Conditions for Language Revitalization: A Comparison of the Cases of Hebrew and Maori

Bernard Spolsky
Language Policy Research Center, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 52900, Israel

Endangered Languages

In the summer of 1995, the European Network for Regional or Minority Languages and Education[1] reported that special courses were to be offered in Albanian, Aranese (Occitan in the Aran valley), Asturian (3), Basque (2), Breton (8), Catalan (4), Croatian (4), Dutch, Finnish (Tornedal, 5), Frisian (2), Gaelic (5), Irish Gaelic (5), Luxemburgish, Manx Gaelic, Romansch (various dialects, 5), Scottish Gaelic (5), Slovenian, and Welsh (8). These efforts at what Fishman (1991) has labelled Reversing Language Shift are one reaction to the realisation that many or most of the six thousand languages spoken in the world today are most likely to be extinct in the not too distant future.[2]

When attention was first focused on language loss by studies such as Joshua Fishman's optimistically named book *Language Loyalty in the United States* (1966),[3] the emphasis was on social changes of a language community. Two groups of linguists had more pessimistic views: philologists working to recreate 'dead' languages, either from scant surviving texts or by comparativist methods, and anthropological linguists carrying out fieldwork with the last speakers of a nearly extinct Native American language.[4] My own studies of Navajo[5] left me wondering if even a language with 120,000 speakers could stand up to the threat of spreading English, and this pessimism has been supported by developments in the past decade[6]. Of course, even a major world language like French can feel itself in danger, as witness recent policy attempts to defend it from the onslaught of English.

Language Death

The most tragic topic in the study of language shift is the death of a small language,[7] where we encounter, as Fishman (1989: 381) expresses it, the 'sorrows of the losers', 'their anguish, trauma and travail'. In contrast, the most joyous is the successful revival of one that had seemed moribund. Perhaps the strength of emotion felt by both participants and observers sometimes obscures a clear understanding of the nature of the phenomena.[8]

The belief in the merit of maintaining a multiplicity of languages, persuasively identified by Fishman (1982) as 'Whorfianism of the third kind',[9] does in fact provide a social consciousness, or even conscience, for linguists in general and sociolinguists in particular, without which the field would be both less humane and less responsible. Given the potential relevance of theory to practical

1352 0520/95/03 0177-25 $10.00/0
© 1996 B. Spolsky

problems being faced by speakers of an ailing language, the student of language shift is obliged to analyse and study the phenomenon with the utmost possible objectivity.

With all the problems involved in language maintenance, the most difficult is that concerned with control of the passing of a language from parents to children as a 'mother' tongue[10]. This phenomenon, labelled formally as 'intimate' or 'informal intergenerational transmission', is clearly the central feature of maintenance. If the chain is once broken, to repair it takes not just a major effort but, if not a miracle, then

> The rare and largely fortuitous co-occurrence of language-and-nationality ideology, disciplined collective will and sufficient societal dislocation from other competing influences to make possible a relatively *rapid and clean break with prior norms of verbal interaction*. (Fishman, 1991: 291; italics in original)

Language Revitalization

This paper deals with this kind of language restoration. To be more precise, it concerns a situation where people start again to use a language as the language of the home and in particular to speak it to newborn children after a period where these uses were extinct. It is one kind of language revival, it is best called *revitalization.*[11] It may be defined as the restoration of vitality (to use the term coined by Stewart (1968) to refer to use as a native language) to a language that had lost or was losing this attribute.

Language revitalization is a signal example of modifying the sociogeographic distribution and the functional allocation of language (Ferguson, 1983). It adds both a new set of speakers and a new function, spreading the language to babies and young children who become its native speakers. In this way, it assures intergenerational transmission, the crucial element in language vitality. At the same time, it adds the functions associated with the domain of home and family, resulting in various kinds of informal and intimate language use and the related emotional associations of the language.

