification* of the standard. Milroy & Milroy (1985) use the example of the historical development of standard English in order to relate standardization to prescriptivism.

In view of all these approaches there is no doubt about the existence of LP (more or less conscious, more or less institutionalized or effective) in the past. The only question that may still be unclear is the extent to which those past processes "are comparable with those of the present" (Coulmas, 1989, 5). In this sense, Fernández Pérez (forthcoming) puts forward an answer to this question: she holds that the difference between past and present LP lies in the prescriptive character of the former as opposed to the more "social" character of the latter:

> En efecto, los problemas de adaptación, reforma, modernización, etc. de las lenguas han venido ocupando *a los gramáticos de todas las épocas a lo largo de la historia*. La labor a este respecto no siempre se concibió en el sentido de *planificar considerando marcos sociales*, sino que más bien se tomó como tarea de *prescribir* imponiendo desde las gramáticas.
>
> (the underlining is mine; Fernández Pérez, forthcoming)

Therefore, this study will also aim at clarifying the extent to which in the past, LP has been a fundamentally prescriptive activity. It will also be interesting to see whether past reformers have considered the need of making some prestige planning which might implicate the individual as a participant in social interaction.

2. AN OUTLINE OF THE EARLY MODERN ENGLISH REFORM MOVEMENT

Around the year 1476, England was witness to the emergence of an interesting debate concerning the validity of the vernacular and its degree of adequacy as a written language (either in the scientific or in the literary field). This subject was also being discussed in other European countries with regard to their respective native languages. However, the situation of English was a special one, as it was the only European language which, in the Middle Ages, had to endure a foreign conquest which imposed, at least temporarily, a new language on the dominant class. The Norman Conquest meant depriving English of a good part of its *functional potential*, as it was relegated to the oral and informal registers.

By the end of the 14th century, the English language started its recovery. At the beginning of this century, English was already known and used by most of the population, but French was still the language of Parliament and of Court. The most decisive step taken so that the English language could recuperate the status of official language was the *Statute of Pleading* (1362). In the 15th century, English was finally adopted by councils, guilds and by Parliament. But this recovery was only relative, since the Medieval stage had brought about a big transformation in the English language affecting all linguistic levels. On the fuctional level, it was highly desirable to create a standard which might satisfy all the communicative needs of the language. Thus, in the 15th century, Caxton complains about the instability and mutability of the English language. An example is given in the *Prologue* to *Eneydos* (c. 1490):

> And also my lorde Abbot of Westmynster ded showe to me late certayn evydences wryton in olde Englysshe (...) And that comyn Englysshe that is spoken in one shyre varyeth from another ... Certaynly, it is harde to playse every man bycause of diversitie and chaunge of language.
>
> (Blake, 1973, p. 79)

Written English was gradually standardized from the 15th to the 18th century. The dialect which played the most prominent part in this process was London English. The Royal Chancery scribes, who used English for official documents, exerted a big influence on the spelling of private and informal letters (cp. Bourcier, 1981, 178 and Scragg, 1974, 35-36). But the establishment of a standard language is a slow process. In England, it was not the result of natural evolution. On the contrary, there was conscious intervention. Bourcier (1981) holds that "linguistic standardization requires conscious regulation of spelling, grammar and vocabulary. In English, the social and cultural considerations combining to create the new standard drew special attention to lexical and stylistic problems" (op. cit., 179).

It was precisely the desire to use English in writing which triggered the initiation of the reform movement. During the Renaissance, scholars and writers began to re-

flect about their native language, which led to different reform designs. Some re-
formers worked on a *functional* level. They were of the opinion that English was an
ineloquent language. This made English inadequate for literary expression (cp. Fos-
ter Jones, 1966). While eloquence was associated with the Classical languages, Eng-
lish was described as *rude, gross, barbarous* or *vile* (op,. cit. 5). Apologies concern-
ing the rudeness or inferiority of the English language crowd the books written at the
time. Nevertheless, although English was first considered a non-literary language,
several factors encouraged its use for scientific and religious aims. One of these fac-
tors was the introduction of the press; another one was the Reformation which en-
couraged the translation of the Bible in order to expand knowledge (religious truths)
among the uncultured masses[1].

Therefore, the English language achieved scientific and religious status before
being eloquent. For this purpose, an important step was consciously taken: the intro-
duction of *neologisms*. They were strongly opposed by those who accused them of
obscurity and "strangeness". Some of the advocates of borrowing (*Sir Thomas Elyot*,
for instance) held that this failure could be palliated with the inclusion of an explana-
tion of the new word. Besides, they claimed that custom and use would help to over-
come that feeling of strangeness. Due to the oppposition encountered by the defend-
ers of borrowing, some other means of enriching the vernacular were set forth, i.e.
composition, a morphological means (advocated by J. Cheke, A. Golding, R. Lever)
and *revival of archaisms*. Nevertheless, these solutions had the same faults as bor-
rowing: both means lacked clarity, and the number of archaisms available was not
sufficient to cover the terminological needs of the time (op. cit., Ch. IV).

