Working Papers in

Urban Language & Literacies

Paper 148

Linguistic repertoire and *Spracherleben*, the lived experience of language

Brigitta Busch (*University of Vienna*)

2015

Linguistic repertoire and Spracherleben, the lived experience of language

Brigitta Busch
(University of Vienna)

2015

Abstract

This paper foregrounds the concept of Spracherleben, the lived experience of language, in a contribution to ongoing debate about the conceptualization of linguistic repertoire in the context of mobility and migration. It discusses three perspectives on repertoire. The first is concerned with how we interact linguistically and socially, drawing on interactional and anthropological approaches. The second looks at how we are constituted as speaking subjects by historical/political discourses, drawing on poststructuralism. The third is inspired by phenomenology, addresses Spracherleben, and investigates the bodily/emotional prerequisites for speaking and experiencing of language. All three contribute to our understanding of repertoire, but in linguistics, the third remains under-researched. The paper elaborates on how a phenomenological view of the lived experience of language helps us to understand the discomfort or confusion that ensues if one suddenly finds oneself in an unknown sociolinguistic space, using the example of a girl who moves school from the country to the city.

Introduction

Relocating the center of one's life, either within a country or from one country or continent to another, always means a change, both in the life world (Lebenswelt) which provides an inter-subjective pool of perceiving, and in the linguistic environment where practices, discourses and rules are familiar. Under favourable conditions, this kind of change can be experienced as a challenge, opening up new horizons and new opportunities to re-invent oneself as a (speaking) subject. Under less favorable conditions, however, changing location and language can also be experienced as a hardship or as a source of ongoing emotional stress – sometimes even leading to traumatization or to re-invoking earlier traumatic experience. This is particularly likely in cases of forced displacement or if the situation after emigration continues to be experienced as precarious, uncertain, or even hostile (Kogan 2005). Nevertheless – and this is the central idea behind this paper – the underlying experience that one's own linguistic repertoire no longer 'fits' is one that occurs not only occurs in extreme situations but is shared (though often in a very attenuated form) by all speakers when experiencing dislocation.

The question we are concerned with is: what happens when speakers come from a space where they are familiar with the social rules and the language practices, and enter a space where this is not the case? We wish to approach this question in three stages:

i) First, how is their linguistic repertoire constituted, what linguistic 'baggage' do they bring as speakers when they enter the space?

ii) Second, how are speakers positioned by discourses about language and ways of speaking, or by linguistic ideologies that shape the space, and how do they position themselves in relation to these discourses? And

iii) third, with what feelings and bodily sensations do they experience themselves—through the eyes and ears of the others—as speakers?

I suggest that these questions need to be addressed from different perspectives, each of which relates to particular sets of theoretical assumptions: a third person perspective focussing on how speakers interact by means of language, a second person perspective focussing on how they become constituted as speaking subjects through language, and a first person perspective focussing on how they live language as a subjective experience. These three perspectives are inspired by an interactional, a poststructuralist, and a phenomenological approach respectively, and I will argue that they are not mutually exclusive but can be seen as complementary in a better understanding of the multilayered and complex nature of the linguistic repertoire. So this paper aims to explore the connections between the concepts of the linguistic repertoire, of linguistic ideologies, and of lived experience of language.

In foregrounding the concept of Spracherleben,[1] the lived experience of language, this paper contributes to ongoing debate about how to rethink the notion of the linguistic repertoire, reckoning with how phenomena such as increased mobility, migration or participation in transnational networks of communication now make it difficult to take relatively stable speech communities as point of departure, as Gumperz (1964) did in his original concept. Whereas Blommaert and Backus (2013) re-conceptualize the linguistic repertoire as a patchwork of resources, skills and competences learnt by (mobile) individual speakers along their life trajectories in situations of formal language learning and informal encounters with language, Pennycook and Otsuji (2014: 166) coin the term 'spatial repertoire', which "links the repertoires formed through individual life trajectories to the available linguistic resources in a particular place". In an earlier paper (Busch 2012), I adopted a biographical approach to empirically explore the linguistic repertoire and suggested drawing on a poststructuralist approach which acknowledges the normative power with which language and categorizing discourses in particular constitute the speaking subject. In this paper I want to expand the concept of linguistic repertoire by developing the notion of the lived experience of language, foregrounding the bodily and emotional dimension of inter-subjective interaction. The approach presented in this paper has been developed in a series of research projects around the topic of multilingualism and school, or multilingualism and migration[2], and these include the project 'When Plurilingual Speakers Encounter Unilingual Environments'[3] and the interdisciplinary pilot study 'Multilingualism and Resilience'.[4]

Passing from one space to another

This paper is based on the biographical approach within research on multilingualism (Busch forthcoming a), an approach that takes the experiencing subject with his or her multilayered linguistic repertoire as its starting point, rather than individual languages or varieties. The focus here is not on how many and which languages speakers have available to them, or how 'proficient' they are in their L_1, L_2 or L_n. The question is rather how linguistic variation can serve to construct belonging or difference, and above all, how such constructions can be experienced by speakers as exclusions or inclusions due to language.

Rather than speaking of multilingualism which somehow suggests the idea of a plurality of individual languages, in the context of the linguistic repertoire I prefer to refer to Mikhail

---

[1] I use the German term Spracherleben to point to the phenomenological foundation of the concept of Erlebnis or Erleben (lived experience) as developed by Husserl (1982) in 1913.

[2] www.heteroglossia.net

[3] Funded by the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF), 2011–2013.

[4] In cooperation with Luise Reddemann (University of Klagenfurt) and Martin Aigner (Medical University of Vienna), 2012–2014.

