DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 741 FL 024 681

AUTHOR Coronel-Molina, Serafin
TITLE Language Policy: Status Planning for the Quechua Language in Peru.
PUB DATE 97
NOTE 20p.; For serial issue as a whole, see FL 024 674.
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v13 n1 p31-48 Spr 1997.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Diglossia; Foreign Countries; Indigenous Populations; *Language Maintenance; *Language Patterns; *Language Planning; Language Research; *Language Role; Public Policy; *Quechua; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Peru

ABSTRACT

The status of Quechua in Peruvian society is discussed, noting specific social and political factors contributing to the dying out of the Quechua language, functional domains the language serves, and possible measures to improve its status. The relationship of those functional domains to Peruvian language policies is also explored. An introductory section provides background information on the principles and purposes of language planning, describes Peru's population and the history of its language use and distribution, and reviews recent literature on diglossia and language status planning. The functional domains of Quechua are then outlined in the context of current theory, and ways in which the domains affect Quechua's status in a Spanish-dominated society are considered, particularly in the formation of language policy. It is concluded that despite predictions that Quechua is headed for extinction, there is potential for maintenance of the language in some domains, such as provincial or group domains. While Quechua will never again be the dominant language, it will continue to be valued by the highland communities that continue to speak it. Development of a national daily newspaper, magazine, or radio program in Quechua is suggested as a means of heightening awareness and visibility of the language. Contains 28 references. (MSE)

Language Policy : Status Planning for the Quechua Language in Peru

Serafin Coronel-Molina

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

Language Policy: Status Planning for the Quechua Language in Peru

Serafín Coronel-Molina

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

Quechua is an indigenous language of Peru that is slowly dying out, as speakers of Quechua realize that the only way they can better their lives is to turn their backs on their mother tongue and learn to speak the Spanish of the dominant class. In this paper, I present a case study of the status of Quechua in Peruvian society. I discuss some of the specific social and political causes contributing to Quechua language loss, detail the current functional domains that Quechua serves, and suggest some possible measures that could be attempted to improve its status. I also explore the relationship of the functional domains to Peruvian language policies, both overt and covert, and conclude with some projections on the future of the Quechua language.

Language policy is a very wide field that covers a range of practices. Schiffman (1996: 3) defines it simply as "the set of positions, principles and decisions reflecting [a] community's relationships to its verbal repertoire and communicative potential." These positions and principles can be either overt and explicitly stated in a formal document or laws, or covert, not written down or formalized but reflected in popular attitudes nonetheless. Language planning, on the other hand, is a more formal procedure that falls within this broad area known as language policy. Language planning can be defined as a "deliberate intervention in language change; that is, changes in the systems of language code or speaking or both that are planned by organizations that are established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes" (Rubin and Jernudd, 1971, cited in Cooper 1989: 30); additionally, as Tollefson (1981: 175) stresses, it deals with "planned change in the structure and status of language varieties."

Language planning itself can then be further divided; the two areas in which I am most interested are corpus planning and status planning. Essentially, corpus planning deals with the *form* of the language, for example, vocabulary and orthography. Status planning, on the other hand, is concerned with the *function*, or perhaps more accurately, the *functional domains* of a language or variety within a given society (cf., Fishman 1979: 12; Cobarrubias 1983: 42). Cobarrubias (1983: 42) indicates that in general,

changes in corpus have received more attention than changes in status, and argues that this situation needs to be addressed. The present paper will make one small contribution to this effort, specifically related to the case of Quechua in Peru. I will focus my attention on status planning by discussing the possibility of increasing the status for Peruvian Quechua. This will involve consideration of the current domains in which Quechua functions, implications for the survival of Quechua based on the relative status of each of those domains, and possible means of increasing the range of functional domains which Quechua can serve. In the process, I will, of course, take into consideration current Peruvian policy trends.

Literature Review and Background on Peru

The general consensus of most researchers is that the field of status planning deals with the relative status of one language to another, or between varieties of the same language in regard to the social domains in which each is used (Wiley 1996: 108-109; Cooper 1989: 32; Wardhaugh 1992: 347; Altehenger-Smith 1990: 29; Cobarrubias 1983; Fishman, 1979: 12). Altehenger–Smith (1990: 29) emphasizes that the various models of status planning do not focus so much on the actual process of decision–making as on its outcome, while Wardhaugh stresses its functional cast. He maintains that status planning affects not only what functions a languages serves, but also the rights of those who use it: "For example, when speakers of a minority language are suddenly denied the use of that language in educating their children, their language has lost status" (Wardhaugh 1992: 347), and the previous rights of those who speak that language have been restricted. In fact, Wardhaugh's words can be applied particularly well to the status of Quechua in Peru over the course of its history, as will become obvious in this paper.

It is important to understand exactly what the current state of affairs is in regards to language policy and planning in Peru. This country is multilingual, with Spanish as the dominant language as a result of the Spanish Conquest in the 16th century. According to a 1984 census, about 72.64% of the population speaks this language. Quechua is the second most widely spoken language, with 24.08% of the speakers in the country, followed by Aymara and a host of other languages spoken by various heterogeneous and widely–scattered groups in the Peruvian jungles, distributed among 3.29% of the speakers (Cerrón–Palomino 1989: 14).