On the linguistic level, *orthography* was a serious hindrance to the standardiza-
tion and normalization of English in the Renaissance. The Roman alphabet was intro-
duced by the Irish monks in the 7th century, and, in the 10th century, with the political
unity achieved under the reign of Alfred, a common system was imposed all over the
country. But the Norman Conquest brought fragmentation and chaos: the absence of
a standard, the phonological changes and the French conventions introduced during
these stage had notable repercussions on the English spelling system. The French
influence was really decisive for the configuration of English orthography: on the
one hand, the new French terms borrowed into English were not coherently repre-
sented by the scribes. Some of them opted for phonetic representation and other pre-
ferred to be faithful to the original word. On the other hand, as many scribes were of
French ascendancy, they introduced foreign conventions into the English spelling
system, which emphasized the lack of correspondence between letter and sound.

The cultured man of the Renaissance was able to perceive these irregularities.
William of Salesbury cites many examples in which the English "do not read and
pronounce every word literally as it is written" (op. cit., 144). The first spelling re-
form treatises are written in the middle of the 16th century. The English reform move-
ment is vinculated, on the one hand, to the French orthographic reform carried out by
Meigret, and, on the other hand, to the controversy over the pronunciation of Greek:
Sir John Cheke and Sir Thomas Smith adopted the revision of Greek pronunciation
which had been introduced by Erasmus. This revision assumed that Greek spelling
was based on phonetic principles. Bishop Gardiner, on the contrary, advocated a pro-
nunciation based on the Greek of the time and which did not bear any relation at all
with orthography. This controversy had a great influence on the appearance of the
first spelling reforms based on phonetic principles. Furthermore, *phonetic spelling*

had an interesting precedent in the Middle Ages. In the 13th century, Orm wrote a homily using his own orthographic system. This was a consistent attempt, made with the purpose of improving predication (cp. Scragg, 1974, 31).

During the 16th century, especially, there were two opposed tendencies in the spelling reform movement: the *etymological* reform which reached its climax in the first half of the 16th century, and the *phonetic* reform, which started with Orm and has continued up to the present day. The former movement was a direct consequence of the diffusion of the book among the population, achieved thanks to the introduction of the press. This fact meant paying more attention to the written word than to the sounds that it represented. Furthermore, the Renaissance interest in Classical culture gave way to numerous attempts to connect the English and Latin lexicons. This process was in fact another "prestige activity", since Latin had a stable orthography. Some of the alterations introduced by the derivationists had a very short life (i.e. "sanct"<Lat. "sanctus"), but others survived, even when the reform was based on a erroneus etymology (op.cit., 56 and ff.) An instance of this can be found in the word "island", where the "s" was introduced by erroneus association with the French word "isle"; the Middle English word "yland" was, however, of Saxon origin. The fact that most of the reformed words did not change their pronunciation immediately brought even more inconsistency to the already-chaotic English spelling system (op. cit.).

The phonetic reform movement of the 16th century starts with two important treatises: *Orthographie* (published by J. Hart in 1551) and Smith's *De Recta et emendata Linguae Anglicae Scriptione Dialogus, etc* (1568). This author claimed that the lack of correspondence between sound and letter was a serious hindrance to the progress of the vernacular, as writing should be "an image of speech". J. Hart has the same view and describes his purpose in these terms:

> ...of this my treatise the summe, effect and ende is one. Which is, to use as many letters in our writing as we doe voyces or breathes in speaking, and no more; and neuer to abuse one for another, and to write as we speak: which must needes doe if we will euer haue our writting perfite.
>
> (Foster Jones, 1966, 148)

Both Hart and Smith design a reform which implies the omission of superfluous letters and the introduction of new symbols and diacritics. In the case of Hart, this was done in spite of his being aware of the great opposition he would encounter. Hart was conscious of the problems of acceptance on the part of the community. But, although this problem delayed the publication of his work, he did not try to adapt it to the community they were addressed. In this fact lay his failure.