Bakhtin's (1981a) concept of heteroglossia. Following Todorov (1984), this concept encompasses the dimensions of multidiscoursivity, linguistic diversity, and multivoicedness, and it is inherent in any form of living language, establishing a 'dialog of languages' (Bakhtin 1981a: 294), regardless of whether this dialog plays out within what is referred to as one language, or between different languages that "have established contact and mutual recognition with each other" (Bakhtin 1981a: 295). To illustrate the fact that nobody has one language only, Bakhtin evokes an illiterate Russian peasant far from any urban center, whose linguistic environment is nonetheless characterized by diversity since it refers to different worlds, each of which has its own socio-ideological constitution: the familiar language of the village, the Old Church Slavonic of the Orthodox faith, the 'paper' language of bureaucracy, or the urban idiom of the worker returning to the village to visit his relatives. Bakhtin writes about this imaginary peasant:

> "Even such a man, however, deals not in fact with a single language, but with languages – except the place occupied by each of these languages is fixed and indisputable, the movement from one to the other is predetermined and not a thought process; it is as if these languages were in different chambers. They do not collide with each other in his consciousness, there is no attempt to coordinate them, to look at one of these languages through the eye of another language." (Bakhtin 1981a: 295)

The question I wish to investigate is what discomfort or confusion ensues if one suddenly finds oneself not in a familiar chamber, but in an unknown space, and one becomes aware that one's linguistic repertoire does not (completely) 'fit', that one has to deal with a diversity of languages, and "that the ideological systems and approaches to the world that were indissolubly connected with these languages contradicted each other and in no way could live in peace and quiet with one another" (Bakhtin 1981a:296).

Under the conditions of globalization, speakers participate in varying spaces of communication which may be arranged sequentially, in parallel, juxtapositionally, or in overlapping form. At different periods in their lives, at different moments of their day, or even simultaneously (with the help of digital means of communication, for example), speakers participate in several spaces that are socially and linguistically constituted in different ways. Each of these spaces has its own language regime – its own set of rules, orders of discourse, and language ideologies – in which linguistic resources are assessed differently. Space is understood here as socially constituted and constituting, an approach that ultimately refers to Lefebvre (1991) who conceives space not as something given but as constantly produced and reproduced in repeated social (and linguistic) practices. Particularly interesting in the context of this paper is Lefebvre's suggestion of a triadic approach in which space is analysed from the perspective of practices located in space, the perspective of discourses about space, and the perspective of subjective experience of space.

In order to examine in detail what happens when a speaker moves from a known to an unknown space, I have deliberately chosen the example of an experience shared by many speakers, namely: changing from one school to another one. What can be seen with this example, which does not transgress the borders of what is usually seen as one language, can be extrapolated to any other situation that involves entering an unfamiliar space, such as situations linked to mobility, migration or displacement. The text that the paper refers to was written in the context of a university course by a student who initially assumed that her linguistic biography was 'boring', because she had grown up monolingual. I have selected a passage in which the student remembers her childhood and the moment when she moved from the village school to the secondary school in the regional capital. She writes about her first days in the new school environment:

> "It was a very hierarchically structured class, most of the schoolgirls came from the 'upper classes', and I felt very insecure and a little deficient, comparing my rural vernacular with their 'High German from the regional capital' [landeshauptstädtisches Hochdeutsch]."

What the student describes in this short sequence is a remembered moment of lived experience of language, a moment that at the time when she writes her language biography, she evaluates as significant because it represents an early moment in her life trajectory of consciously feeling that she did not 'belong', linguistically. Moments of lived experience of language inscribe themselves in the linguistic memory, and as I will show in the following sections coming back to this student's text, they become part of the linguistic repertoire, either because they represent a special event with a strong emotional impact, as in this student's case, or because they occur repeatedly.

Changing concepts of the linguistic repertoire

Speakers generally only realize that they have such a thing as a linguistic repertoire when they are made aware that those around them perceive them as 'speaking another language'– in our example, the schoolgirl with her 'rural vernacular' in the urban environment of the secondary school. In their usual everyday life, the repertoire provides habitualized paradigms of language use, which the speakers themselves scarcely notice.

Gumperz (1964) developed his concept of the linguistic repertoire on the basis of his research in two medium-sized rural towns, one in India, the other in Norway. The framework for Gumperz's analysis is the speech community, which he does not define in essentialist terms, but as a community constituted through regular interaction over a long period of time. The linguistic repertoire, says Gumperz (1964: 138), "contains all the accepted ways of formulating messages. It provides the weapons of everyday communication. Speakers choose among this arsenal in accordance with the meanings they wish to convey". The repertoire is understood as a whole, comprising those languages, dialects, styles, registers, codes and routines that characterize interaction in everyday life. According to Gumperz, it is up to the individual speakers to make decisions about the use of linguistic resources, but this freedom to choose is subject to both grammatical and social constraints. It is limited by generally accepted conventions, which serve to classify types of expression as informal, technical, literary, humorous etc. "The social etiquette of language choice is learned along with grammatical rules and once internalized it becomes a part of our linguistic equipment" (ibid.). Gumperz's concept moves away from the assumption made in earlier sociolinguistic studies that particular ways of speaking indicate membership of particular regional or social groups – just as the signifier indicates the signified. Although the linguistic repertoire is internalized and is by no means random, it is understood as fundamentally open, as a means of positioning which speakers use in situated interactions. And it is seen as forming a whole, across individual languages or dialects, which speakers draw from as the situation demands.

