Lancaster University
Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language

CLSL

Centre for Language in Social Life
http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/groups/clsl/home.htm

Working Papers Series
http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/pubs/clsl/wpapers.htm

Working Paper No. 102

ORTHOGRAPHY AS PRACTICE AND IDEOLOGY: THE CASE OF MANX

by

Mark Sebba

1998

All rights reserved. This document is placed on the Internet solely in order to make it freely available to the wider research community. Any quotation from it for the purposes of discussion must be properly acknowledged in accordance with academic convention. The reproduction of any substantial portion of this document is forbidden unless written permission is obtained from the author. The use and reproduction of this document and any part of it is protected by the international laws of copyright.

© 1998 Mark Sebba

Editorial address:
Centre for Language in Social Life
Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language
Bowland College,
Lancaster University,
Lancaster LA1 4YT
United Kingdom

Orthography as practice and ideology: the case of Manx

Mark Sebba[1]

1. Introduction

In this paper I want to explore the history and form of the writing system of one language, not from the point of view of phonology or the match between sounds and symbols, but in terms of the social context in which it originated. The language I shall discuss here is Manx, also known as Manx Gaelic (Gaelg Vanninagh), spoken on the Isle of Man, which lies in the Irish Sea approximately equidistant from England, Scotland and Ireland. The population of the island is approximately 70,000, of whom slightly less than half were born on the island. Manx is a Celtic language "very closely related to the now extinct Gaelic dialects of neighbouring Ulster and Galloway" (Thomson and Pilgrim:1) and only very distantly related to English. Manx itself effectively became extinct as a spoken language with the death of its last native speaker in 1974; however, it retains a ceremonial role in Manx life and is the focus of a small but committed revivalist movement.

Manx has a written tradition dating back at least to the early 17th century. In the past, though some scholarly attention has been given to Manx literature, there has been little mention of Manx orthography,[2]except for the fact, widely noted, that Manx orthography is strikingly different from that of Manx's closest relatives, Irish and Scots Gaelic.

In this paper, I shall argue that Manx orthography, like the orthography of all languages, is the product of an intersection of social as well as linguistic factors. In this paper I shall focus on three of these: bilingualism, literacy practices (the cultural practices surrounding reading and writing) and language ideology.

2. Orthography as bilingualism

Standardisation of a vernacular, according to Joseph (1987), invariably involves modelling the new standard language on an already existing standard. Normally the language which provides this model is the language which already fulfils the functions of a "high" language (Ferguson 1959) in the community. Standardisation is thus usually a process which involves a bilingual elite, who are able to transfer the conventions of the old standard to the new one.

Although writing a language and standardising its spelling are by no means one and the same thing, Joseph's point could equally well be made with respect to development of an orthography for a previously unwritten language: with very few exceptions, it is a process involving a bilingual scribal or educated class, who transfer or adapt the conventions of their language of primary literacy to the other language.[3]

This can be seen to have happened more than once in the history of English orthography. The Roman alphabet, originally designed for Latin and providing a reasonably close match between characters and phonemes, was first adapted to representing Anglo-Saxon, a language only distantly related to Latin. Later, Anglo-Norman began to be written in England before continental French orthography was stabilised, by scribes familiar with the West Saxon (English) scribal orthographic tradition (Scragg 1974). Both French and Old English conventions survived in Anglo-Norman, and were reintroduced to Chancery English when English again took over the "high" language functions in England. Modern Standard English thus contains a mixture of conventions of which the most pervasive, arguably, derives from Latin - the use of the Roman alphabet itself.

One might well argue that half a millenium or so of independent scribal or print tradition would be enough to allow a language to call its orthography its own rather than an adaptation of a foreign system. In that case, some of the languages of Europe and Asia could be said to have their "own" systems of orthography, while many others have orthographies which are modelled on those of other languages with longer literate traditions.[4]

If development of an orthography involves transfer of conventions from another, cultural or politically dominant language, orthographic decisions necessarily involve an element of politics. Far from being a neutral process, the introduction of orthography - involving as it does an educated elite and the choice of a model - always seems to be socially, culturally and ideologically charged.[5]

In the case of Manx, the choice of orthography can be seen to be closely bound up with bilingualism on the one hand, and with the practices connected with literacy on the other. In the remainder of this paper, I will examine this in more detail.