John Baret and Arthur Golding also thought a new spelling system was desirable for their mother tongue. Their significance rests in the fact that they were the first to realize the importance of the *implementation* of the reform by *institutionalized means* (i.e. the government and the university). John Baret, in his *Dictionary* published in 1573 considers it impossible to amend orthography until "...the learned Universities have determined vpon the truth thereof, and after the Prince also with the noble Counsell, ratified and confirmed the same, to be publickly taught and used in the Realme" (op.cit., 151). Arthur Golding (who composed a prefaciatory poem to Baret's *Dictionary)* claims that the new system should be:

...set out by learning and aduysed skill,
(which certesse might be done full easilye)
And *then confirmed by the Souereines will*...
<div align="center">(op. cit., 152)</div>

The orthographic reform undertaken by Bullokar (*Bullokar's Book at Large for the Amendement of Orthographie*, 1580) belongs to a tendency known as "amended spelling". He intends to be more faithful to tradition and this makes him criticize his predecessors for having gone too far away from custom. But his new system ends up being as extravagant as the preceding ones. Nevertheless, his proposal for elaborating a grammar and a dictionary makes his reform more complete than the ones devised by his predecessors.

The orthographic controversy of the 16th century ends with Mulcaster's *The First Part of the Elementarie* (1582). Mulcaster was one of the most famous teachers of his time (first, at the Merchant Taylor's school, and then, at St. Paul's School in London). Therefore, he exerted a very important influence on the intellectuals. He was the first to perceive clearly the importance of the relationship that any language holds with the people who speak it. He realized that linguistic change is inevitable and that language resists private laws and personal innovation. He is against the previous reform designs and suggests his own reform based on use and custom. Therefore, he suggests eliminating superfluous letters and duplicating consonants in derivative words. The reason for his success must lie in the fact that his reform was supported by Elizabeth I, as it was based on *tradition*. This fact was of great importance for a country still looking for its national identity.

Interest in the spelling reform increases in the 17th century. One of the most outstanding figures is A. Gill (*Logonomia Anglica*, 1621). He has much to owe to his predecessors, especially to Hart. His system, though phonetic, gives due consideration to "derivation" (etymology) and use. He recognizes the importance of a standard language (which he associates with the language of the educated) as a basis for any reform design. His importance lies in the great influence he exerted over Milton, whom he instructed at St. Paul's School in London. The spelling reform of this century ends with C. Butler's *The English Grammar or the Institution of Letters, etc* (1634)[2]. He adopted a system that was somewhere between phonetic and traditional orthography. In the end, his system looks a bit odd, but he had the merit of having published his books using his own orthographic system.

The 18th century, with its concern with rules and order, means the temporal interruption of the reform movement, at least, as far as phonetic reform is concerned. On the contrary, the 18th century scholars think that spelling must be permanently fixed by an academy. Thus, Swift views linguistic change as undesirable and even argues patriotic reasons for justifying his desire to stabilize the language (as it "would very much contribute to the glory of Her Majesty's [Queen Anne] reign") (cp. Crowley, 1991, 2). Furthermore, he criticizes phonetic spelling in these terms:

Another Cause...which hath contributed not a little to the maiming of our Language is a *foolish opinion* that we ought to spell exactly as we speak; which beside the obvious Inconvenience of utterly destroying our Etymology, would be a Thing we should never see an End of...
<div align="center">(op. cit., 35)</div>

Swift puts forward the idea of creating a society that may "control" change. An interesting antecedent of a possible Academy can be found in the Royal Society, founded in 1662. In 1664 it assumed the task of improving the English language. Several measures were set forth (the compilation of a grammar, spelling reform...), but nothing was done in the end (Baugh, 1978, 265-6). In 1712, Jonathan Swift, conscious of the indispensability of political support addresses the Lord Treasurer of England (in a letter titled *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue)*, asking for his protection for the society in question arguing that "... such a Society would want your Instruction and Example, as much as your Protection..." (op. cit., 37). Swift's proposal did not materialize. The reason for his failure was probably the lack of agreement among scholars. Furthermore, as the 18th century came to an end, scepticism about the feasibility of avoiding language change increased considerably among the intellectuals. A significant example is given by Dr. Johnson's change of attitude. In the *Plan* of his *Dictionary* (1747), he thought that language should be fixed. However, his attitude changed in the *Preface* written in 1755, where he confessed: "I have indulged expectation which neither reason nor experience can justify."(Baugh, 1978, 268). This time, Johnson clearly opposed the foundation of an academy since this would have destroyed the traditional spirit of "English liberty", a typical English attitude which made non-intervention preferable to arbitrary regulation (op. cit.). It seems probable that Johnson's position may have influenced his contemporaries since the number of advocators of an academy decreased after the publication of his dictionary. However, it must be remembered that the stabilization of orthography had been almost completely achieved in the 18th century (op. cit., 213), even though orthographic incongruency not only continued to exist but also increased after the publication of Johnson's dictionary (cp. Iglesias Rábade, forthcoming). The "merit" of fixing orthography has often been attributed to Dr. Johnson. Osselton (1963, p. 271), however, claims that Johnson confined himself to follow the conventions which had already been fixed by the printers a hundred years before. In the *Preface* to his *Dictionary*, Johnson states that his role as a lexicographer is not to correct anomalies but to register them so as to avoid confusion. He is against reform and the principles which guide his orthography are custom and use:

> When a question of orthography is dubious, this practice has, in my opinion, a claim to preference, which preserves the greater number of radical letters or seems most to comply with the general custom of our language. But the chief rule which I propose to follow is to make no innovation ... change is of itself an evil....
>
> (Crowley, 1991, 49)

On the other hand, it must be pointed out that Johnson's orthography is considerably different in his private letters. This confirms the existence of a double orthographic standard in the 18th century (cp. Osselton, 1984, 123). The other dictionaries of the time (such as Bailey's *A Universal Etymological English Dictionary*, 1721) had the important mission of bringing and keeping together the conventions of formal and informal spelling" (cp. Osselton, 1963, 275).

Going back to the Renaissance, two other planning activities were started at this time: the writing of *grammars* and *dictionaries*. This was a fundamental task, necessary for achieving the status of formal language that English had lost in the Middle

Ages. Besides, if certain grammatical rules were fixed for the English language, this would become normativized and would look more like Latin (its "model"). It was Latin which conditioned the appearance of the first grammars. The educational reformers thought that Latin should be taught in English as it took too long to learn it otherwise. Thus, the first grammars in English are published in the 16th century (Lily's grammar, for instance). Later, English becomes an object of study in itself, ceasing to be a mere instrument for teaching Latin (see for example, J. Brisley's 1612 treatise, *Ludus Literarius*). 17th century grammars concentrate on orthography but they are important because of the big number of them which are published: Gil, *Logonomia Anglica* (1619); Butler, *The English Grammar* (1633); Ben Jonson, *The English Grammar* (1640); John Wallis, *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* (1652), etc. Nevertheless, Latin continued to be the model until 1653, when J. Wallis, influenced by Puritanism and contemporary science started using an inductive method that lead him to search for data in his own language. He condemned his predecessors' way of dealing with grammar "...for all bring our English language much to the Latin norm...and so introduce many useless principles concerning the case, genders, and many other things..." (op. cit., 290).

In spite of Wallis's efforts, 18th century scholars turn back to Latin as a model of correctness. The 18th century intellectual believes in the individual's power to legislate the language by means of academies. The interest in the standardization, fixation and refinement of the vernacular (i.e "ascertainment") is present in all the treatises of that time (cp. Baugh, 1978, p. 253). 18th century grammars[3] are fundamentally *prescriptive* and based on three principles: reason, etymology and imitation of the Classical languages. As for the results obtained, it can be said that defective as many of those rules were, some of them were finally established in our language.

Nevertheless, use starts to be recognized as the only criterion at the end of the 18th century. Campbell (*Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 1776) argues that language "...is purely a species of fashion ... It is not the business of grammar, as some critics seem preposterously to imagine, to give law to the fashions which regulate our speech..." (op. cit., 283).

On the other hand, the publication of Johnson's *Dictionary* in 1755 was considered a great achievement of the time. His work had been preceded by the publication of other kind of dictionaries in the two preceding centuries: "hard word" dictionaries and etymological dictionaries. The 18th century witnesses the elaboration of the first dictionaries following the principle of "general inclusion" (cp. Hayashi, 1979, 79): *A New English Dictionary* (1702), by Kersey; *Dictionarium Britanicum* (1730), by Bailey; *A New general English Dictionary* (1735), by Dyche-Pardon, etc. Johnson's dictionary was the most influential. Baugh (1978) thinks that in spite of having some defects, such as wrong etymologies, and being "marred ... by prejudice and caprice", it had many virtues: "It exhibited the English vocabulary much more fully than had ever been done before. It offered a spelling ...that could be accepted as standard. It supplied thousands of quotations illustrating the use of words" (op. cit., 270).

To conclude this review, we shall refer to the 18th century attempts to reform the English vocabulary. It was an activity of a prescriptive character, following the general tendency of the century: those words which were considered too old, too new or slang were forbidden by the "linguistic authorities", even though they were not always successful. Thus, Swift states: "I have done my best ... for some Years past to stop the Progress of *Mobb* and *Banter*, but have been plainly borne down by Num-

bers, and betrayed by those who promised to assist me" (op. cit., 285). Furthermore, the controversy over borrowing is renewed in this century, this time concerning the recently borrowed French terms which are considered a threat to language purity by authors such as Defoe, Dryden, Addison, Campbell, Swift, etc[4].