These ideas explain why the notion of repertoire is attracting renewed interest in current sociolinguistics. This particularly applies to the analysis of linguistic practices such as 'language crossing' (Rampton 1995) or 'translanguaging' (García 2009; Blackledge and Creese 2010; Li Wei 2011), in which speakers make use of heteroglossic resources as a means of stylization. Some authors suggest that Gumperz's concept of repertoire needs to be updated in the light of processes of globalization, characterized by mobility, migration and transnational networks (Pennycook 2009; Blackledge and Creese 2010; Li Wei 2011). In the conceptualization that he developed in the 1960s, Gumperz assumed that individual speakers

were part of relatively stable speech communities, but he himself was no stranger to the experience of linguistic displacement, having been forced to emigrate from Germany to the US in 1939. In fact from the point of view in this paper, his remark that "stylistic choice becomes a problem when we are away from our accustomed social surroundings" (Gumperz 1964: 138) can itself be read as referring to a lived experience of language beyond the limits of a speech community.

Gumperz's conception of linguistic repertoire is rooted in linguistic anthropology and interactional linguistics, and it is based on the observation of linguistic interaction. From the external perspective of the researcher, observable linguistic behavior is in the foreground, and the focus is on rules and conventions of communicative interaction, which are learnt, followed, and occasionally subverted or broken. Gumperz's tendency to locate linguistic repertoire in a linguistic community rather than in the speaking subject can be partly explained by the fact that the subject is not a stable category from an interactional point of view, but is constantly being reconstructed (and co-constructed) in interaction with and in relation to others.

What is crucial in current conceptual elaborations of linguistic repertoire is the move beyond the realm of speech community, which is achieved either by taking a biographical perspective that ties the repertoire more to an individual's life trajectory, or by taking a spatial perspective that focuses on encounters in linguistically highly diverse settings. The approach which links the repertoire to an individual life trajectory is prominently represented by Blommaert (2008) and by Blommaert and Backus (2013). In the earlier paper, Blommaert (2008) uses the example of a refugee from Rwanda to argue that linguistic repertoires do not primarily give information about a person's place of birth, but about his or her journey through life. Even so, the notion of space also comes into play in this conceptualization, as repertoires do not tell us about a supposedly stable geographical space (of origin), but about sociopolitical changes and caesuras that reshape space and impact on the repertoire: "The fact is… that someone's linguistic repertoire reflects a life, and not just birth, and it is a life that is lived in a real sociocultural, historical and political space" (Blommaert 2008: 17). Blommaert and Backus (2013: 2) explore the question how linguistic resources are "functionally distributed in a patchwork of resources and skills" and how these competences enter into the repertoire. They attribute a central role to processes of learning both in formal language learning situations as well as in informal encounters with language, and they understand these processes as driven by the cognitive and by the social. From the perspective of language learning and teaching, Rymes (2014) advocates a repertoire approach which moves beyond language and includes the multimodal dimension of communication. She also locates the communicative repertoire in individual speakers but emphasizes that they constantly need to expand their repertoire in order to find a common ground of communication with the other. Pennycook and Otsuji (2014) take specific places in which highly differing linguistic resources and everyday practices come together as their point of departure to explore what they call 'metrolingual multitasking'. They develop the concept of 'spatial repertoire', which "links the repertoires formed through individual life trajectories to the available linguistic resources in particular places" (Pennycook and Otsuji 2014: 166). In sum, repertoire approaches focusing on individual biographies also take into account the notion of space, while approaches focusing on space also acknowledge the importance of the biographical dimension. But what most of these approaches share is an analysis of repertoire from the perspective of an external observer.

In my conceptualisation of linguistic repertoire, I also take a speaker-centered approach, but I propose to complement the third person view with a first person perspective based on biographical narratives. I do not see the speaker as an (independently acting) individual but –

in a poststructuralist move – as a subject formed through and in language and discourse. I understand the repertoire not as something that the individual possesses but as something formed and deployed in intersubjective processes located on the border between the self and the other. This is precisely why I attach crucial significance to the concept of the lived experience of language. As I argued in an earlier paper (Busch 2012) and as I will further develop below, language ideologies and discursive categorizations – categorizations of others as well as self – have a decisive impact on linguistic repertoires. Eventually, Gumperz (2001:37) himself drew attention to the fact that in his earlier works, he had underestimated the role of linguistic ideologies and their influence on internalized background knowledge and processes of linguistic interaction. In the following sections I shall argue that for all its importance, the observation-based interactional approach is not enough to capture the full complexity of the linguistic repertoire that people use to position themselves in relation to their social environment. I propose that the concept of the repertoire needs to be expanded to include at least two further dimensions: that of linguistic ideologies, and that of lived experience of language.

Linguistic ideologies or discourses about language and speech

Let us recall the description of the schoolgirl's move from the country school to the secondary school in the city. Due to the way she spoke, the writer tells us, her fellow students from higher social strata, who dominated the class, identified her as not belonging to their group, and they relegated her to the category of the Others – those with a rural language. She remembers that this made her feel 'a little deficient'. In retrospect, the writer perceives the class as 'very hierarchically structured'. The mechanism that the schoolgirls from the 'upper classes' evidently deployed to consolidate their position was a double one: on the one hand they used metalinguistic discourses, denigrating the 'rural' or otherwise 'inappropriate' linguistic practices of their fellow schoolgirls, and on the other hand they performed linguistic distinction by speaking 'High German from the regional capital'.