I use the term revitalization rather than 'revival' which is misleading in cases such as Hebrew. As Cooper pointed out:[12]

> … The term Hebrew revival is a misnomer. Hebrew is no exception to the rule that once a language has passed out of all use whatsoever, it remains dead. The 'revival' of Hebrew refers to its resuscitation as a vernacular, as a language of everyday spoken life. (Cooper, 1989: 19–20)

For in fact Hebrew remained alive, widely known and used for a wide range of important functions, throughout the centuries that followed its loss of native speakers. It is a mistake to confuse the terms and assume that revival and revitalization are the same thing. This lack of clarity about outcomes of language planning accounts for the widespread mistaken belief that, because it has not led to revitalization, Irish language revival has been a failure. As Dorian (1987) remarked, if one looks beyond the criterion of adding native speakers, Irish revival efforts have led both to an appreciable increase in the number of people who know the language and to a significant enhancement of its status.

In this paper,[13] my goal is to consider the specific conditions that seem best to account for Hebrew language revitalization. One aim will be to suggest a model of language revitalization that sorts necessary conditions from typicality ones. The detailed comparison I make with current efforts at Maori language revitalization[14] has three aims. The pragmatic aims is to help understand the process. The early stages of the revitalization process with Hebrew are no longer observable, and so looking at Maori offers a chance to see a process in operation.[15] The second is scientific, the need to have at least a second case to test the model. The third is the hope that this analysis of the Hebrew case will help those working on Maori language revival.

Models of Revitalization

In Spolsky (1991), I explored revitalization within a general model of second language learning. Language shift, loss, maintenance and spread, including revitalization, could usefully be seen, I proposed, as special cases of second language learning. While studies of second language learning generally concentrate their attention on the individual learner, the social phenomenon of language shift depends on groups of individuals who learn a language, who do not learn it, or who forget it. Thus what appears as a change in social patterns of language use and knowledge can be shown to depend on individual success or failure in language learning.

The general theory opportunities (Spolsky, 1989a: 15) proposes that language learning depends on previous knowledge, ability, motivation and learning. In the model, social context is relevant to language learning both in determining the attitudes and goals of the learner which lead to motivation, and in determining the learning opportunities, whether formal (e.g. educational) or informal, provided by those who interact linguistically with the learner.

I argued there that language revitalization depended fundamentally on the decision of parents or other significant caretakers to speak the moribund language to the young children in their charge; I suggested further that this decision was affected by a number of factors, some instrumental or pragmatic and some ideological or spiritual. I proposed that when there is conflict between the two kinds of factors, it takes particularly strong ideological force to overcome instrumental values.

The specific claim I presented was that the possibility of successful language revitalization was to be found partly in previous knowledge of the language by the adult sources, partly in the social factors which account for their attitudes and the children's attitudes, and partly in the resulting exposure of the children, in formal and informal circumstances, to the language. The level of knowledge on the part of the teachers or other sources of innovation have a strong effect: limitations in fluency or lexicon on the part of parents or teachers or other potential interlocutors, for instance, will hamper revitalization.

While there are many different social factors involved, both as causes of and as rationales for language revitalization, they may generally be grouped in two major categories, the pragmatic or instrumental on the one hand, and the ideological or integrative on the other. That is to say, one chooses to use a language because it is directly useful (economically, practically, for access to

power or control) or because one values it for some social, cultural, nationalistic, or religious reason. Successful language revitalization depends, it was hypothesised, on establishing high enough solidarity value for the language being revived to overcome any power or economic effects of the competing language.

Successful language revitalization also involves providing the learners with sufficient exposure to the language, both in formal language teaching and in informal language use, to make learning possible.

It is important to clarify the more restricted scope of my model from, for instance, Kloss (1966), who set up a list of factors that might account for language shift and language maintenance as a whole, or Fishman's (1991) concern on efforts to reverse language shift. My focus is on informal intergenerational language transmission, and not on some other form of transmission such as the ethnoreligious transmission of Hebrew or the cultural-religious transmission of Latin through formal educational systems. Nor am I concerned with the equally important (and certainly much more common) efforts to raise the status of a vernacular language to that of a standard language, even though the goal of such an effort may be to lessen the chance of language shift taking place through lack of motivation for informal intergenerational transmission.