3. The Manx Orthography

The written tradition in Manx, as far as can be definitely ascertained, dates back only to the 17th century, though Manx must have been used in writing before that, if only for place names. The orthography of the earliest known book in Manx was largely the invention of John Phillips, who was Bishop of Sodor and Mann 1605 - 1633. According to Thomson (1969:178), Phillips, together with at least one other person, translated the Book of Common Prayer into Manx, probably between 1605 and 1610.

Phillips, who was probably a native of North Wales, would have known the Welsh orthography of the time, though he and his co-writer "adopted for the consonants a system fairly close to that of contemporary English" (Thomson 1969:181), while relying more on Welsh, Latin, Italian or Spanish for the vowel symbols. Phillips's orthography marks the phonemic contrasts of Manx where English orthography provides the means for doing so, but "ignores those distinctions which English has no need to make" (Thomson 1969:181). Phillips's translation of the Book of Common Prayer was not published in his lifetime, and a single manuscript copy survived from which an edition was finally produced in 1894.

Following Phillips, Thomas Wilson (Bishop 1698 - 1755) set about having the Book of Common Prayer and the Bible translated into Manx. "Principles and Duties of Christianity" (Coyrle Sodjeh) appeared in Manx and English in 1707. According to Thomson 1969:184, "in this work the spelling of the Manx text, though not fully

developed into the near uniformity of the second half of the century, is already clearly the same system as that in use later and as clearly marks a break with the Phillipsian type except in that both are non-Gaelic.[6]”

Like the orthographic tradition of Phillips, the modern Manx orthography, based on that of Wilson, shows many conventions which derive from English; for example, the representation of /u:/ as <oo>, /i:/ as <ee>, /ʃ/ as <sh>, /x/ as <gh>, and word final <ck> for /k/. The first three of these digraphs in particular are identifiably “English” as they are not widely found with these values in the orthographies of other languages. As an example of how the Manx conventions correspond to English ones, here is part of a “specimen text” in Manx (in capitals) from Thomson and Pilgrim (p. 10), accompanied by their “approximate pronunciation using the English spelling system as a basis” (with stressed syllables underlined), and a gloss:

AYR AIN T’AYNS NIAU,
Airine tunss n-yow,
father at-us [who] is in heaven

CASHERICK DY ROW DT’ENNYM;
cahsherick the row th’ennem
hallowed be thy name

DY JIG DIY REERIAGHT;
the jig the ree-reeacht
come thy kingdom

DI’AIGNEY DY ROW JEANT ER Y TALLOO
th’ahgnier the row jint erra tolloo
thy will be done

MYR T’EH AYNS NIAU.
mer teh unss n-yow
as is it in heaven

Thomson and Pilgrim stress that their “transcription” of the Manx is “only a very rough approximation of the English sounds, and is in no way scientifically accurate”. It is meant to show the English reader with no prior knowledge of Manx or its orthography the approximate sound of the words. Yet it is remarkable how the conventions of the “transcription” parallel the standard Manx orthography. It is almost as though the

conventional Manx orthography served a similar purpose to Thomson and Pilgrim's "transcription", namely to help a reader familiar with the English spelling conventions to sound the Manx words.

Both Scots and Irish Gaelic have numerous conventions which have no part in Manx orthography. Among these are the use of digraphs like <dh> and <mh> and accents to indicate long vowels, <í> where Manx has <ee> and <ú> where Manx has <oo>.