Quechua was not the only language spoken Peru before the Conquest. Which language was widely spoken depended greatly on who was in power and the part of the country in which one found oneself. Cultural contact, of course, meant linguistic contact, which often also meant linguistic domination of one group over another:

> Over time, the expansion of one language at the expense of others varied in accordance with the expansions

> and recessions of the peoples. Consequently, the present linguistic map is a result of a series of displacements and superpositions of these languages... their interaction—actually that of the speakers—undoubtedly established the multilingual nature of the country. (Cerrón-Palomino 1989: 11)

It seems clear that when Cerrón-Palomino talks about the expansion and recession of languages, he is referring to the respective status of the languages as well as their distribution throughout the territory. In the time of the Incas, Quechua was widely spoken, and was, in fact, the main lingua franca. With the arrival of the Spaniards and their subsequent subjugation of the indigenous peoples, this situation rapidly started changing. The Spaniards insisted that their new subjects learn Spanish and give up their own language. It was not quite as easy, painless, or rapid as the Spaniards might have wished, and for a long time, Quechua was still a primary language of communication.

However, over the last 500 years or so, the Spaniards slowly managed to instill their own negative opinion of the Quechua language in the native speakers, thus achieving the lowering of that language's status to the point where many speakers are ashamed to use it (Cerrón–Palomino 1989: 27). Cerrón–Palomino discusses the issue of power dynamics in relation to the development of statuses. He indicates that we have to remember that it is the people who have power, and not the language itself. Also, it is important to understand *who* has the linguistic power in a given situation and how they manifest it in explicit and implicit policy. This detail has the greatest influence on determining which language has the higher status. Cerrón–Palomino gives Peru as a case in point of the effect on language status of the group in power:

> This is clearly shown by the Peruvian situation, since, due to the structure of the present society, ... the functional jurisdiction of the languages is unequally distributed and gives the edge to Spanish, to the disadvantage of ancestral languages and the cultures that the latter support; Peru is thus a typical diglossic society. (1989: 11)

Cerrón–Palomino is not the only one to emphasize the diglossic nature of Peruvian linguistic reality. Fishman (1967: 32) does not refer specifically to Peru when he discusses the restrictive effect of limited role repertoires on linguistic repertoires, but his words nonetheless have clear implications for the Peruvian situation. He maintains that the smaller the range of the role repertoires (functional domains) of a given linguistic repertoire (lan-

guage or variety), the less used that linguistic repertoire will be, "with the result that separate languages or varieties would be(come) superfluous." López Quiroz (1990), on the other hand, does refer specifically to Peru in his work. He emphasizes the hegemonic efforts of the Spaniards throughout the conquest, colonization and up to the present day. He stresses the difference between diglossia and bilingualism:

> Regarding the analysis of the category of diglossia, we may deduce that it is only possible to conceive of a society as bilingual when the functional distribution between the languages spoken in that society is relatively equitable and neither one nor the other suffers reduction or deterioration, but rather individuals tend to use both languages freely and creatively. (1990: 107; translation mine)

In other words, the situation is bilingual if the two languages have equal status; if one is in a superior position, the situation is diglossic. It is the insidious psychological influence of the ancient Spanish *conquistadores'* and present day *criollos'*[1] opinions of their superiority over the indigenous populations which has led to the disdain of the *criollos* and the shame of the Quechua people themselves with regard to the Quechua language.

López Quiroz (1990: 105) illustrates a very dramatic extreme of such linguistic shame, which he refers to as linguistic asphyxia. He asserts that some people would rather hide their status as native Quechua speakers, and let others think they are "mentally limited" (i.e., retarded) because they do not speak Spanish very well. This is due, he maintains, to "the strong social pressure that exists against indigenous languages used as a vernacular" (1990: 105; translation mine). Cerrón–Palomino (1989: 26) states quite emphatically that the death of many of the ancestral Peruvian languages was due to deliberate efforts by the hegemonic society: "The policies which brought about the linguicide paralleled the ethnocidal and genocidal policies of the governing groups. Many languages died out not only because the speakers turned to other languages, mainly Spanish, but also ... because of the considerable reduction, or sometimes total annihilation, of the respective populations."

Schiffman (1996: 4) emphasizes the effect that diglossia exercises on both

[1] It is important to understand that the term criollo refers specifically to that part of the population of more or less pure Spanish descent, but who were born in Latin America. This population thus has inherited the ancient pride of Spanish heritage. At the same time, they have a new and different world perspective because of having been raised in Latin America, which has completely distinct environmental and social influences from those of Spain. Thus, they still feel the necessity to hold themselves separate from the indigenous peoples, maintaining the social and racial "purity" (although in reality this is a fallacy, since there has been so much mixing through the centuries of all the races which are in Peru) which is what grants them their "superiority."

corpus and status planning. As a social construct which has evolved unconsciously over time, it becomes very entrenched ("persistent") in the mentality of the people, and thus very resistant to any kind of rapid change such as a government might attempt by simply passing a law. In reference to Peru, this becomes clear through knowing that it has taken centuries of contact and psychological pressure for the dominant sector of society to convince the subaltern one of its lower prestige. Therefore, the government will not be able to reverse this and convince all Quechua speakers to start speaking their language again by merely passing a law instituting bilingual education in the schools. There is no matching social reinforcement to prove to either Spanish or Quechua speakers that there is any social value in being able to speak Quechua. It took centuries to devalue the language; it may take centuries more to totally revalorize it.