Two things become clear from this example. Firstly, the other students' identification of the schoolgirl in terms of linguistic ideology means that she then perceives herself as belonging to a particular category – this is what first makes her 'realize' that she is 'a girl from the country'. Differences in pronunciation are used like a shibboleth[5] as a criterion for inclusion or exclusion. And secondly, the (negative) evaluation of her linguistic resources by others influences her own self-perception as a 'deficient' speaker.

Pierre Bourdieu (1991) dealt with the way social distinction is learnt by means of language in the course of socialization, inscribed in a person's body, and translated into a habitus. He shows how social and political power relationships are produced and reproduced using linguistic distinction. The crucial factor for the efficacy of such mechanisms is that they not only act on individuals from the outside, but are internalized. Thus people subordinate themselves, voluntarily and almost without noticing, to ideas about what the world is like and how categories of thought and feeling are formed, and come to see these ideas as natural and self-evident. Theories of subjectivation, of becoming a subject, as developed among others by Louis Althusser, Michel Foucault, and Judith Butler, can help to understand how this

---

5 'Shibboleth' is taken to mean a linguistic difference that does not indicate a conceptual difference, but is used to assign someone to a particular social group or region. The term 'shibboleth', the Hebrew word for an ear of corn, refers to the Old Testament book of Judges (12: 5–6), which tells how this word was used as a password: whoever pronounced it as 'sibboleth' was identified as a fugitive Ephraimite and was killed; only those who could pronounce the 'sh' were allowed to pass.

voluntary subordination can come about. Using the famous metaphor of a policeman summoning somebody walking past, Althusser (1971) assigns the central role in the constitution of the subject to acts of authoritative interpellation by and of identification with hegemonic (state-)ideologies. To Foucault (1982) we owe insights into how the power of categorization becomes internalized not only through interdictions and restrictions but also through 'technologies of the self' that human beings use to address and understand themselves, to effect operations "on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being" (Foucault 1988:17).

In her theoretical approach to subjectivation, Butler draws on Althusser and Foucault and emphasizes the double character of discourse in both constituting and subjugating the subject. Her work on gender, discrimination, power and performativity is based on the assumption that the concept of the subject is ambiguous. The subject is regarded not primarily as an acting subject, but as a subjugated one, while at the same time subjectivation is understood as an enabling precondition for acting. Acting is preceded by subjugation (or subjection) to the power of previously existing discourses, previously spoken language. One could say that one becomes a subject by being repeatedly allocated to already established identity categories. Every such recognition is at the same time a misrecognition, because it reduces heterogeneous and ambiguous elements to either-or categories. According to Butler, the constitution of the subject by the discursive, performative power of language shapes thought, speech, feelings and even bodily being. Butler particularly emphasizes the normative aspect of language, ascribing to this a performative power. Borrowing from Foucault, she argues that entry into the language system exercises a 'productive' censorship, which constitutes both the subject and the legitimate boundaries of speech. She goes on to argue that this primary censorship, the entry of the subject into the normativity of language, is "reinvoked in political life when the question of being able to speak is once again a condition of the subject's survival" (Butler 1997: 135).

With regard to linguistic repertoire, this process could be interpreted as follows: The original constitution of the subject in language happens 'unnoticed', as it were, as the child adopts the (grammatical and discursive) rules of the language and internalizes the 'censorship' that these rules impose. This censorship is experienced as a crisis if the subject's conditions of existence are called into question, if there is reason to fear that one's status as a subject and one's ability to speak will be denied. Butler discusses this by referring to a regulation in the US army, according to which homosexuality was not forbidden, but admitting to it was. Denial of a person's status as subject is ultimately apparent in nearly all situations where there is a loss of rights, discrimination, degradation, denial of access and vulnerability. A situation may be experienced as a crisis when, for example, discourses (connected with different languages) telling us who we are and how we should speak come into conflict with one another, and each of these ideologies demands loyalty for itself. Those affected often describe this as a fear of betraying one language in favor of the other (Busch and Busch 2013).

However problematic categorizations are, because they are always based on exclusions and on a discursively constituted either-or, it is impossible to get by without them. For example, if we receive a phone call from an unknown person, we involuntarily carry out a whole series of categorizations on the basis of language – gender, age, origin, education, social status etc. This identification in situ also influences our own choice of language, usually without our noticing it. But categorizations are never innocent. Linguistic ideologies are used to construct social, ethnic, national and other affiliations and exclusions. They have a major influence on whether we feel that a language we speak brings respect, or whether we try to hide it from others or even to get rid of it. Personal attitudes to language are largely determined by the

value ascribed to a language or language variety in a particular social space. In relation to linguistic repertoires, this means that the restrictive or exclusionary power of linguistic categorizations is at its most noticeable when language is not available as a matter of course, for example when people are not acknowledged (or do not perceive themselves) as legitimate speakers of a particular language or way of speaking. This may happen not only when they enter a social space where the linguistic practices and rules are unfamiliar to them – as in the case of the schoolgirl – but also when spaces that were familiar to them are reconfigured, and as a result change their linguistic regime within a short space of time. Such situations can arise when state borders are redrawn or radical political changes occur, bringing a re-evaluation of linguistic ideologies. This happened, for example, after the unification of East and West Germany, after the collapse of the former Yugoslavia, or after the end of apartheid in South Africa. So in the region covered by the former Yugoslavia, the collapse of the federation at the beginning of the 1990s led not only to the emergence of new nation states, but also to a reorientation in language policies, with a number of new national languages – Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian and Montenegrin – being proclaimed instead of the previously shared language, Serbo-Croatian. An effort has been made to emphasize and consolidate differences between the newly proclaimed languages, with the aid of new dictionaries and prescriptive discourses about correct language use. Such changes force speakers to reposition themselves in relation to the new linguistic categorizations, even more so if they are required to prove their loyalty by pledging allegiance to a 'new mother tongue' (Busch 2010).