To underline this point, a look at the first few lines of the Lord's Prayer in standard Scottish Gaelic and Irish Gaelic shows that they employ substantially different orthographic conventions from Manx:

Gaelg (Manx)	**Gàidhlig (Scots)**	**Gaeilge (Irish)**
Ayr ain t'ayns niau,	Ar n-Athair a tha air nèamh:	Ár n-athair, atá ar neamh:
casherick dy row dt'ennym.	gu naomhaichear d'ainm.	go naofar d'ainm.
Dy jig dty reeriaght.	Thigeadh dorìoghachd.	Go dtaga do riocht.
Dt'algney dy row jeant er y thalloo	Deanar do thoil air an talamh,	Go ndéantar do thoil ar an talamh,
myr t'eh ayns niau.	mar a nithear air nèamh.	mar dhéantar ar neamh.

Though the Philips and Wilson orthographies for Manx differed from each other, it is clear that both were strongly influenced by the conventions of English of the time. From this we can begin to see the importance of the role of bilinguals in determining the form of the orthography. As Thomson points out (Thomson 1969:193) in respect of the translation of religious works into Manx which went on apace in the second half of the eighteenth century:

> nothing of all this translation work could be carried out by monoglot Manxmen [...] the clergy who undertook this work were locally educated, it is true, but through English and in the classics, only informally and occasionally through or in Manx, and for some of them, depending on their upbringing, it must have been a second rather than a first language in terms of status if not always in terms of order of acquisition.

Thus the Manx orthographic conventions which have come down to the present can be seen to be the work of bilinguals and, in particular, clergy. Indeed, as Thomson notes, for some of the translators Manx may not even have been a first language; and certainly, they were far more used to writing English, and perhaps even Latin and Greek, than Manx.

4. Orthography as literacy practice

In what Street calls the *ideological model* of literacy, (1984:8), it is assumed, inter alia, that the meaning of literacy within a culture depends on the social institutions within which it is embedded and that the processes whereby reading and writing are learnt are what construct their meaning for particular practitioners.

Furthermore, according to Scribner and Cole (1981:236), literacy is “a set of socially organized practices which make use of a symbol system and a technology for producing and disseminating it. Literacy is not simply knowing how to read and write a particular script but applying this knowledge for specific purposes in specific contexts of use.”

The practices involving literacy in which a community engages are inevitably related to the type of orthography which will emerge as one of the technologies underpinning those practices.[7] This is particularly true in bilingual (especially diglossic bilingual) communities where literacy is introduced to the “low” or vernacular language through the medium of another, better established and more prestigious language.

The history of Manx orthography illustrates this. Even following Phillip’s work on the Book of Common Prayer, Manx was essentially an unwritten language, and in the 18th century, “most Manxmen were illiterate in their own language and even those who could write did not write in Manx” (Thomson 1969:179). This was inevitable, given that “all attempts at elementary education took it for granted that a knowledge of English reading and writing was the goal to be aimed at” (Thomson 1969:180).

Some idea of what "literacy" in English may have meant for many people may be gained from the following, from a letter from Bishop Hildesley to the Archbishop of York, 1762:

> The Manks people [...] would be, I am confident, extremely fond of perusing the scriptures, if they had them, and were taught to read them, in their own tongue, as they are the English Bibles; which latter, numbers can do very roundly, whilst they scarce understand the meaning of a single sentence; nay, I might say, I believe, of some, a single word!
>
> (Butler 1799:422).

In other words, some of those who could "read" could sound the English letters, but had little idea of the language they represented. At least until the Bible and other religious material became widely available in Manx in printed form in the 1760s (largely through the work of Hildesley himself) the main use of written Manx seems to have been by clergy literate in English, who used Manx religious material for reading in church or in their pastoral work with Manx monolinguals. The majority of literate lay people had little or no access to anything written in Manx at least until the second half of the 18th century.

We can see how in Manx society in the 18th century, literacy in Manx and literacy in English had different social meanings and were embedded in different social practices. While literacy in English may have been seen as a desirable goal in itself, leading to social and economic advancement, literacy in *Manx* served mainly to support religious activities.The available evidence suggests that the reading of Manx was largely the preserve of those who already could read English to some degree.[8] From 1769, after the appearance of the Bible in Manx, it was possible for "masters of families, and others, who are well disposed, [to] read to the ignorant and illiterate the Sacred Oracles in their own language" (Butler 1799:227). Very likely some of these "masters of families" were the same people who could read the English Bible "very roundly", in Hildesley's words, but understanding little or nothing of what they read.