Ferguson (1996: 29) makes a different point about the relative prestige of the two languages in a diglossic situation which also finds resonance in the Peruvian experience. He says that in general the H (high) variety, which in the case of Peru is Spanish, is considered by *all* speakers to be superior in some way to the L (low) variety, or Quechua and other indigenous languages. "Sometimes the feeling is so strong that H alone is regarded as real and L is reported 'not to exist'.... This attitude cannot be called a deliberate attempt to deceive the questioner, but seems almost a self–deception." While no one in Peru yet denies that Quechua exists, many native Quechua speakers who have learned Spanish will deny that they speak Quechua, despite quite obvious influences on their Spanish speech habits by Quechua — most notably in their lexicon and pronunciation. There are any number of reasons why these speakers might make this kind of denial: linguistic shame, desire for social mobility, simple continuous daily contact with Spanish and the need to be able to communicate, the perception that Spanish is the most appropriate language for education, the urbanization of the Quechua speaking peoples, and so on, ad infinitum. However, all of these ultimately can be reduced once again to the fact that Spanish has prestige and Quechua does not.

It is perhaps relevant to note here an interesting fact about the functioning of status planning. This is an activity which happens somewhat after the fact. In other words, it is compensatory or retroactive. In reading the discussions of all the various researchers, it becomes clear that different languages or varieties achieve their current status through a process mediated by what Schiffman (1996: 5) calls linguistic culture, or "the set of behaviours, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language." The unconscious (covert) nature of all the elements of his list is quite notable. For any actual planning to be able to take place, all of these various points which are already unconsciously present in the constitution of language status need to be brought to conscious awareness and talked about, in order to

plan to try to change them. This is what makes status *planning* a compensatory phenomenon.

Thinking in these terms necessarily involves the need to understand how beliefs and attitudes become established, and what can be done to bring about changes in attitudes. Ferguson (1996: 275) emphasizes that "discovering language attitudes is more difficult than finding the basic data," but that it is a very necessary part of establishing language policy. Such attitudes will obviously have serious implications for any effort to change the status of one language relative to another.

Schiffman (1990a, 1990b), Eastman (1990) and Spolsky (1978) also discuss the impact of language attitudes and power relations on language planning and policies in various regions of the world. Spolsky (1978: 44) specifically addresses the Latin American context thus: "While there are few data on the situation in Latin America, some studies suggest the maintenance of Indian vernaculars only as the languages of socially inferior and uneducated groups." Such a statement by this time is somewhat outdated in terms of the amount of research available, since the study of indigenous languages has become very *de rigeur* in recent years, but the truth still remains that in many cases, those who speak indigenous languages are often regarded as "socially inferior and uneducated."

The Guaraní language in Paraguay is an example that is at the same time both supportive of and contradictory to this generalization. While Spolky's reference to the functional domains of Guaraní may be true in the most general sense devoid of a social context ("The typical speaker of Guaraní is a poor, inconspicuous, cigar–smoking woman; of Spanish, an educated townsman" [1978: 44]), Rubin discusses the situation in much more detail. She indicates that Spolky's words may well be too simplistic. While a politically diglossic situation does exist, in which status *may* be revealed by language choice in situations where either language might be used, Rubin has found that in general, Guaraní is used for more intimate or informal situations and Spanish for more formal or official ones (for example, in government or administrative situations):

> Since Spanish has, throughout Paraguayan history, been used for administrative purposes, it is in such formal situations and in discussing related topics that Spanish ... is, in fact, used. Since Paraguay did not develop a sharply defined class system, usage in non-rural, non-formal situations falls back on the equalitarian [*sic*] criteria of intimacy and the seriousness of a situation.... Status does not seem to be a determining factor in linguistic behavior. (1972: 529)

One detail she does not discuss in her paper is the racial categories in-

volved. Is it equally likely for a person of primarily *criollo* descent to learn Guaraní as a first language in rural areas, as it is for someone of indigenous descent in those same rural areas? Rubin does not seem to consider race to be a factor in first language learned. However, this issue is very pertinent to the Peruvian case, which might otherwise be considered to be somewhat similar to Guaraní. The reason that the Quechua *language* is more commonly found in rural areas is specifically because that is where the Quechua *people* have been concentrated until recent decades. Thus, bilingualism in Peru is very much a class–based issue, with classes being formed principally along racial lines.

Case Study: Functional Domains of Quechua

Various researchers have treated the topic of functional domains in a language (cf. Appel and Muysken 1987; Prujiner 1986; Cobarrubias 1983). In examining the status of the Quechua language in Peru and exploring options for status planning, I feel it is very important to emphasize sociopolitical issues. Stewart's (1972) specification of language functions provides a framework that allows such a focus; therefore, I will follow his guidelines. Cooper (1989: 99-119) refers to Stewart's functions as *targets* of status planning, since such functions or domains of language use are very often affected by the status of the language or variety in the society under discussion. This being the case, the spread of a language into a new function would naturally be an appropriate objective of trying to improve or broaden the status of that language.