With regard to linguistic repertoire, the approaches sketched above help us to understand the power that established discursive categorizations have over the speaking subject: it is only through discourses that 'interpellate' or 'address' us in the second person, telling us who we are and how we differ from other people, that we are constituted as speaking subjects. In order to understand how linguistic ideologies or discourses about language and speech are internalized or absorbed, and how they coalesce into personal attitudes to language, another change in perspective is needed – a shift towards a first-person experiential perspective. The following section will draw on a phenomenological approach to achieve this.

The concept of Spracherleben, the lived experience of language

A subject perspective makes it possible to focus on the biographical dimension of the linguistic repertoire, to reconstruct how the repertoire develops and changes throughout life, a process beginning in early childhood. What interests us here is not so much the way linguistic skills are acquired and accumulated along the time axis; instead we wish to be able to trace how, by way of emotional and bodily experience, dramatic or recurring situations of interaction with others become part of the repertoire, in the form of explicit and implicit linguistic attitudes and habitualized patterns of language practice. It is only when we do not reduce language to its cognitive and instrumental dimension, but give due weight to its essentially intersubjective, social nature and its bodily and emotional dimension, that questions about personal attitudes toward language can be adequately framed. For example, why, in certain situations in life, do people give up a language that used to be familiar to them? Why are certain languages sought after, others rejected, and still others treated with indifference?

The concept of lived experience of language presented here is primarily based on the phenomenology of perception, as developed in the 1940s by the French philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty, because this casts light on the often-neglected bodily and emotional dimension of experience and speech. Taking inspiration from Husserl, Merleau-Ponty

(2009:120) sees bodily being as the basis for the subject. Our body, he says, is always with us. It positions the subject in the world. Here Merleau-Ponty makes a terminological distinction between the physical body (corps physique) as an object that is observable and measurable, and the living body (corps vivant) as the subject of perception, feeling, experience, action and interaction. He illustrates the ambiguity of the body as simultaneously observing and observed, as affecting and affected, with the example of the left subject hand that touches and feels the right object hand.

Interestingly, we also find this ambiguity in the anecdote related by the student who recounts her linguistic experience from childhood. In her efforts to meet the expectations of the new school environment, she tried hard to speak 'High German'. "I still remember", she writes, "how I more or less listened to myself talking, from the outside, and felt like an actress, so inauthentic did my speaking seem to me." In this situation she experiences herself – through the eyes or ears of the others – as an object, as someone being observed. The consequence of her efforts at linguistic assimilation, motivated by the hope that she will no longer be perceived as different by the others, is that she now perceives herself as different, as a stranger.

The movement of the body is, according to Merleau-Ponty, the basis of the faculty to relate to the world, to engage with it. The hand that reaches out to grasp an object 'knows' what it is reaching for, and where that object is; there is no need for consciousness to construct a space-time diagram calculating the points through which the hand will pass. A movement is learnt when the body 'gets it', when it assimilates or incorporates it. According to Merleau-Ponty, our 'being-in-the-world' (être-au-monde) does not begin with an 'I think' (je pense), but with an 'I can' (je peux) (Merleau-Ponty 2009: 171).

These thoughts are relevant for the understanding of the linguistic repertoire because according to Merleau-Ponty, language is also primarily a bodily phenomenon (2009). Like gesture and emotion, language is first and foremost about positioning oneself in relationship to the world, of projecting oneself towards the other – and only then is it also a cognitive act of representation and symbolization. The bodily and gestural dimension of speech, for which Merleau-Ponty (2009: 238) uses the term parole parlante (speaking speech), precedes what he calls parole parlée (spoken speech), which he takes to mean linguistic conventions and the sedimentation of spoken speech into a language system:

> "The spoken word is a genuine gesture, and it contains its meaning in the same way as the gesture contains its. This is what makes communication possible. In order that I may understand the words of another person, it is clear that his vocabulary and syntax must be 'already known' to me. But that does not mean that words do their work by arousing in me 'representations' associated with them, and which in aggregate eventually reproduce in me the original 'representation' of the speaker. What I communicate with primarily is not 'representations' or thought, but a speaking subject, with a certain style of being and with the 'world' at which he directs his aim." (Merleau-Ponty 2002: 212).

Language, according to Merleau-Ponty, is anchored in the bodily and emotional gesture. It is part of intersubjectivity, i.e. of the projection from an 'I' to a 'you', and it therefore belongs to the realm that Merleau-Ponty refers to as 'intercorporeality'. Merleau-Ponty's concept of spoken speech and intersubjectivity resonates to a certain extent with Bakhtin's dialogic principle which postulates that any utterance is responsive to earlier utterances and anticipates utterances to come, that it is directed to a (physically present or imagined) other and therefore bears traces of otherness:

> "[...] the unique speech experience of each individual is shaped and developed in

continuous and constant interaction with others' individual utterances. The experience can be characterized to some degree as the process of assimilation – more or less creative – of others' words (and not the words of a language). Our speech, that is, all our utterances (including creative works), is filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of 'our-own-ness', varying degrees of awareness and detachment. These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate." (Bakhtin 1986: 89)