This also gives an indication of how the social practices surrounding reading and writing in Manx related to the nature of the Manx orthography which was being developed at that time largely for the purposes of Bible translation. For both the clergy and lay people Manx would be mainly a read and spoken, rather than a written, language. For both groups Manx literacy was secondary to English literacy in terms of both order and status. For both groups, written Manx would have a strong identification with the Church, whereas written English was seen to have a wider range of uses. Thus the transfer of conventions from English orthography to Manx served the purposes of both the clergy, who were already fully literate in English, and the lay people, for most of whom their limited literacy derived from schooling in English.

Under these circumstances, it was almost inevitable that a Manx orthography would develop that would resemble that of English[9] in some respects.

5. Ideology, orthography and language shift

It is clear from the history of Manx that, for several centuries, it fought a losing battle against the encroachment of English. The eventual result was complete language shift - from being almost entirely monolingual in Manx, the population of the island became almost exclusively monolingual in English. In this section, I want to examine the role of orthography in this language shift.

In the 18th century, as Thomson has stated, the goal of elementary education in Mann was a knowledge of English reading and writing (Thomson 1969:180). Implicit in this is a view that English was the superior language, which would confer on its speakers opportunities for advancement which would remain closed to monolingual Manx speakers. In fact similar official attitudes applied to Welsh in Wales during the same period.

In the 20th century, the creation of orthographies for previously unwritten languages has often been seen as a kind of gift to their speakers, bringing in its wake empowerment of the indigenous population and other benefits of literacy, spiritual and material. However, given the fate of a language like Manx - virtual extinction - it is

reasonable to examine critically the beliefs and motives of those who introduced writing to the language. In the case of Manx, we have an explicitly ideological statement from John Kelly, a Manxman who as a young man was involved in Bible translation work in the service of Bishop Hildesley, and who had a key role in the production of the Manx Bible. Kelly went on to produce a grammar and two dictionaries of Manx (Thomson 1969:186). It is instructive to quote from the introduction to his "Triglott Dictionary" (English/Scottish/Irish/Manx Gaelic), dated 1805.[10] At the outset, he puts forward "unity of language" as a virtue:

> To cultivate a language and to improve a people are similar offices. [...]Wilson and Hildesley [’s] motives were religious and moral; but the present state of the empire holds out to government and individuals another motive at this time not less imperious, that unity of language is the surest cement of civil as well as of religious establishments. [It] has long been the policy of France to render her language universal, and she has acquired more influence by its becoming the court language of Europe than even by her arms in the field [...]

Next, he laments the loss of an opportunity in Ireland:

> Had books been printed in [Irish] Gaelic, and Gaelic schools established in those parts of Ireland where Gaelic is the vulgar tongue, the people would have acquired learning by using the English alphabet, - they would have read English before they could read Irish, by reading Irish through an English medium [...]

Thus in Ireland, the publication of *Gaelic* books using the "English" alphabet could have promoted a knowledge of *English*, with desirable consequences: the removal of "deplorable ignorance, poverty and bigotry". The source of this wretchedness, it is implied, was the Catholic church, for

> By the publication of Gaelic books, and more particularly by the clergy being obliged to understand, and to use the Gaelic tongue, the Roman Catholic faith was entirely superseded in Man. Of thirty thousand inhabitants, there is not to be found one native who is a Roman Catholic, nor a single dissenter from the

> Established Church of England. The same wisdom exercised by the rulers of the Church of Scotland, has produced similar effects in the Highlands. By their clergy being obliged to use the Gaelic language in the Highland parishes, the national and political prejudices, which formerly existed so strongly there, are entirely removed, and the knowledge of the English language, in consequence of the publication of the Gaelic Scriptures and Gaelic books, is everywhere gaining ground. And when there shall be one national language, then only will the union of the empire be completely established.