Stewart (1978: 540-41) lists ten functions that a language or variety may serve in a society. (1) The *official* function refers to the political or administrative domain, which is often specified constitutionally and is recognized nationwide. (2) The *provincial* function is applicable to the official language(s) of a province or region within the country. (3) The *wider communication* function involves a language variety that operates as a lingua franca across language frontiers within the country, but does not have any "official" capacity as described in (1) and (2) above. (4) The *international* function concerns varieties that may not have "official" status (indeed, the remainder of the categories are specifically excluded by Stewart from official or provincial standing), but may be used for communication across national boundaries. (5) The *capital* function refers to the primary language or variety used in or around the national capital. (6) The *group* function pertains to the main language of communication of a single cultural or ethnic group. (7) The *educational* function relates to the language used for primary and secondary (but specifically not university) education in all school subjects, either regionally or nationally. (8) The *school subject* function differs from the educational in that the language is taught only as a school subject, but is not necessarily used as the means of communication in teaching it; also, this function can exist in the higher education setting.

(9) The *literary* function refers to the language's use for either literary or scholarly pursuits; and (10) the *religious* function pertains to use of the language for the practice of a given religion.

Peruvian Quechua clearly does not serve all of these functions, although it does fulfill some of them. The current social status of Quechua in Peru has already been examined above. The remainder of the paper will discuss specifically which of the functional domains it does fill and how those domains impact its status. The paper will also detail possible ways of spreading its use to other domains and with what possible effect on its status.

Stewart's first function is that of *official* language. In the case of Peru, this is a situation which tends to fluctuate depending on the views of the government in power. In 1975, during Velasco Alvarado's presidency, Quechua was legally declared an official language of Peru, "coequal with Spanish, and ... taught at all levels of education beginning in 1976 and used in all court actions involving Quechua speakers beginning in 1977" (Hornberger 1995: 189). This was such big news that it even made the front page of the leading newspaper in Lima (*El Comercio*, May 26, 1975). Later, however, this law was retracted in the 1979 constitution. In this document, Spanish is designated as the only official language, with Quechua and Aymara having "official use zones" (Hornberger 1995: 189). Hence, from a legal perspective, Quechua has both been and not been an official national language in fairly recent history in Peru.

The category of "official use zones" could equate to another of Stewart's domains, that of *provincial* use, with official language status limited to certain legally specified regions of the country. Currently, the 1979 constitution is still in force, and so Quechua retains its legally recognized provincial status. Cerrón–Palomino (1989: 26) indicates that such a limitation of Quechua to specific regions or ethnic groups could be problematic, especially in large coastal cities which have experienced a huge in-migration of indigenous peoples from the highlands, looking for better opportunities. Such a regional limitation could lead to the suppression of an entire ethnolinguistic group's right to speak their native language, by the simple act of their moving from one place to another. Hence, he suggests that "a solution based on personal criteria would be preferable." In this case, such a solution might be more in line with Stewart's *group* function (number 6 in the list above), which doesn't necessarily distinguish by geographic region. For the moment, however, speaking Quechua remains mostly a regional issue. It is primarily spoken in the rural Andes, where you can still find monolingual Quechua communities. However, even in the highlands, metropolitan cities such as Cuzco are experiencing a shift towards Spanish monolingualism. And while Quechua may occasionally be heard in the large coastal cities such as Lima, those few occasions will only be in homes and small markets in areas fringing the city where the Quechua immigrants tend to congregate and settle. I can assert from personal experience that it is never heard in public places within the cities proper. This is because

most speakers of it are ashamed for monolingual Spanish speakers to know that they speak such a "backward" language, as discussed in the previous section.

Clearly, then, as the above shows, Quechua does not serve the *capital* function. This results in another negative impact on its status, since, as Cooper (1989: 106) emphasizes, when political power, social prestige, and economic activity are centered in the capital, this tends to cause the language spoken there to spread from there to the periphery. Spanish is dominant in the capital, and is slowly spreading outward to marginal territories. As a result, Quechua is disappearing from this domain. Alternatively, then, if there were any way to promote greater use of Quechua by *all* city-dwellers, and not just the rural immigrants, it might be possible to spread Quechua through this route also.

Having emphasized the legal stature of Quechua, it is now logical to point out the difference between legal recognition and actual, social use. Cerrón-Palomino (1989: 25) states that "it is well known that the [original effort] to promote Quechua failed before more than a few steps toward its implementation were taken." He also maintains that such "official" recognition of Quechua was little more than lip service, apparently offered in an attempt to gain the political support of the indigenous population (1989: 26). Hence, even when Quechua was an "official" language, that fact did not enhance its status or its level of usage among the general populace, and so in reality, it was little more than a useless gesture, made without much thought or planning as to means of implementation of the law. Additionally, whether Quechua is defined as having a *provincial* or a *group* function, both definitions still restrict its use and thus limit its potential status.