My concern in this paper will be to isolate the conditions that appear necessary or important to language revitalization, i.e. to encouraging new generations of speakers (or even learners) of a language to speak it to their babies. To do this, I wish first to clarify further both the temporal and the causative (or facilitative) aspects of the process. This might help cast light on what is the crux of the whole issue: understanding the point at which individual language learners feel confident enough to rely on their new language. With Maori, it seems, the point has not yet arrived. With Hebrew, I now suspect that the critical date was closer to 1910 than to 1900. My first aim, then, is to the clarify the time chart for each language revitalization programme.

The Ongoing Process of Maori Language Revitalization

Because I wish to use the Maori case,[16] which is still in progress and so open to observation, to clarify and help resolve contradictions and confusions in the records of the Hebrew case, I start with that.

As I described in an earlier paper,[17] the shift away from the use of Maori started in the middle of the nineteenth century after the New Zealand land wars.[18] It may be dated from the use of English as medium of instruction in Maori schools starting in 1847, when the Education Ordinance subsidised mission schools on condition that they taught in English, but the process of loss was at first slow. The strength of Maori resistance in the New Zealand land wars, Belich (1986: 310) argued, served to mitigate the effects of subjugation. The Maori people were able to preserve their 'language, culture, and identity' providing a basis for the 'social and political resurgence' that came later.

One early result of this resurgence was a Maori insistence that their language be taught in secondary schools. There was continuing resistance to language loss until the middle of this century, but eventually the pressure of using only English from the earliest school years, and its growing use in the community, proved too strong. Language loss was hastened when large numbers of Maori moved to the

cities. The effect was spread when some Maori moved back to the villages, bringing with them the city values that stressed the value of speaking English.

A sociolinguistic survey conducted by Richard Benton between 1973 and 1978 traced the process of Maori language loss.[19] In a town like Whangarei City, for instance, the erosion in ability to speak Maori was apparent as early as 1915; only 40% of Maori born there twenty years later could speak Maori; and most born after 1955 speak only English. Even in country areas, the switch to English seems to have begun in the 1930s, during the Depression, with certain areas moving much faster than others. As late as 1951, adult fluency in Maori could be taken for granted, and the 1951 census was accompanied by schedules printed in Maori. Material for teaching in Maori continued to be produced, but in the 1960s it was realised that few Maori children knew the language. By the time of Benton's survey, only two communities, Ruatoki and Matawaia, seemed to have maintained language vitality.

In the early 1970s, the final blow to continued language vitality may well have been the promotion of the use of English in the pre-school Play Centre movement, in which Maori mothers were urged to use only English with their children. This was reinforced by the spread of television. As a result, by the 1970s, the youngest native speakers of Maori were starting to grow older, there were no signs of a new generation of children growing up speaking the language, and the prospects for language survival were becoming dimmer. Looking at domains of language use, the picture was equally dismal. Only the *marae*, the site of traditional Maori *iwi* (tribal) activities, and some religious activities were clearly marked for Maori language use, and these too were showing signs of slippage.

By the late 1960s, Benton (1991) judges that 'Maori had ceased to be the primary language of socialisation for most Maori families'. In fewer than 8% of the households surveyed could the children understand Maori; in only half of these were the children considered fluent. It was not unreasonable then for Fishman *et al*. (1985: 45) to cite New Zealand and its Maori as a 'successful' case of 'translinguification', remarking that Maori ethnic identity seemed to be surviving the reported loss of the Maori language:

> The movement for revival and revitalization appeared in the early 1980s, supported externally by civil rights concerns associated with the anti-apartheid movement in New Zealand.[20]

Initial efforts to use elementary schools for the purpose of language revival appear not to have been successful:

> In the New Zealand situation, while the number of native Maori speakers has been progressively falling, government educational authorities and Maori leaders have sought to stage a revival in the school use of Maori. The children, however, are growing up in a predominantly English language world … (Ritchie & Ritchie, 1979: 140)

The solution proposed to this impasse was to start teaching the children even before they went to school. A meeting of Maori leaders, sponsored by the Department of Maori Affairs in 1981, suggested the establishment of all Maori language pre-school groups, in which older Maoris, fluent speakers of the

language, would conduct the programmes and make up for the fact that the majority of Maori parents could no longer speak their language. The first *kohanga reo* or language nest was set up in 1981. The Department of Maori Affairs provided encouragement and financial support, but the weight of organisation and implementation fell on the community that wanted one. Four experimental centres opened in 1982. Two years later, there were over 280 in existence; and by 1987 nearly five hundred centres,[21] under the aegis of the Kohanga Reo National Trust. The effect of the *kohanga reo* in exposing children to the language and its culture cannot be exaggerated. Fishman (1991) recognises the potential of this movement in reversing language shift of a language that was, before it started, virtually without child speakers.

The language revitalization process has also been boosted by political and legal pressure. A 1974 amendment to the Maori Affairs Act recognised Maori as 'the ancestral language of that portion of the population of New Zealand of Maori descent' but a number of court cases established, as Benton (1979) pointed out, that this had no practical meaning. However, in 1986, the Waitangi Tribunal held that the Crown had failed in its promise made in the Treaty of Waitangi[22] to protect the Maori language. lt recommended (among other things) that Maori be made an official language, available as a language of instruction in schools, and watched over by a Maori Language Commission. Implementation began immediately. Maori was declared an official language of New Zealand and a Maori Language Commission,[23] was established. In addition, Maori started to be used as a language of instruction in some New Zealand schools, a move supported by parental pressure and recognised by the Department of Education.

My paper (Spolsky, 1989) surveyed the situation of Maori bilingual education in 1987. I noted three kinds of schools. There were a few older bilingual programmes, such as that at Ruatoki. There were a number of immersion programmes, none more than a year or two old, in which Maori-speaking teachers were exploring for the first time the presentation of a full syllabus. The third trend, of which two were in existence, were *kura kaupapa Maori* (Maori philosophy schools), independent of but funded by the Department,[24] where both instruction and curriculum are Maori.

The speed of development is shown in recent figures supplied by the Ministry of Education.[25] In 1990, there were six were *kura kaupapa Maori* serving 190 pupils; at the beginning of the 1995 school year, there were 38 catering for 3000 students. In addition, by 1993, 335 other schools offered some form of Maori medium instruction. In a third of these schools, Maori is being used 80% of the time. Thus, just over 1% of Maori children are in *kura kaupapa Maori*, and another 12.5% are receiving some other form of bilingual education. At the moment, the Ministry is undertaking a basic revision of the curriculum in mathematics, science and language. To meet the special needs of the Maori pupils, teams of Maori teachers are preparing and trying out separately developed Maori versions of the three draft curriculum statements.

To sum up the situation, we might first look at some figures. By the time of Benton's survey, only about 12% of adult Maori were speakers of the language. Over 55 years of age, the figure was closer to 50%; under ten years of age, there were only a handful of fluent speakers. Now, about 12% of younger children are

on the way to a command of Maori; if they (and only they) succeed, there will have been success in reversing some 15–20 years of loss. Benton (1991) estimated that the *kohanga reo* movement was already producing some 3000 speakers a year; with the addition of the bilingual and immersion primary school programmes, and the continuation into secondary school programmes and beyond.[26]