Here we start to see an imperial and religious project which has language shift as an intermediate goal, and in which orthography plays a small but perhaps pivotal part.[11] Literacy in Gaelic, Kelly implies, can provide the crucial transitional step to literacy in English; and once literacy in English has been attained, there is no need for any other kind. The consequence, according to Kelly, is necessarily the loss of Gaelic: "it is true that in process of time this cultivation of the Gaelic language will destroy the language itself, as a living language; but it will have produced the knowledge of a better, and will descend to posterity by means of the press in a more perfect state" [i.e. as a "dead" language like Latin].

Of course, the fact that Kelly believed that the spread of publications in Manx would be the mechanism of language shift to English does not mean that it actually happened thus. Nevertheless, if his desired outcome was the replacement of Manx by English he could not have been disappointed by the state of affairs today. Likewise, the fact that he placed great importance on becoming literate "by using the English alphabet" does not prove that language shift would have been prevented or delayed if Manx literacy had been spread using some other kind of orthography. What is interesting, however, is that Kelly himself saw it as an important factor. Nor would his ideas be dismissed out of hand today. A contemporary linguist, Coulmas has written (1989: 233):

> Given that [transitional literacy facilitating later literacy in a language of wider communication] is a major objective of designing an orthography for a hitherto unwritten language, it is highly desirable that the new orthography differ as

> little as possible from that language of wider communication which is of greatest functional value for the speech community in question.

A pessimistic view of vernacular literacy, namely that it is the direct route to language shift and the consequent loss of traditional culture, has been taken recently by Peter Mühlhäusler. In a chapter entitled "'Reducing'[12] Pacific languages to writings" he concludes that "if the aim is that of preserving cultures, then the entire enterprise of literacy will have to be rethought. [...] Literacy has in the past promoted numerous invisible-hand processes of culture and language change. [...] Vernacular literacy involves much more than merely devising the optimal orthography for a given language as many linguists would have us believe." (Mühlhäusler 1990:205)

Drawing a parallel between the cases studied by Mühlhäusler - mainly among indigenous island peoples of the Pacific - and this other small island, we may infer that Manx literacy may in fact have hastened the demise of Manx as a spoken language and that the English-influenced Manx orthography, though not actually devised with the goal of language shift in mind, may have played a role in this.

Having suggested in this section that the Manx orthography may have played the role of a Trojan horse encouraging the decline of Manx, in the next section I shall discuss how it may paradoxically have helped to preserve the independence of Manx as a language separate from Gaelic.

6. Manx orthography and the autonomy of Manx

One of the most persistent criticisms of Manx orthography is that it does not resemble the orthographies of its closest relatives, Scots and Irish Gaelic. Fargher, for example, writes in the preface to his dictionary (1979:vi): "My own view, also shared by many respected and authoritative speakers of the language, is that this system is a historical abomination, separating, as it does, Mann from the rest of Gaeldom, and thus destroying the linguistic unity of the Gaels without replacing it with anything better in the way of a truly phonetic orthography".

The view that Manx orthography is “an abomination” appears to have been shared by O'Rahilly, who states (1976:120-121): “Phillips and his successors, indeed, removed the reproach that it was an unwritten language; but in so doing they encumbered it with an orthography which was hardly more fitted to represent its sounds than the orthography of Early Modern Irish would have been.”[13]

While clearly, Manx might have benefited from an orthography which was tailored to indicate the phonemic contrasts relevant in a Gaelic language, it is not obvious that a Manx orthography based on that of other Gaelic languages would in the long run have served it better, as I shall argue below.

Kloss (1967) introduced the concepts of *ausbau* (“development”) and *abstand* (“distance”) for discussing the relationship between similar languages and language varieties as they develop (or fail to develop) into standard literary languages. *Abstand* refers to linguistic distance from other, similar languages. Languages which differ in terms of *ausbau* include “dialects whose speakers would certainly be reported by linguists as constituting a single linguistic community if they were at a preliterate stage” but which nevertheless follow different paths of elaboration to become two or more separate literary standards. In this way they become recognised as “different languages.” Kloss gives Scots Gaelic and Irish Gaelic among his examples (7:29).