3. THE EARLY MODERN ENGLISH REFORM PROCESS IN THE LIGHT OF LANGUAGE PLANNING.

This section will deal with the goals and phases of the English language planning process. Haugen's (1983), Nahir's (1984) and Haarman's (1990) models will be used for that purpose.

3.1. GOALS

Nahir (1984) states that the establishment of goals must necessarily precede the establishment of phases of the process. That is the reason why we have decided to include the goals in the first place. Nahir establishes a set of goals which have been aimed at by the agencies since LP started and which could be adopted in the future. These goals are: *language purification* (internal or external); *language revival; language reform* (or "deliberate change in specific aspects of language, intended to facilitate its use. Usually, it involves changes in, or simplification of orthography, spelling, lexicon, or grammar"); *language standardization; language spread; lexical modernization;terminological unification; stylistic simplification; interlingual communication; and auxiliary-code standardization* (op. cit., 299 & ff.). It must be also pointed out that Nahir's (1984) goals are not mutually exclusive. Therefore one stage of the process can be found to pursue more than one goal simultaneously (op. cit). What follows is an outline of the LP goals pursued in England from the 15th to the 18th century (Nahir's 1984 order has been kept)[5]:

1. Linguistic Purification

a) External: In the Renaissance, there was a great interest in protecting the language from external influence, which was reflected in a clear opposition to linguistic borrowing (specially, to superfluous borrowing) on the part of many intellectuals. Nevertheless, it must be said that, in the Renaissance, this attitude cannot be considered as part of a planning goal; on the contrary, it was a natural consequence of a process of lexical enrichment of the vernacular (a goal in itself) which was indispensable for achieving other kinds of objectives. The term "Linguistic Purification" is best applied to the purist attitude which consisted in rejecting French neologisms that characterized the 18th century.

b) Internal: but the English purists of the 18th century concentrated on internal purification, protecting the vernacular from deviations of the norm. The author who best illustrated this attitude is J. Swift (see above).

2. Linguistic Reform

This is the main goal of the planning activities performed during these four centuries. On the one hand, it affected lexicon: in the Renaissance, many intellectuals

considered borrowing an indispensable activity for adjusting the vernacular to the needs of the time. On the one hand, English had to be apt for the diffusion of knowledge; on the other hand, it had to be adequate for literary expression. Nevertheless, this lexical reform did not only use borrowing as a means of enriching the language. It also resorted to morphological means, such as derivation and composition, and other kinds of lexical means, such as revival. On a different level, orthography was one of the main targets of linguistic reform in England. All the attempts to reform spelling shared a common aim: facilitating the use of the written code, as well as its teaching and learning.

3. Linguistic Standardization

This goal has been often associated to the preceding ones, since the acceptance of a language or dialect as "the standard" usually implies the previous achievement of other goals. Leith (1983) describes the stages of the standardization process in England: first, there was a stage of *selection* of the standard (London English) and this was followed by its *acceptance* by the educated class; afterwards it came a stage of *elaboration* of the functions the standard had to develop in order to occupy the place previously reserved to French and Latin. Finally, the language needed a stage of *codification*, necessary for fixing that standard in dictionaries and grammars (cp. Leith, 1983, ch. 2).

4. Lexical modernization.

As far as the English language is concerned, this goal is connected with lexical (i.e. borrowing, revival) or morphological means (i.e. derivation, composition...) which have been already described.

3.2 PHASES AND ACTIVITIES

This section will try to adapt Haugen's (1983) and Haarman's (1990) models to the study of eModE. In the case of Haugen's model, our task becomes especially difficult as it enhances an approach to the English LP process treating it as a unit. This has the inconvenience of disregarding the differences existing, for instance, between the Renaissance orthographic reform and the elaboration of grammars and dictionaries in the 18th century, since they are seen as parts of the same process. Therefore, Haugen's model does not consider the fact that the different reform activities pursue different goals (even though sometimes several objectives complement one another). On the other hand this model has the advantage of viewing all the activities as parts of a unique process made up of several stages (bearing in mind that they must not be thought of as successive in time, but as cyclical or even simultaneous) (cp. Haugen, 1983, 270). Haugen's ideas had been basically explained in his 1966 model, but the 1983 revision explicitly includes the concepts of *corpus planning* (concerning language itself) and *status planning* (external to language, concerning society) which had been first introduced by Kloss (1969, 81 and ff.). The original "fourfold-model" is basically kept as well as the distinction *form vs. function*. The following table shows the application of Haugen's (1984) model to the English example:

	FORM (Policy planning)	FUNCTION (Language cultivation)
SOCIETY (Status planning)	1. *Selection*: need for substituting English for French; need for turning English into a scientific and literary language; also, selection of the London dialect as standard.	3. *Implementation:* performed by means of books and manuals, and also by means of education[6]; Mulcaster's efforts are implemented by the government and Golding and Lever in the 16th century, and Swift in the 18th century see the convenience of political or academic support for their plans.
LANGUAGE (Corpus planning)	2. *Codification* : orthographic reform; lexical reform of the 18th c. (Swift, Johnson, etc); fixing of grammatical rules; (18th c.: Johnson, Priestley, etc)	4. *Elaboration:* lexical enrichment and the introduction of the rhetorical figures needed for literary expression; refining efforts of the 18th century.