In a number of disciplines the rather neglected bodily and emotional dimensions in the processes of experiencing, remembering, and speaking are now attracting growing attention, namely among neuroscientists (e.g. Damásio 1999), psycholinguists (e.g. Lüdtke 2012), and psychiatrists and psychoanalysts (e.g. Fuchs 2011; Küchenhoff 2012). Fuchs (2011) draws explicitly on Merleau-Ponty to develop a phenomenologically grounded concept of body memory. He analyzes how in body memory, situations and interactions experienced in the past fuse together, and through repetition and superimposition, form a structure, a style that sticks to the subject – usually without the subject's knowledge. According to Fuchs, body memory forms an ensemble of predispositions and potentials for perceiving the world, for social action, communication, and desire. It functions as an intersubjective system, in which bodily patterns of interacting with others are established and constantly updated, from childhood onwards. If we conceive language as part of this body memory, it becomes possible to understand repertoire in its biographical dimension, as a structure bearing the traces of past experience of situated interactions, and of the everyday linguistic practices derived from this experience, a structure that is constantly present in our current linguistic perceptions, interpretations and actions, and is simultaneously directed forwards, anticipating future situations and events we are preparing to face.

It is the emotionally charged experience of outstanding or repeated situations of interaction with others that keeps alive the process of inscribing language experience into body memory, or more specifically into the linguistic repertoire, whether a specific experience is charged with feelings of wellbeing or of discomfort. Typically the latter are linked to situations that cause confusion because the linguistic resources of the participants – their linguistic capital, as it were – are perceived as unequal. As numerous language biography texts show (Busch and Busch 2008), this is especially likely to be the case when self-perception and perception by others are not experienced as congruent, when people experience inclusion or exclusion because of a language or a particular way of speaking, or when their own capacity of interacting by words is associated with the experience of power or powerlessness. These three kinds of experience of linguistic inequality, which could be referred to as key experiences of multilingualism or heteroglossia, can also be identified in the story about the schoolgirl moving from country school to city school when she talks about observing herself from the outside, feeling excluded by her schoolmates, and perceiving herself as deficient.

Infraction of linguistic or pragmatic rules – experiencing feelings of shame

A feeling often mentioned in biographies in connection with multilingualism is that of shame, arising because one has used a 'wrong' word, a 'wrong' tone, or is speaking with a 'wrong', out-of-place accent. This is often described as feeling as though everyone is looking at you, or wishing the earth would swallow you up. It results in a kind of paralysis, an abrupt suspension of the capacity to act. The feeling of shame comes suddenly and is experienced bodily in all its intensity. If one attempts to analyze the feeling of shame from a phenomenological perspective, following Demmerling and Landweer (2007), the core

element underlying the feeling is the violation of a norm. We are ashamed about transgressing or disregarding a norm, standard, or ideal; we feel shame before others, or, having assimilated the norms, we feel shame before ourselves. The term 'norm' makes it clear that the definition of things that cause shame is not universal, but is a product of history and society. The emergence of the feeling of shame is based on a change of perspective: the person who, as a living body (corps vivant), is involved in an action that initially causes him or her no concern suddenly assumes an external view of himself/herself as an object body (corps physique), and thus sees his or her action in another light, as the transgression of a norm. As Sartre (2003) puts it, shame is in its first layer shame before somebody and at the same time an act of acknowledging: I am ashamed of myself in the way I appear to the other, and I acknowledge that I am as the other sees me. In connection with language, this change in perspective may for example be triggered by noticing signs of unease or irritation in the person one is speaking to.

Situations of intense shame, Demmerling and Landweer argue (2007), affect the self-image of the person who feels shame. Shame before oneself is the most intense shame experienced, and is remembered for an especially long time, because it relates to norms from which the person who has violated them cannot distance himself or herself. An accumulation of situations of shame can become concentrated into particular dispositions or attitudes, such as feelings of inferiority or shyness. In terms of linguistic experience, this may mean that people stop speaking a low-prestige minority language in public, that they give it up completely, or that they avoid speaking in public at all, regardless of language. Sudden transitions to other feelings may also occur, e.g. from shame to fear (of sanctions, for example) or from shame to anger.

The approach used here to analyze shame could also be applied to any kind of emotion associated with particular interactions. From a phenomenological viewpoint, feelings can not only be expressed in the form of physical symptoms, but are to be understood as bodily gestures (towards the other). Hermann Schmitz (1989, quoted in Demmerling and Landweer 2007: 22) distinguishes here between feelings of constriction and dilation, in other words, between gestures used to shut oneself off from the world, and those used to open oneself up. Gestures of closing are often accompanied by a momentary hush, or by a long-lasting retreat into silence, whereby the silence can change its function over time: embarrassed or intimidated silence, silence as a place of retreat, silence as a sign of defiance or a feeling of superiority. Julia Kristeva (1991) dedicated a separate, fascinating chapter of her book Strangers to Ourselves to this multilayered 'Silence of Polyglots'.

Such gestures of constriction or of shutting oneself off can stem from stressful or traumatic experiences. In extreme cases of this kind, writes Merleau-Ponty (2002: 190–91), "the move towards the future, towards the living present or towards the past, the power of learning, of maturing, of entering into communication with others, have become, as it were, arrested in a bodily symptom, existence is tied up and the body has become 'the place where life hides away'." The only way to untie the knot is to open up towards the world again: "The memory or the voice is recovered when the body once more opens itself to others or to the past, when it opens the way to coexistence and once more (in the active sense) acquires significance beyond itself" (Merleau-Ponty 2002: 191). Researchers concerned with language teaching and learning are coming to accept that learning languages is not a purely cognitive process, and that a positive emotional experience of language, the chance to project oneself as a speaker of the new language, is of vital importance for the appropriation of a new language (Kramsch 2009).