Wider communication, the third of Stewart's functions, is another interesting historical case in multilingual Peru. During colonial times, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Quechua was essentially a lingua franca between the Spaniards and the Quechua natives (Cooper 1989: 105). Over the centuries and with increasing contact between the original populations and the *criollos*, Spanish has been increasingly enforced socially as the dominant language, as discussed in the previous section. Quechua no longer functions as a lingua franca between speakers of Spanish and those of Quechua, and so one more valuable function of the language has been lost.

Despite this loss of a function previously held, Quechua has made an interesting gain on the *international* front. First of all, Quechua is spoken throughout South America, in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. Certainly, its strongest influence is felt in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia, the countries that formed the base of the Incan empire in pre-Columbian times. These countries still have large populations who have spoken it without interruption for more than 450 years; in the other countries, it is spoken only in very small, isolated communities which have very

little contact with the Spanish–dominated world (Cerrón–Palomino 1987: 53).

Secondly, and this is the more interesting occurrence, Quechua has achieved an international prestige that it certainly lacks at home in Peru. Indigenous languages in general have experienced an incredible upsurge of popularity as a topic of study by linguists, and Quechua is no exception. In conjunction with the increasing interest in studying it, a concurrent availability of Quechua as an academic subject in universities and institutes has developed worldwide, from the United States (13) to Britain (4) to Japan (1).[2] The Rheinische Friedrich–Wilhelms–Universität in Bonn, Germany recently held a conference commemorating sixty years of Quechua language instruction (Rheinische brochure, 1996), and the University of Hamburg also has a program. Additionally, there are numerous Quechua webpages on the internet. It is more likely that Quechua speakers, given the proper technology, could communicate with foreigners from around the globe than with the majority of their own countrymen. This is an intriguing — and in my opinion, shameful — paradox. However, since most native speakers of the language will never have such an opportunity, this interesting paradox does little to help enhance the status of Quechua for the speakers at home in Peru. On the other hand, perhaps if more Peruvians — both Spanish and Quechua speakers — were made aware of just how widely Quechua is becoming spoken around the world, that would be a possible tool to enhance its prestige in their eyes, and make more of them willing to learn it or to continue speaking it.

Of course, there are also some universities in Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador that offer courses in Quechua as a second language, but one would expect to see that, since it is a native language of those countries. It is certainly more impressive to learn of the many international institutions which want to promote the Quechua language. In this case, Quechua is fulfilling the functions of both *international* language and *school subject* (at the secondary and college levels). Incidentally, in his discussion of the function of school language, Cooper (1989: 112) offers the opinion that this category should be broadened to include language instruction at the primary grade levels, as well as secondary and university, since second languages are routinely taught at primary schools in many countries. Despite bilingual education programs in Peru, Quechua is currently not one of these languages taught as a school subject in the primary grades, except in some few bilingual schools in the Andes sponsored by international non–governmental

[2] The American universities are: UCLA, UC-Santa Cruz, Stanford University, University of Texas-Austin, University of New Mexico, University of Pittsburgh, University of Maryland, Cornell University, Indiana University, University of Wisconsin, University of Illinois, and Georgetown University. In Great Britain, they are: University of Manchester, London School of Economics, University of Liverpool, and University of St. Andrew's. In Tokyo, Japan, it is the Academy of the Quechua Language. There are also other universities scattered across France, Holland and other countries which offer Quechua language courses.

organizations. It is certainly not a national phenomenon.

On the subject of the Peruvian bilingual education programs, *education* is another linguistic function which Stewart discusses. As mentioned above, this domain refers to content education in the language under discussion, not to teaching students how to speak that language. Bilingual education is yet another Peruvian issue with a colorful history. It has had sporadic support, once again depending on who is in power. The 1975 reform discussed above called for bilingual education in both Quechua and Spanish, and provided the governmental financial support to implement it. With the rewriting of the 1979 constitution, bilingual education was reduced to programs offered only in the official use zones, and financial support was withdrawn (Pozzi-Escot 1988: 56-59). As a result, such support had to come from private groups and researchers. Fortunately, there are various groups of linguists working on Quechua language maintenance and bilingual education, and through their efforts, regional programs have been established (cf., Hornberger 1995). According to López Quiroz, there are currently 18 different bilingual education projects ongoing in Peru, either through the efforts of non-governmental organizations, or through private organizations (Hornberger, personal communication, April 30, 1996).

The most notable of these bilingual education programs are the Experimental Quechua-Spanish Bilingual Education Program of Ayacucho, and the Experimental Bilingual Education Project of Puno (Hornberger 1995: 192). Unfortunately, in 1994, the bilingual education programs which had been organized and maintained once again at the federal level were terminated due to the government's changing priorities (R. Cerrón-Palomino, personal communication, April 27, 1996). Bilingual education was no longer a government priority, and any such programs that were still in effect were not linked in any systematic way either to each other or to the government. It was only recently, in 1996, that the government reinstated a national bilingual education program, which it is still in the process of implementing (H. Rosales Alvarado, personal communication, September 2, 1996).[3] It remains to be seen whether this effort will turn out to have more thoughtful planning efforts devoted to it, and be implemented in such a way that not only Quechua speakers, but Spanish speakers as well will be required to study the language; and if so, whether this will have any effect on public perceptions of its status.