Where there is insufficient distance between related varieties to establish the claims of one variety to be autonomous from another, adopting divergent orthographies can provide a useful way of creating a *sense* of difference, even to the point of mutual unintelligibility.[14] Orthographic debates in various different languages[15] can partly be seen as a struggle over symbolic *abstand* which will support linguistic autonomy and *ausbau* in the first instance, possibly later being used to bolster claims of national identity and independence. Conversely, minimising orthographic distance can help to create “language unity” and foster cultural detente, as in the case of Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Malaysia.[16](Vikør 1988).

At the cost of making it appear superficially more like English, Manx’s very un-Gaelic orthography helps to provide it with autonomy from the other Gaelic languages which,

though under threat, are in a relatively enviable position in comparison to Manx. Instead, what mutual intelligibility might have existed between the written languages is minimised by the great differences in orthography. With Manx precariously poised between revival and extinction, this might not be such a bad thing. Had Manx shared its orthography with Scots or Irish Gaelic, it may well have come under pressure from these near relations, losing its claim to linguistic independence in spite of its substantial differences from both. The "linguistic unity" which Fargher mentions does not necessarily hold equal benefits for all parties; compare the case of English and Scots.

7. Conclusions

Orthographies, including that of Manx, are shaped by social and cultural factors in the context where the orthography develops: in particular, the nature of bilingualism among the literate part of the population; literacy practices within the community as a whole; and ideological beliefs concerning languages and their speakers, both inside and outside the community. In looking in more detail at the orthography of Manx we have been able to see the involvement and interplay of all three factors in its development. It seems likely that different factors are more or less important in different cases and at different stages; therefore, the outcome cannot be predicted in advance in a deterministic way. What we can say, however, is that in this case, social factors made it likely that the writing system of Manx would resemble that of English. This fact may have helped pave the way for the loss of Manx as a spoken language. At the same time, paradoxically, the very distinctiveness of Manx orthography may be what preserves Manx as an independent language in the face of pressure from its Gaelic neighbours.

The extent to which orthography is relevant in processes of language shift - or the shifting balance between languages as spoken-and-written and spoken-only - remains to be discovered. What this study shows, however, is that there is a relationship between orthography and more general processes involving literacy and language change. It is to be hoped that research will continue to be done in this area.

References

Alvarez-Caccamo, C. and Mário J. Herrero Valeiro (1996): O continuum das normas escritas na Galiza: do espanhol ao português. *Agália: revista da Associaçom Galega da Lingua* 143 - 156.

Barros, Candida Drumond Mendes (1995): "The misssionary presence in literacy campaigns in the indigenous languages of Latin America." *International Journal of Educational Development* 15:3, pp.277-287.

Butler, Weeden (1799): *Memoirs of Mark Hildesley, D.D. Lord Bishop of Sodor and Mann, and Master of Sherburn Hospital; under whose auspices the Holy Scriptures were translated into the Manks Language*. London: J. Nichols.

Coulmas, Florian (1989): *The writing systems of the world*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fargher, Douglas Crebbin (1979): *Fargher's English-Manx dictionary* [by] Douglas C. Fargher; edited by Brian Stowell and Ian Faulds. Douglas: Shearwater Press.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1959): "Diglossia". *Word* 15:325-40.

Garvin, Paul L. (1954): "Literacy as problem in language and culture". *Georgetown University Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics* 7, 117 - 129.

Geerts, G., Van Den Broeck, J., Verdoodt, A. (1977): "Successes and failures in Dutch Spelling Reform". In Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.): *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*, pp. 179 - 245. The Hague, Mouton.

Herrero Valeiro, Mário A. (1993): Guerre des graphies et conflit glottopolitique: lignes de discours dans la sociolinguistique galicienne. *Plurilinguismes 6* 181 - 209.