Even if lived experience of language throughout one's life is engraved in one's linguistic

body memory, the prelinguistic physical and emotional interaction between the infant and its caregivers – conveyed by gestures, facial expressions, sounds or rhythms – seems particularly important. Julia Kristeva (2002: 101) has pointed to the importance of this prelinguistic interaction between mother and child, which constitutes a dimension of language connected with the preconscious or unconscious, and with the bodily/affective. She refers to this dimension as semiotic, in contrast to the symbolic function of language: It is characterized by sound and rhythm, by heterogeneousness in meaning and signification, by indeterminacy or ambiguity. Kristeva identifies residual traces of the semiotic in 'psychotic discourse', when the subject is threatened by the collapse of the signifying function. She also, however, sees these as present in what she calls poetic language: the playful/imaginative undermining and disabling of the regulated and normative aspects of language.

Such resources offer a great deal of potential, which can be reactivated in situations of linguistic crisis (Busch and Busch 2013). Prelinguistic articulation is, as the psychoanalyst Jacques Hassoun (1994) puts it, the bearer of our oldest, strongest feelings – of physical contacts, unarticulated sounds, words that the child hears without understanding them, and which the adult suddenly rediscovers in a turn of phrase or a change in mood. Again from a psychoanalytical perspective, Alfred Lorenzer (1981) makes a distinction between sensory/symbolic and linguistic/symbolic forms of interaction, comparable to Kristeva's differentiation between semiotic and symbolic language. He classifies the former (sensory/symbolic interaction) as part of the prelinguistic sensorimotor interaction between child and caregiver, which inscribes itself into the body as a 'memory trace', in the form of a gesture, and which, by repetition, forms a pre-reflexive structure that is the basis for the child's ways of acting and its passive expectations.

So far it has mainly been psychoanalytical, or phenomenologically oriented philosophical approaches, that have drawn attention to the exceptional importance of the physical and emotional dimension of language. Linguists have yet to engage with this topic to any great extent.[6]

The repertoire as a chronotopically layered structure

In this paper we have used the example of an autobiographical text, recalling a schoolgirl's move from an elementary school in the country to a secondary school in the city, to consider the idea of linguistic repertoire from three different perspectives. The first, indebted to an anthropological or interactional viewpoint, is concerned with how we interact linguistically and socially with one another; the second, drawing on poststructuralism, looks at how we are constituted as speaking subjects by historical/political discourses; the third, inspired by phenomenology, investigates the bodily/emotional prerequisites for speaking and experiencing of language. What we have found is that the linguistic repertoire interweaves social/interactive elements with historical/political and personal/biographical ones. What Bakhtin (1981b) established with the concept of the chronotope – the co-presence of different spaces and times in speech – can be transferred to the linguistic repertoire: with every linguistic interaction situated in the here and now, we not only position ourselves in relation to what is immediately present, i.e. the people we are interacting with and the context of the interaction. We also implicitly position ourselves in relation to what is absent, operating or resonating in the background, and therefore also intentionally or unintentionally present: relevant others, other spaces and times from which we take our bearings. "Chronotopes",

---

6   For studies on language and emotion cf. inter alia Pavlenko 2005, Schwarz-Friesel 2007, Lüdtke 2012, Busch 2013, Busch and Busch (forthcoming_b).

writes Bakhtin, "are mutually inclusive, they co-exist, they may be interwoven with, replace or oppose one another, contradict one another or find themselves in ever more complex interrelationships" (1981b: 252). In whichever case, they encroach on the here and now.

The multi-dimensionality of linguistic repertoire explored in this paper entails a move away from the idea that the repertoire is a set of competences, a kind of toolbox, from which we select the 'right' language, the 'right code' for each context or situation. The range of choices available to a speaking subject is not limited only by grammatical rules and knowledge of social conventions. Instead, particular languages or ways of speaking can have such strong emotional or linguistic-ideological connotations that they are unavailable or only partly available at particular moments. Our repertoire is not determined solely by the linguistic resources we have, but sometimes by those we do not have, and these can become noticeable in a given situation as a gap, a threat or a desire. The linguistic repertoire can be understood as a heteroglossic realm of constraints and potentialities: different languages and ways of speaking come to the fore, then return to the background, they observe each other, keep their distance from each other, intervene or interweave into something new, but in one form or another they are always there. Because language is, in Bakhtin's term, dialogic, because it lies on the border between oneself and the other (Bakhtin 1981a: 293), the linguistic repertoire reflects the synchronic coexistence of different social spaces in which we participate as speakers, and it points diachronically to different levels of time. It not only points backwards to the past of the language biography, which has left behind its traces and scars, but also forwards, anticipating and projecting the future situations and events we are preparing to face.

References

Althusser, L. 1971. 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)' in L. Althusser: Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays. New Left Books, pp. 127–188.

Busch 2012. 'The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited', Applied Linguistics 33 (5): 503–523.

Busch 2013. Mehrsprachigkeit. Vienna: UTB/Facultas.

Busch forthcoming_a. 'Biographical approaches to research in multilingual settings: exploring linguistic repertoires' in M. Martin-Jones and D. Martin (eds.): Researching multilingualism: Critical and ethnographic approaches. Routledge.

Busch forthcoming_b. ''Without language, everything is chaos and confusion.' Bodily and emotional language experience and the linguistic repertoire' in U. Lüdtke (ed.): Emotion in Language: Theory – Research – Application. John Benjamins.

Busch and Busch (eds.) 2008. Mitten durch meine Zunge. Erfahrungen mit Sprache von *Augustinus bis Zaimoğlu*. Drava.