It would seem, then, that for the moment, the government recognizes the importance of offering education in a speaker's native language as well as the dominant language. However, there is often resistance to bilingual education from an unexpected source: the community itself. As Rubin (1972: 521) points out in her discussion of Guaraní in Paraguay, because of incredible pressure on both students and teachers to use Spanish in the

[3] This sudden about-face in policy is one more manifestation of how rapidly situations can change in Latin American politics.

schools, teachers try to insist on Spanish in the classroom, regardless of the rural or urban status of the school. Hornberger (1988: 174-182) emphasizes the community's role in enforcing this preference for Spanish in her study of several Quechua communities. She has found that although these communities still value Quechua for very specific home and community domains, the parents firmly believe that the only way their children will be able to improve their lots is to be able to speak Spanish, and to receive their education in Spanish. They recognize that the dominant society does not value their native language, and thus feel that it is pointless to be educated in a language that they know to be worthless for social advancement. This is a valid point, if only in relation to the present. What needs to happen is for researchers and linguists to find a way to convince them that unless they maintain their Quechua in as many domains as possible, it will never even have the opportunity to grow in strength and status. This quickly degenerates into a circular argument with the native speakers, and therein lies the difficulty of increasing the domains of a language and attempting to plan an improvement in its status.

Hence, even the educational function of Quechua is currently somewhat debatable. Between vacillating government support and the grass-roots opposition in some communities, it is hard to decide whether or not to assert that Quechua serves such a function, and even if it does, whether teaching it to everyone will improve its status. As Schiffman (personal communication, December 8, 1996) points out, the mere fact that a language receives an increase in legal status (e.g., by mandating bilingual education) does not automatically mean that its perceived status at the popular level will also increase.

A function about which there is little argument is the *literary* domain. There simply is not a strong Quechua literary tradition, due in part to the long oral history of the language. There are examples of oral Quechua tales and histories, translated and written in Spanish; but these stories are not printed in Quechua. Additionally, there is some limited production in Quechua in the present time. One example is William Hurtado Mendoza, a well-known Quechua poet, who has published several bilingual Quechua-Spanish collections of his poetry. Rufino Chuquimamani is another native Quechua speaker, who earned his master's degree in Andean linguistics and education and wrote his master's thesis entirely in Quechua. He has also compiled two volumes each of short stories and folk wisdom gathered from oral storytellers and local elders, all produced bilingually in Quechua and Spanish. The Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (Institute of Peruvian Studies) and the Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de las Casas" (The "Bartolomé de las Casas" Center for Regional Andean Studies) are two well-known and highly respected publishing houses who promote publications in Quechua — although, of course, the vast majority of what they publish is actually in Spanish. However, such examples as these have clearly limited and specialized audiences, and

would probably not achieve wide dissemination. Perhaps the work produced in Quechua which is most likely to reach a wide audience is the Bible, which has been translated by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) into various Quechua dialects. The main objective of the SIL is to attempt to convert the native populations to the Christian faith.

Another group contributing to the literary function of Quechua is the Peruvian Academy of the Quechua Language. This is an organization founded specifically to establish and disseminate Quechua not just as a vernacular, but also as a literary and intellectual language. The founder, Faustino Espinoza Navarro, has contributed greatly to Quechua's use as a literary language, both by producing literature in Quechua, and by establishing the National Cuzco Prize for a Quechua Novel, Poem, Story and Drama (Hornberger 1995: 193).

These are all impressive achievements in themselves, but they are still only individual achievements. There is no coherent, recognizable, widely disseminated body of written literature in Quechua. This is due in part to the fact that Quechua has always been an oral language, and it has only been since the Conquest that any attempt has been made to reproduce it in writing. It is also significant that the population who is the target audience of such publications still has an alarmingly low literacy rate, in either Quechua or Spanish. Hornberger (1988: 231), for instance, cites statistics for the department of Puno: as of the 1981 census, 32% of the population over 15 years old was illiterate. Therefore, any written literature in their own language is inaccessible to a great majority of Quechua speakers. Native Spanish speakers can easily read the Spanish translation that accompanies many of the works, so again the Quechua is superfluous. Until such a major obstacle as this access to the printed word can be addressed, seeking to spread Quechua to a literary function in an effort to increase its status is not a very practical move.

Perhaps a more practical effort would be to restore to Quechua a function that it served previously and subsequently lost: the *religious* domain. As happened with the function of wider communication, it was necessary for the Spaniards to use Quechua for religious purposes during colonial times, simply because the indigenous people did not understand Spanish. Using Quechua was the only way the missionaries could hope to convert the Indians to Christianity (Cerrón–Palomino 1989: 20). However, as time passed and contact with Spanish increased, Quechua lost the majority of its applicability in this domain. Cerrón–Palomino (1989: 21) indicates that this was not necessarily a subtle process; many Spaniards felt that the policy of evangelizing in the indigenous languages was not in the crown's ultimate best interest, an opinion which helped to accelerate the shift to Spanish.