Table 1. Adaptation of Haugen's (1983, 275) model to the English example.

Selection is "a form of LP which in this case establishes that a given linguistic form...shall enjoy or not enjoy a given status in society" (op. cit., 271). It can be carried out by an oficial agency or by individuals. *Codification* is giving written form to the norm. It implies three stages: *graphization*, *lexication*, *grammatication* so it clearly includes the efforts for reforming the spelling system as well as the fixing of grammatical rules. Haugen remarks the idea that codification is a fundamentally prescriptive activity. He says that "the typical product of all codification has been a *prescriptive* orthography, grammar and dictionary" (the underlining is mine; op. cit., 272). *Implementation*, the object of which is expanding the linguistic form which has been selected, has been carried out either by an author, an agency or by the government, by means of books, the mass media, laws (remember the *Statute of Pleading*, 1362) or the educational system (see above). Finally, *elaboration* refers to the continuing of the implementation process "to meet the functions of the modern world" (op. cit.). In the English case, the introduction of neologisms, the orthographic reform... had to be necessarily acomplished in order to turn the vernacular into a "learned language".

The model adopted by Haarman (1990) is quite useful since it implies a combination of phases and goals which gives a more global view of the planning process as a whole. What is more remarkable in this study is the introduction of a new dimension of LP: *prestige planning*. This function is independent from the other two (i.e. *corpus planning* and *status planning*), though, at the same time, the notion of prestige is fundamental in all the relationships in which they take part (op. cit., 105). This new dimension is necessary because "planning activities must have such prestige as to guarantee a favourable engagement on the part of the planners, and, moreover, on the part of those who are supposed to use the planned language" (op. cit., 104).

Those three distinctions are included in his outline of phases and targets in language planning (op. cit., 106). This is the adaptation of his model to the English LP process (principally referred to the eModE period):

---

    1. *Language corpus planning*
  1.1. Planning related to the *writing system*:
1.1.1. Introduction of the Roman alphabet by the Irish monks in the 7th century as a substitute for the Runic alphabet.
1.1.2. Revision of the orthographic system: carried out by Orm in the Middle Ages and then by several scholars from the 16th centruy up to the present day.
  1.2. Planning related to the structures and *techniques of a language*:
1.2.1. Elaboration of the norms of a standard in the phonological, lexical and grammatical levels: fundamentally concerning the codifying activities of the 18th century, but also existing in the 17th century grammars.

    2. *Language status planning:*
  2.1. Planning related to the *sociocultural status*:
2.2.1. Elaboration of elementary functional styles: the efforts to turn English into a scientific language in the Renaissance.
  2.2. Planning related to the *political status*:
2.2.1. Extension of the political functions of a language by means of its institutionalization in the legislation: the edicts promulgated in the 14th and 15th centuries concerning the use of English in Parliament, in the local administration and at the Justice Courts.

    3. *Language prestige planning* (see below under *Conclusions*):
  3.1. Prestige of production
  3.2. Prestige of reception

Table 2. Adaptation of Haarman's (1990, 106-7) model to the English LP process (Haarman, 1990, 106-ff)

Thus, Prestige Planning has two aspects, one associated with *production* and the other one associated with *reception* of LP. The evaluation of the LP process directly implicates the individual so that the sucess of the process depends on the speaker's evaluation measures (which refer to the concept of *prestige values*) (op. cit., 114); but it also depends on its organizational impact, i.e., "an indicator of its efficiency from the point of view of language planners" (op. cit., 121). Therefore, LP develops on a continuum whose extremes are, on the one hand, the organizational impact of LP and, on the other hand, the individual's response to it. These concepts are used for elaborating "an ideal typology of language cultivation and language planning". This notion of cultivation differs from Haugen (1983) who uses the term to refer to a concept which includes two LP stages (*implementation* and *elaboration*). Haarman distinguishes *language planning* and *language cultivation* depending on the agent(s) of the planning activities: the former implies the participation of official agencies or governments; the latter implicates individuals or pressure groups. This distinction has considerable implications for a historical study as the one which is included in this section. Haarman argues that his typology:

    ...may be useful as a sociolinguistic instrument for surveying the historical development of language cultivation and/or planning in a given country. It is

useful because, in many countries, planning activities *have emerged from ear-lier stages of cultivation at a lower level of organization.....*

<div align="right">(op. cit., 123)</div>

Haarman's typology (op. cit., 120) is used in *table 3* for describing, on the one hand, the efficiency of the English planning activities, and, on the other hand the degree of institutionalization of such activities.