Busch and Busch 2013. 'Sprachen der Verletzung, Sprachen als Ressource. Mehrsprachigkeit und traumatisches Erleben' in A. Lampe, P. Abilgaard, and K. Ottomeyer (eds): Mit beiden Augen sehen: Leid und Ressourcen in der Psychotherapie. Luise Reddemann zum 70. Geburtstag. Klett Cotta, pp. 95–117.

Bakhtin, M. 1981a. 'Discourse in the Novel' in M. Bakhtin: The dialogic imagination (Ed. by Michael Holquist). University of Texas Press, pp. 259–422.

Bakhtin, M. 1981b. 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel' in M. Bakhtin: The dialogic imagination. Ed. by M. Holquist. University of Texas Press, pp. 84–258.

Bakhtin, M. 1986. Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Ed. by C. Emerson and Holquist M., trans. by V. W. McGee. University of Texas Press.

Blackledge, A. and A. Creese 2010. Multilingualism. A Critical Perspective. Continuum.

Blommaert, J. (2008) 'Language, asylum, and the national order', Urban Language & Literacies 50: 2–21.

Blommaert, J. and A. Backus 2013. 'Superdiverse Repertoires and the Individual. Current Challenges for Educational Studies' in I. de Saint-Georges and J.-J. Weber (eds.): Multilingualism and Multimodality. Sense, pp. 11–32.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. Language and Symbolic Power. Ed. by J. B. Thompson, trans. by G. Raymond and M. Adamson. Polity Press.

Butler, J. 1997. Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative. Taylor & Francis.

Damásio, A. 1999. The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness. Harcourt Brace.

Demmerling, C., and H. Landweer 2007. Philosophie der Gefühle. Von Achtung bis Zorn. J. B. Metzler.

Foucault, M. 1982. 'The Subject and Power' in M. Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Ed. by H. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow. The University of Chicago Press, pp. 208–226.

Foucault, M. 1988. 'Technologies of the Self. Lectures at Vermont University in October 1982' in M. Foucault et al. (eds.): Technologies of the Self (1988). University of Massachusetts Press, pp. 16–49.

Fuchs, T. 2011. 'Body Memory and the Unconscious' in D. Lohmar and D. J. Brudzinska (eds): Founding Psychoanalysis. Phenomenological Theory of Subjectivity and the Psychoanalytical Experience. Springer, pp. 86–103.

García, O. 2009. 'Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century' in A. Mohanty, K. Ajit, M. Panday, R. Phillipson, and T. Skutnabb-Kangas (eds): Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local. Orient Black Swan, pp. 140–158.

Gumperz, J. J. 1964. 'Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities', American Anthropologist 66 (6/2): 137–153.

Gumperz, J. J. 2001. 'Contextualiziation and Ideology in Intercultural Communication' in A. Di Luzio, S. Günthner, and F. Orletti (eds): Culture in Communication: Analyses of Intercultural Situations. Benjamins, pp. 35–53.

Hassoun, J. 1994. Les contrebandiers de la mémoire. Syros.

Husserl, E. 1982. Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy – First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology. Nijhoff.

Kogan, I. 2005. 'Nachwort' in P. Bründl and I. Kogan (eds): Kindheit jenseits von Trauma und Fremdheit. Brandes & Apsel, pp. 288–300.

Kramsch, C. 2009. The multilingual subject. Oxford University Press.

Kristeva, J. 1991. Strangers to Ourselves. Trans. by L. S. Roudiez. Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. 2002. 'From One Identity to an Other' in The Portable Kristeva. Updated Edition. Ed. by K. Oliver. Columbia University Press, pp. 93–115.

Küchenhoff, J. 2012. Körper und Sprache. Theoretische und klinische Beiträge zu einem intersubjektiven Verständnis der Körpererlebens. Psychosozial-Verlag.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. The Production of Space. Blackwell.

Li Wei 2011. 'Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain', Journal of Pragmatics 43: 1222–1235.

Lorenzer, A. 1981. Das Konzil der Buchhalter. Die Zerstörung der Sinnlichkeit. Eine Religionskritik. Europäische Verlagsanstalt.

Lüdtke, U. 2012. 'Relational emotions in semiotic and linguistic development: Towards an intersubjective theory of language learning and language therapy' in A. Foolen, U. Lüdtke, T. Racine, and J. Zlatev (eds.): Moving Ourselves, Moving Others: Motion and emotion consciousness, intersubjectivity and language. Consciousness and Emotion Book Series. John Benjamins, pp. 305–346.

Merleau-Ponty, M. 2002. Phenomenology of Perception. Trans. by C. Smith. Routledge.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2009) Phénoménologie de la perception. Gallimard.

Pavlenko, A. 2005. Emotions and Multilingualism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, A. 2009. 'Linguistic landscapes and the transgressive semiotics of graffiti' in E. Shohamy and D. Gorter (eds): Linguistic landscape. Expanding the scenery. Routledge, pp. 302–313.

Pennycook, A. and E. Otsuji 2014. 'Metrolingual multitasking and spatial repertoires: 'Pizza mo two minutes coming'', Journal of Sociolinguistics 18 (2): 161–184.

Rampton, B. 1995. Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents. Longman.

Rymes, B. 2014. Communicating Beyond Language. Everyday Encounters with Diversity. Routledge.

Sartre, J.-P. 2003. Being and nothingness. Routledge.

Schmitz, H. 1989. Leib und Gefühl. Materialien zu einer philosophischen Therapeutik. Junfermann.

Schwarz-Friesel, M. 2007. Sprache und Emotion. UTB.

Todorov, T. 1984. Mikhail Bakhtin: The dialogical principle. Manchester University