However, it is somewhat simplistic to say that Quechua today plays no role whatsoever in religion. The Andean Catholicism is often touted as a syncretism of Spanish Catholicism and Andean beliefs. As such, the

Quechua people's religious practices are a mixture of native and Christian beliefs. For example, on All Saints' Day, when the families go to the church for Mass, and then afterwards spread a feast in the church graveyard, to feed the deceased family members whom it is believed will return in spirit to spend that day with their families.[4] Also, as mentioned previously, the Summer Institute of Linguistics has published the Bible in various dialects of Quechua. This is a modern effort, not a colonial one, and those Bibles can currently be found in the communities, presumably still in use by those who can read. Finally, there are a few Catholic prayers in Quechua that are still uttered by some individuals.

Also important is the fact that some Quechua communities in the Andean highlands still follow many ancient rituals, even while professing the Catholic faith. These rituals are considered to be somehow separate from Catholicism, perhaps in some sense not "religion," and thus the Quechuas do not feel they are being contradictory in following both belief systems. These ancient rituals, often performed by *los curanderos*, or folk healers, are always conducted in Quechua (cf., Bastien 1978; Gow 1976).

In short, Quechua fulfills a religious function, but only in very limited territories. This being the case, it cannot really act to increase the status of the language, especially in light of the fact that such local religions by definition have lower status than the national Roman Catholic faith. So again there exists a situation in which the language fulfills the function under discussion to some degree, but not perhaps in a widespread enough area to consider that it does so for the Peruvian society as a whole. This seems to be the most common thread running through nearly all of these functions: almost but not quite good enough.

Conclusions

Cerrón–Palomino (1989: 28) states unequivocally that Quechua is headed for extinction, because of its marginal position in the culture: "As the dominating culture extends its influence further into the zones where these languages have taken refuge, their role will disappear and Spanish will be placed on the throne forever." Additionally, Cooper makes a very important point regarding one factor in the success or failure of status planning efforts:

> Status planning... is usually invoked when changes in the functional allocation of a community's language is seen as desirable. But elites and counterelites may be slow to alter the *status quo* precisely because they may share, with the community at large, the evaluations which they ultimately seek to change. ... Planners must change their own

[4] This has been an annual tradition for the author and his family in Peru for many years. His family continues this practice to the present day

> evaluations before they can change the public's. (1989: 120-121)

Cerrón–Palomino's (1989) assertion of the ultimate demise of Quechua is a very strong stand to take, but he has some compelling reasons for stating it. As I have illustrated throughout the paper, Quechua has gradually lost many of the prestigious domains it once had, and this has had a very negative impact on its status. It is no longer an official language, nor even a lingua franca, and far less is it recognized in the capital domain. It is only sporadically that it serves an educational function, although it does continue to be a school subject.

However, there are also reasons for hope, at least for the maintenance of Quechua within specific domains such as provincial or group, and the exotic type of international fame which it has gained. Hornberger (1988: 233-234) points out that while Quechua will never be the dominant language it once was, it is nevertheless still very much valued by the highland communities which continue to speak it. They value it for specific community domains, and feel that they are jealously protecting it from further intrusion by Spanish by not using it in other domains such as the educational one. Hornberger (1988: 234) also proposes that it may be only a matter of time before the Quechua communities come around to accepting bilingual Quechua–Spanish education in the schools.

As discussed previously, Quechua does already have status in some areas, such as the group and provincial domains. However, since these are areas that are easily hidden from the mainstream of society, they don't necessarily help to boost the overall status of the language in the eyes of the general population. One thing that would help greatly is for Quechua to become much more visible in society, for instance, with the publication of a national daily Quechua newspaper, or a weekly or monthly magazine. Such publications would probably not have a wide readership, given the literacy problems discussed above, and the fact that most native Spanish-speakers are monolinguals. However, the longer such a publication were visible, the more likely it would be for people to slowly begin to accept it as normal and permanent. Having become accustomed to seeing it regularly, they might begin to take more of an interest in knowing the language.

Obviously, such a plan has drawbacks. The greatest one is financial: to publish this way, without an appreciable readership, takes a large investment of capital and human resources that few companies would be either willing or able to afford. Also, the low literacy rates in Quechua would seriously limit any potential readership. Finally, it would have to be on the market for quite an extended period before a slow conversion could begin to take place. Perhaps a more practical way to start would be to produce one section of an already existing newspaper or magazine in Quechua consistently.

Another answer might be to start with a medium other than print. There are already a few radio stations that broadcast some programming in

Quechua, although it tends to be limited to very early morning or very late at night. Additionally, these are primarily religious programs, which again might narrow their appeal. A Quechua speaker who wants to hear music or news will not listen for very long to a program that offers neither of those things. But it would at least be a beginning from which to grow. Limited television programming in Quechua might also be an option, although considering the cost involved, one would have to find a very philanthropic television station to produce it.

All of these points can ultimately be condensed to reflect a single goal: the ability of both Quechua and Spanish speakers to expand the Quechua language into new domains to increase its status. Both groups need to develop a recognition and an appreciation for this language and the culture which has enriched Peruvian society, very likely without the conscious awareness of either group. Clearly such a goal is much more difficult to achieve than it is merely to state. There needs to be a combined and continuous effort of top-down support from the government, and bottom-up (grass roots) support from both the Spanish-speaking and Quechua-speaking communities. All three of these groups will be very hard to convince. But Hornberger, for one, continues to find reasons to believe it can be done, and keeps pushing to get it done (cf., 1988: 236-37).