Maximum		**L. status**	**L. prestige**	**L. corpus**		
Efficiency in terms of organiza-tional impact	Level 4	?	*officially promoted*	Elizabeth I's support to Mulcaster	*Governmen-tal activities*	R a n g e s o f L P
	level 3	?	*institutionally promoted*	The efforts of the Royal Society in the 17th century	*Activities of agencies*	
	level 2	Puritan efforts in order to make English the language of teaching	*promoted by a pressure group*	The fixation of a written standard by scriveners and printers	*Group activities*	R a n g e s o f L C[7]
	level 1	Desire to adapt the language to literary use	*individually promoted*	Orthographic reform; purism and desires to fix the language in the 18th c.	*Activities of individuals*	
Minimum		**L. status**	**L. prestige**	**L. corpus**		

Table 3. Adaptation of Haarman's typology (1990, 120) to the English process.

It must be pointed out that, in Haarman's model, the higher the degree of author-ity, the greater the organizational impact of that planning process. Nevertheless, the English example shows that this is not always true, in view of the low degree of institutionalization that was achieved by the planners, probably due to what Johnson called the "spirit of English liberty" (see above). For the same reasons, table 3 shows that during the eModE period cultivation always preceded real language planning, since the first reform designs were undertaken by individuals. In fact, language culti-vation was a more frequent phenomenon than language planning.

Therefore, the models offered by LP have proved effective in the analysis of the planning activities in eModE: they provide a new framework which allows us to describe and classify the goals and stages of a process which started in the Renaissance and still continues today.

4. CONCLUSION

Once the models offered by *Language Planning* have been applied to the activities carried out in eModE, we should now comment on some of the problems which have arisen in the course of our analysis.

An important question is whether these past activities are comparable with present LP activities or not. It can be stated that few past reformers were concerned with giving a more "social" view of languages and the people who speak them. Their main objective was prescribing, even though this was not necessarily an arbitrary imposition but only an attempt to obtain their fellow countrymen's advantage. Mulcaster was a remarkable exception to this tendency in the 16th century. He realized that it was impossible to avoid linguistic change artificially, disregarding other factors such as use and tradition. This view, which at first sight might seem "conservative", was, nevertheless, quite advanced since Mulcaster gave due consideration to the receptors of language planning: he knew that they would find it nearly impossible to learn a new writing system based on phonetic principles and filled with so many strange elements. Furthermore, A. Golding and R. Lever perceived the importance of implementing LP by means of the intervention of political and academic authorities.

A second question we must answer is the extent to which scholars have been able to see the pertinence of doing some *Prestige Planning*. Mulcaster realized that it was indispensable for LP to be successful. Other authors, such as Hart, were aware that men usually hate the idea of learning a new alphabet, that they tend to resist change. Nevertheless, Hart creates an orthographic system too extravagant to be learnt by the English. Swift went too far in his attempt to fix the language. He did not take into account the fact that this task was already regarded as impossible by his contemporaries (we must remember Johnson's change of attitude towards the subject; vide supra). However, some authors *did* provide the means for solving the problems of acceptance by the community that were likely to arise as a consequence of the introduction of changes. For instance, Sir Thomas Elyot, who favoured the introduction of neologisms in his works, set forth the idea of including an explanation of the new term when it appeared by the first time (see above).

Other problems have to do with Haarman's (1990) statement that in many countries a stage of *cultivation* has preceded the stage of real *planning*. This may be true of the English language: most of the English "reforming" activities were carried out by individuals or promoted by pressure groups (the printers, the Puritans ...) and only occasionally supported by the government (as in the case of Mulcaster). An indicator of the lack of institutionalization of the English process is the fact that in spite of the numerous efforts, the attempt to create an academy did not succeed. If Haarman's thesis (according to which a higher degree of institutionalization is often associated with a higher degree of effectivity) were to be accepted, it would then have to be concluded that these reforming activities hardly succeeded. Nevertheless, this is not

true, at least as far as lexicon and grammar are concerned. Furthermore, spelling is already fixed today although many voices are raised in favour of a substantial reform. The analysis of the success or failure of the planning activities of the past may perhaps serve as a firm base for future planning designs. The models offered by LP have proved effective in the analysis of some eModE reform activities. At least, they provide a new theoretical framework which allows us to describe the aims and phases of a process which started in the Renaissance and may still continue in the future.