But how successful has the reversal been? The numerical and political gains achieved in a few years have been remarkable, but Benton (1991: 30) warns against complacency: 'Tokenism in Maori language matters has often created an impressive facade of progress masking retrogressive reality'. He is particularly concerned about the draining of resources to teaching Maori language and culture to non-Maoris. The Ministry statistics for 1995 report that 93% of the children in Maori-medium education are Maori, but nearly half of the students studying Maori language at secondary school are not. Maoris make up only 18% of the 290,000 pupils who studied *Taha Maori* (a Maori culture programme) in 1993. These programmes that teach Maori as a New Zealand language rather than as an ethnically Maori one use up teaching resources that are sorely needed by the language revitalization programmes. In a press release for a speech earlier this year that was not in fact given, the Prime Minister, Mr Bolger, wrote that he was looking forward to the day when all New Zealand primary children would be comfortably bilingual in their two official languages. Even the most optimistic supporters of Maori revitalization suspect it will take some time before this is true even of ethnically Maori pupils.

For in truth, all signs are that the actual level of Maori knowledge and use remains quite low, even among students in immersion programmes. The difficulties of the switch cannot be denied. Most of the teachers involved in the *kohanga reo*, in the bilingual programmes, and in the *kura kaupapa Maori* are likely to be themselves second language speakers of Maori, with low fluency and restricted knowledge. At the same time, they are generally well educated in English. As a result, most use of the Maori language is restricted to the class-room. Even there, pupils regularly reply in English, and teachers often use English for more complex explanations. The children themselves continue to speak English both outside the class-room and with each other inside it. Only with their grand-parents is Maori likely to be fairly general.[27] Thus, the efforts have so far not led to the significant changes in language use that would count as successful revitalization. I will return to this question again later.

To summarise, I present a brief timeline for Maori language (see Table 1). In twenty years, educational programmes have been put in place that offer a chance of stemming language loss. It is premature to predict whether they will succeed, but useful to ask how the process to date matches the first stages of Hebrew revitalization.

The Process of Hebrew Language Revitalization

In this section I present a parallel description of the process of Hebrew language revitalization.

Although Hebrew ceased being a native language in daily spoken use,[28] it retained its place in most Jewish communities as a language to be read and to be written, to be prayed in and to be studied. It was used in secular domains as well:

Table 1

Year	*Event*
1814	First missionaries
1840	Treaty of Waitangi
1847	Anglicisation of schools starts
1920–35	Language loss at fast rate
1970–75	Language at low ebb, vitality almost nil
1981	*Kohanga reo* movement
1986	Maori language official; Maori Language Commission
1987	*480 kohanga reo*; a dozen bilingual schools, one or two *kura kaupapa* Maori
1990	*Six kura kaupapa Maori*
1995	38 *kura*, 335 other schools offering Maori medium instruction, 819 *kohanga reo*.

in writing legal, scientific, and philosophical texts, and, with the development of the Enlightenment, secular *belles-lettres*. An immense number of books were in fact written in Hebrew throughout this period when the language was not spoken. Hebrew thus continued to add new terms and to change to meet the demands of a changing world. It was far from a dead language.

At the same, time, there was restriction in its domains, serving mainly liturgical, scholarly and literary functions. Occasionally, it served as a lingua franca between Jews who had no other common language, but, as Harshav (1993: 107) remarks, the idea that there was extensive communication in nineteenth century Jerusalem between the established Ladino and Arabic-speaking Sephardic community and the newly arrived Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazim is a myth.

But it is also a mistake to assume that Hebrew before its revival was a language incapable of dealing with daily life. Glinert (1987) takes issue with the general 'Zionist-Hebraist' view represented by scholars such as Tur-Sinai and Avineri who made this claim, and which attributes the enrichment of the language to the work of secular scholars and committees in the early years of the twentieth century. Glinert produces evidence of a semi-vernacular religious Hebrew already available and in use. The forrn and resources of this variety can be judged from Ganzfried's Kitzur *Shulkhan Arukh*, an abridged and popularised guide to Jewish religious practice.[29]

The *Kitzur* was taught in the traditional Jewish elementary schools in Europe and in Palestine, and covered the daily life of a Jew, all aspects of which were fully governed by religious law. It required Hebrew words for such everyday

items as fruit, vegetables and trees (some of which Avineri claims as later discoveries of the dictionary makers) as well as other normal objects of daily life. Because the first Hebrew teachers in the settlements had themselves had a religious education, they would have known these words.[30] Hebrew was a language with potential for modern use, and Jews with a solid education in it would have been ready to start trying to speak it.