This paper has illustrated the decrease in status that Quechua has suffered over the last four and a half centuries, and offered some possible suggestions for ways to attempt to increase the status. However, it is obvious that all of the proposals put forth in this paper involve resources of both time and money, by groups who either do not have them to spare, or do not want to spare them. This lack of access to resources severely restricts the possibility of implementing such plans.

Ultimately, there is a great deal of work to be done, and a relatively small number of people willing to believe in the need to preserve Quechua in Peru. If the language is maintained, it may only be in isolated pockets that do not have daily contact with Spanish. Alternatively, there would have to be a radical change in Peruvian social structure for true revitalization of Quechua to occur on a wide scale. In any case, if such maintenance of Quechua is to be achieved at all, serious attempts to increase its status must be made. Without raising awareness and appreciation of the language by both speakers and non-speakers, there is little chance that the language will survive in the long run.

I would like to gratefully acknowledge Dr. Harold Schiffman for his thoughtful comments and suggestions on the first draft of this paper. I would also like to thank Dr. Nancy Hornberger and Steve Hornberger for their continued support and suggestions, and Linda Grabner for her feedback and the time she devoted to editing it.

References

Altehenger-Smith, S. (1990). *Language change via language planning: Some theoretical and empirical aspects with a focus on Singapore.* Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism.* London: Edward Arnold.

Bastien, J. W. (1978). *Mountain of the condor: Metaphor and ritual in an Andean ayllu.* St. Paul, MN: West.

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1987). *Lingüística quechua.*Cuzco, Peru: Centro de Estudios Rurales Andinos "Bartolomé de las Casas."

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1989). Language policy in Peru: A historical overview. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 77,* 11-33.

Cobarrubias, J. (1983). Ethical issues in status planning. In J. Fishman and J. Cobarrubias (Eds.) *Progress in language planning: International perspectives.* Berlin: Mouton.

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Eastman, C. M. (1990). The politics and sociolinguistics of language planning in Africa. *Language and Society Papers,* No. LD6. Seattle: University of Washington Interdisciplinary Research Committee on Language and Society.

Ferguson, C. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistic perspectives: Papers on language in society, 1959–1994.* T. Huebner (Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues, 23,* 2: 29-38.

Fishman, J. (1979). Bilingual education, language planning and English. *English World-Wide, 1,* 1: 11-22.

El gobierno revolucionario oficializó la lengua Quechua [The revolutionary government officialized the Quechua language]. (1975, May 28). *El Comercio,* pp. 1, 4-5.

Gow, D. D. (1976). *The gods and social change in the high Andes.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin. Unpublished doctoral thesis.

Hornberger, N. H. (1988). *Bilingual education and language maintenance.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris Publications.

Hornberger, N. H. (1995). Five vowels or three? Linguistics and politics in Quechua language planning in Peru. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

López Quiroz, L. E. (1990). El bilingüismo de los unos y los otros: Diglosia y conflicto lingüístico en el Perú. In E. Ballón–Aguirre and R. Cerrón–Palomino (Eds.) *Diglosia linguo-literario y educación en el Perú.* Lima, Peru: CONCYTEC (Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología) and GTZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit).

Pozzi–Escot, I. (1988). La educación bilingüe en el Perú: Una mirada retrospectiva prospectiva. In L.E. Lopez (Ed.) *Pesquisas en lingüística andina* (pp. 37-77). Lima–Puno, Peru: CONCYTEC, Universidad Nacional del Altiplano, and GTZ.

Prujiner, A. (1986). The use of law in language planning. In E. Annamalai, B. H. Jernudd, and J. Rubin (Eds.) *Language planning, proceedings of an institute.* Manasagangotri, India: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Rheinische Friedrich–Wilhelms–Universität Bonn (1996). *60 Jahre Quechua an der Universität Bonn* [Brochure]. Bonn, Germany.

Rubin, J. (1972 [1968]). Bilingual usage in Paraguay. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 512-30). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Schiffman, H. F. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy.* New York: Routledge.

Schiffman, H. F. (1990a). The balance of power in multiglossic languages: Implications for language shift. *Language and Society Papers*, No. LD4. Seattle: University of Washington Interdisciplinary Research Committee on Language and Society.

Schiffman, H. F. (1990b). Typologies of multilingualism and typologies of language policy: Incorporating register and repertoire. *Language and Society Papers*, No. LD5. Seattle: University of Washington Interdisciplinary Research Committee on Language and Society.

Spolsky, B. (1978). *Educational linguistics: An introduction*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Stewart, W. A. (1972 [1968]). A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism. In J. Fishman (Ed.) *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 531-45). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Tollefson, J. W. (1981). Centralized and decentralized language planning. *Language problems and language planning*, 5, 2, 175-188.

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics, 2nd ed.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Wiley, T. G. (1996). Language planning and policy. In S. L. McKay and N. H. Hornberger (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Serafín Coronel-Molina is a Ph.D. student in Educational Linguistics in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. His research interests include language policy and planning, with special emphasis on its applicability to his native language, Quechua. He is also interested in qualitative sociolinguistics and bilingual education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").