Joseph, John Earl (1987): *Eloquence and Power: the rise of language standards and standard languages*. London: Frances Pinter.

Kelly, John (1866): *Fockleyr Manninagh as Baarlagh Liorish Juan y Kelly. Currit magh fo chiarail I. Gill.* [An English and Manx dictionary prepared from Dr. Kelly's triglot dictionary, with alterations and additions from the dictionaries of A. Cregeen and J.I. Mosley, by W. Gill and J.T. Clarke.] Douglas, for the Manx Society.

Kloss, Heinz (1967): "Abstand" languages and "Ausbau" languages. *Anthropological Linguistics* 9: 29-41.

Kurman, George (1968): *The Development of Written Estonian.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press/Mouton.

Lepsius, Richard (1981): *Standard Alphabet for reducing unwritten languages and foreign graphic systems to a uniform orthography in European letters.* Second, revised edition (London, 1863) edited with an introduction by J. Alan Kemp. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mühlhäusler, Peter (1990): "'Reducing' Pacific languages to writings" in: Joseph, John E. and Taylor, Talbot J. (eds.): *Ideologies of Language*, pp.189 - 205. London, Routledge.

O'Rahilly, Thomas Francis (1976): *Irish dialects past and present, with chapters on Scottish and Manx*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

Pike, Kenneth (1938): Practical suggestions toward a common orthography for Indian languages of Mexico for education of the natives within their own tongues. *Investigaciones Linguísticas* 2: 422 - 427.

Schieffelin, Bambi B. and Doucet, Rachelle C. (1994): The "real" Haitian Creole: ideology, metalingusitics and orthographic choice. *American Ethnologist* 21: 176-200.

Scribner, S. and Cole, M. (1981): *The Psychology of Literacy*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Sebba, M (1998): Phonology meets ideology: the meaning of orthographic practices in British Creole. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 22:1, 19-47.

Stowell, Brian and O' Breasláin, Diarmuid (1996): *A short history of the Manx language*. Béal Feirste: An Clochán.

Street, Brian (1984): *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swadesh, Morris. (1940a): El alfabeto y la labor de alfabetización. In *Primer Congreso Indigenista Interamericano*, pp. 271-274. Cyclostyled: México.

Swadesh, Morris. (1940b): Metodos de la alfabetización en lenguas natívas. In *Primer Congreso Indigenista Interamericano*, pp. 275-280. Cyclostyled: México.

Swadesh, Morris. (1940c): El congreso linguistico y la educación rural. In *Primer Congreso indigenista Interamericano*, pp. 287-289. Cyclostyled: México.

Thomson, Robert L. (1969): The study of Manx Gaelic. Sir John Rhys memorial lecture, 1969. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. 55. London: Oxford University Press.

Thomson, Robert L., and A.J. Pilgrim (n.d.): Outline of the Manx language and literature. Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh (The Manx Gaelic Society).

Vikør, Lars S (1988): *Perfecting spelling. Spelling discussions and reforms in Indonesia and Malaysia 1900 - 1972*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Winner, Thomas G. (1952): Problems of alphabetic reform among the turkic peoples of Soviet Central Asia, 1920 - 41. *Slavonic and East European Review 31*:133 - 147.

---

[1] I gratefully acknowledge the help, at different stages, of the following: Rhisiart Hincks, Mark Kermode and Robert Thomson. Any errors of fact or interpretation are, of course, my own.

[2] The main exception is Thomson (1969).

[3] One set of exceptions, of course, are those languages which have their orthography devised by linguists using a "scientifically" designed writing system which is not actually that of their own native language. Nevertheless, it is still usually the case that the system which they devise for the newly-written language has a great deal in common with the native language of the linguists. Hence languages "given" an orthography by North American and European linguists usually use an alphabetic system based on the Roman Alphabet, while languages whose written forms have been developed by linguists from the former Soviet Union typically have alphabetic systems based on Cyrillic. See Winner (1952) for one account of the latter.