Weinreich (1980: 311) points out that the revitalization of Hebrew involved a separation from the Diaspora and from the Yiddish that represented the Diaspora. At the same time, because of the complex pattern of functional allocation that existed between Yiddish and *lashon kodesh* (Fishman, 1976), the Hebrew speakers who were the pioneering speakers of modern Hebrew were able to draw on both Yiddish and *lashon kodesh* as they started to speak Hebrew as a vernacular daily language.[31]

The movement for Hebrew revernacularisation or revitalization[32] may be dated from the series of pogroms and repressive measures in Russia following the assassination of the Tsar Alexander II in 1881. These events started a wave of mass emigration of Jews. Some two million or so left Eastern Europe. Most of the emigrants found their way to America, but a small number came to Palestine, then a somewhat neglected outpost of the Ottoman Empire. Among them were young intellectuals, influenced by European nationalism, and imbued with the notion of building a life in Palestine that was better than and different from the one they had known in Eastern Europe. It was these Jews who started coming to Palestine in the 1880s who brought with them and embraced the notion of using Hebrew as their national language, an all-purpose vernacular that would serve to mark the distinction from life in the Diaspora.

The idea was first promulgated by Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, a young Russian Jew, who arrived in the Promised Land in 1881. He was an indefatigable promoter of the revival of Hebrew, in his prolific writing, in his speaking, and in his own practice: he was the first to insist on speaking Hebrew at home and to raise his own children speaking the language. Ben Yehuda himself lived in Jerusalem, but with a few distinguished exceptions, his arguments fell on deaf or even inimical ears, as the majority of the religious Jews in Jerusalem continued to favour the restriction of Hebrew to its sacred functions. It was to be in the new Zionist settlements that the revitalization of Hebrew was to take place.

In a discussion of Hebrew language revitalization Nahir (1988) proposes that there were four steps (or components, for they overlap) in what he calls the 'Great Leap' to Hebrew. First, the children of the community were 'instilled' with the required linguistic attitudes; second, they were presented with a model of language use in school; third, they themselves came to speak and use Hebrew not just in the school but also outside it, as a second language; fourth, when these children grew up, they started using Hebrew as the language of communication with their own children, who then grew up as native speakers.

The language learning model referred to above helps clarify the relations between these factors. Taking language use with children as the outcome, the necessary conditions are knowledge of the language on the part of teachers and parents, motivation of the teachers and parents to use the language, and the actual kind and amount of exposure. I have already mentioned the knowledge

of Hebrew. In the next section, I will deal with the ideological basis for the decision taken to instill Hebrew in the children and to speak it. Here, then, my concern is with exposure.

How did the teaching actually start? Nahir says it followed from the decision to teach Hebrew in Hebrew, making use of the direct method. Until Eliezer Ben Yehuda's brief spell as a Hebrew teacher in Jerusalem in 1883, traditional European Jewish teaching had always assumed that Hebrew (and the Aramaic of the Talmud) was to be taught through Yiddish, the pupils' native language. Ben Yehuda taught, Fellman (1973: 49) reports, for a few months in an *Alliance Israèlite Universelle* school, using (at the suggestion of the principal, Nissim Bechar) the Berlitz (or direct) method of Hebrew through Hebrew.

In the schools of the agricultural settlements, under the patronage of the Baron de Rothschild, the regular medium of instruction for general subjects after 1884 had been French with Yiddish the language used for teaching Jewish subjects. There was no objection, however, when in 1886, David Yudelevic, emulated Ben Yehuda and started teaching Hebrew in Hebrew. Texts were prepared; all general subjects were taught in his school in Hebrew by 1888. By 1891, in several other colonies as well some subjects were being taught in Hebrew.