Notes

1. Tyndale's translation of the Bible provoked a storm of criticism on the part of the Catholics, who did not consider English a worthy means for the explanation of religious truths. The religious reformers, on the contrary, exhibited a big contempt towards Rhetorics and Poetry and contemplated with acquiescence the English simplicity.
2. Simon Daines (*Orthoepia Anglicana*, 1640) and Richard Hodges (*The English Primrose*, 1644) did not devise their own systems; they just wrote manuals which described the spelling system and gave rules of usage. About the same time, Wilkins wrote *An Essay Towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language* (1668). He also criticizes the deficiencies of English orthography. However, his importance lies in the fact that he dealt with another aspect of language planning. He sought "a notation system which would comprehend the whole of human knowledge (...) each symbol unambiguously indicating the properties of the object symbolised, and possessing its own standard pronunciation." (Salmon, 1978, 129)
3. Among them, we can cite *Practical Grammar of the English Tongue* (1734), by W. Loughton; *The Rudiments of the English Grammar* (1761), by J. Priestley; *The British Grammar* (1762), by Buchanan, etc.
4. Baugh (1978), however, holds that the amount of French words borrowed at this stage is not alarming, and even less worrying is the number of words which has survived up to the present day (op. cit.). On the other hand, it must be born in mind that this problem is not exclusive of English, since it affects other European languages.
5. Numbers correspond to the order in which the goals appear in that study.
6. It must be remembered, for instance, that most spelling reformers were teachers so they exerted a big influence on their pupils. Thus, Mulcaster was Ben Jonson's teacher and Milton received instruction from Alexander Gill.
7. *LC* stands for "Language Cultivation".

References

Baugh, A.C. and T. Cable. *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge, 1978.

Blake, N.F. *Caxton's Own Prose*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1973.

— and Ch. Jones. Eds. *English Historical Linguistics: Studies in Development*. Sheffield: U of Sheffield, 1983.

Bourcier, G. *An Introduction to the History of the English Language*. Cheltenham: C. Clark, 1981.

Cobarrubias, J. and J. Fishman. Eds. *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. The Hague: Mouton, 1983.

Coulmas, F. Ed. *Language Adaptation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Crowley, T. *Proper English?* London: Routledge, 1981.

Daoust, D. & J. Maurais. "L'aménagement Linguistique." J. Maurais, ed. 1987. 5-46.

Ferguson, Ch. A. "Language Development." F. Fishman, C. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta. Eds. 1968. 27-35.

Fernández Pérez, M. "Teoría y aplicación. El estatuto de la planificación lingüística". *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica* XI. (forthcoming)

Fishman, F., C. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta. Eds. *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley, 1968.

— Ed. *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning: The "First" Congress Phenomenon*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1993.

Fodor, I. & C. Hagège. Eds. *Language Reform: History and Future*. Hamburg: Buske, 1983.

— "Language Reforms of the Past and in the Developing Countries." Eds. I. Fodor & Hagège. 1983. 442-445.

Foster Jones, R. *The Triumph of the English Language*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1966.

Haarman, H. 1990. "Language Planning in the Light of a General Theory of Language: A Methodological Framework." *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 86 (1990): 103-126.

Haugen, E. *Language Planning and Language Conflict: The Case of Modern Norweigian*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1966.

— "The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice." Eds. J. Cobarrubias and J.A. Fishman. 1983. 269-290.

Hayashi, T. *The Theory of English Lexicography 1530-1791*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1979.

Iglesias Rábade, L. "A Controversia entre etimoloxistas e fonetistas na historia da ortografía da lingua inglesa". *Cadernos de Lingua* 11. (forthcoming)

Kloss, H. *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism, 1969.

Leith, D. *A Social History of English*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.

Milroy, J. & L. Milroy. *Authority in Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.

Nahir, M. 1984. "Language Planning Goals: A Classification." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 8/3 (1984): 297-327.

Osselton, N.E. "Formal and Informal Spelling in the Eighteenth Century." *English Studies* 44 (1963): 267-75.

— "Formal and Informal Systems in Early Modern English: 1500-1800." Eds. N.F. Blake and Ch. Jones. 1984. 123-137.

Salmon, V. *The Study of Language in the 17th-Century England*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1978.

Scragg, D. G. *A History of English Spelling*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1974.

Vallins, G.H. *Spelling*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1965.

Zachrrison, R. E. "Four Hundred Years of English Spelling Reform." *Studia Neophilologica* 4 (1931): 1-69.