[4] For example, both Bahasa Indonesia and Sranan Tongo, spoken in colonies of the Netherlands, faithfully reproduced at one time some of the historical idiosyncrasies of Dutch spelling, for example using <oe> for /u/ and <ie> for /I/; elsewhere French, Portuguese and Spanish conventions have been evident in the orthographies of vernacular languages in French, Portuguese and Spanish colonies at various times. Other, less obvious, examples are provided by languages which have developed under the cultural and/or political domination of neighbouring states, for example, the old Estonian orthographic tradition, based on German (Kurman 1968).

[5] See Sebba (1998) for an elaboration of this assertion.

[6] Thomson quotes Bishop Wilson's introduction: "They that have had the Trouble of Writing it, are very Sensible that the Liberty which every Man takes *of Writing after his own Way*, will expose them to some censure". In other words, orthography was only partly standardised and most likely, based on perceived phonetic similarities between Manx and English. A similar situation may be found today in much written English-lexicon Creole; see Sebba (1998).

[7] For example, see Barros (1995:282-3) on the controversies between linguists and missionaries concerning appropriate orthographies for indigenous Mexican languages, and the differing literacy practices promoted by each group.

[8] According to Stowell and O' Breasláin (1996:8-9), Hildesley in the 1750s found only three parishes where Manx was used as a medium of instruction. His response was "to make available teaching material in Manx and to limit the use of English", and to encourage teachers who could teach in Manx. For a time, Manx became established as teaching medium in nearly all parishes, only to go into a decline again soon after Hildesley's death in 1772.

[9] See also Thompson (1965:180).

[10] Kelly's text should be read in its historical context, that of the Napoleonic Wars.

[11] For a remarkably similar case concerning the "alphabetisation" of Turkic languages in the Soviet Union by means of the Cyrillic alphabet, see Winner (1952.) According to Pravda at the time, "the transition to the Russian script will contribute to an even greater unification of the peoples of the USSR, to an even greater strengthening of the friendship of the peoples of the USSR". Likewise, in Mexico, where there was disagreement between "indigenist" linguists and missionaries, "each group tried to convince the Mexicans that its own alphabet style would accomplish more effectively the Mexican goal of unifying the Nation-State, one by the use of the national language orthography [i.e. Spanish], the other by employing the same phonetic symbols for all indigenous languages" (Barros 1995:282).

[12] The use of quotation marks around 'reducing' is ironic, implying that little will remain of some of these languages beyond a few written texts. cf. Kelly's claim that Manx would "descend to posterity by means of the press in a more perfect state".

[13] cf. Thomson (p. 180) on this point: "We may doubt whether in any case it would have been a great advantage to Manxmen to have a traditional Gaelic orthography for their language, for the more perfectly the system was adjusted to the facts of Manx pronunciation the less help it would be to Manxmen in reading Scottish or Irish Gaelic because of the numerous sound-changes that have overtaken Manx, and that reading would in any case have been complicated by the impoverishment of vocabulary already referred to."

[14] The different spelling conventions which distinguish American from British Standard English could be seen as a very mild example of this, and the different scripts used by Serbian and Croatian, or Hindi and Urdu, as extreme examples.

[15] For example, in Haitian Creole (Schieffelin and Doucet 1994), where opposing factions favour <c> (French-like) or <k> (autonomous) for /k/; in Galician (Herrero Valeiro, 1993, Alvarez-Caccamo and Herrero Valeiro 1996), where the issue is similarity to or difference from the conventions of Spanish and Portuguese; in Afrikaans, which has systematically replaced Dutch etymological spellings like <concert> with phonemic spellings (<konsert>), at the same time drawing attention to differences, rather than similarities, which exist between the two languages.

[16] After several attempts to agree a common orthography for Malay and Indonesian, the respective governments finally reached an agreement in 1972. The Galician orthographic "wars" (see references in preceding footnote) provide a different kind of example, where differing sets of orthographic practices reflect the writers' attitudes towards the degree of "integration" Galician should have with Spanish on the one hand, or Portuguese on the other.