In 1892, a meeting of the nineteen members of the Hebrew Teachers Association decided that children of six should attend school for five years, that the Direct Method ('Hebrew in Hebrew') should be used, and that '... the explanation of the Bible is to be in Hebrew and in general all studies are to be explained in Hebrew' (Fellman, 1973). The next major step in providing children with opportunities to learn Hebrew was the opening of kindergartens, or preparatory programmes. In 1892 the Baron de Rothschild had opened a French kindergarten in Zikhron Ya'akov. Two years later, in 1894, a preparatory (pre-school) programme was opened in Rishon Le-Zion, in Hebrew, for four and five year-olds. The teachers were untrained; their work is reported to have been unimaginative. In 1896, three year-olds were admitted. A graduate of the school was sent to Jerusalem to be trained (at the Evelina de Rothschild school, in English). She returned in 1898 to open the first modern Hebrew kindergarten at Rishon Le-Zion with thirty pupils. More Hebrew kindergartens were opened, in Jerusalem (1903), in Safed, Jaffa, Haifa, Tiberias, Rehovot, Zikhron Ya'akov and Nes Ziyyonah (1904). Kindergartens became the main instrument of developing Hebrew fluency: 'Hebrew became almost the daily language of the youngsters' (Yosef Azaryahu cited by Fellman, 1973). 'The child became the teacher of his parents, his brothers, his sisters ...' (Chaim Zuta cited by Fellman, 1973).

A meeting of the Hebrew Teachers Association in 1895 adopted Hebrew as the language of instruction, with Sephardic pronunciation to be used (but Ashkenazic pronunciation was allowed in the first year in Ashkenazic schools, and for prayer and ritual). The next meeting of the association was not until 1903, at the close of a major convention of Jews of the Yishuv called in Zikhron Ya'akov by Ussishkin, the Russian Zionist leader. The fifty-nine members present accepted Hebrew as the medium of instruction of instruction and the direct method as the technique of instruction without much debate; there was general agreement also on the use of Ashkenazic script and Sephardic pronunciation.

The success of the new programmes in leading to language use was at first

quite slow. Smilansky (1930) reports that in 1891 Hebrewschool graduates stopped speaking Hebrew when they left school. Harshav (1993: 87–8) points out the evidence for this. Many of the heroes of the revival confessed to the problems they had speaking the new tongue. Bialik (the premier Hebrew poet of the revival) and Eliezer Shteynman (another major literary figure of the revival) were reported to still converse in Yiddish in the 1930s. Yosef Klauzner, the first professor of Hebrew Literature at the Hebrew University confessed that he needed a French translation of the Hebrew book of Job to console him for his mother's death. Ben-Yehuda, in his autobiography, admitted to slipping — in his thoughts — into Yiddish, French or Russian.

Harshav (1993: 108) presents evidence on the slow progress. Ahad Haam reported on a visit in 1893 that both teachers and students stammered. Smilansky in 1891 reported that the speech of the 'fanatics' was 'artificial' and 'stammering'. A student in Rehovot Hebrew School in 1896 recalls that they spoke 'Hebrew with Yiddish'. The level of Hebrew instruction in the schools as late as 1900 is shown by the proposals made then for teaching elementary vocabulary. One textbook proposed teaching two to three hundred words. Yiddish and even French continued to be used in Zikhron Yaakov, more even than Hebrew, until well into the present century. Harshav concludes that the first twenty years or so of the revival were disappointing in their results. He cites a statement made by Shlomo Tsemakh in 1904:

> Many in Eretz-Israel know Hebrew, but very few, almost none, use it for everyday needs, and the question is how to turn those who know Hebrew into Hebrew speakers. (Translated and cited by Harshav, 1994: 109.)

The breakthrough came, Harshav proposes, with the Second Aliya (1904–14), a wave of better educated and highly ideological immigrants. In this period, only a small part of the hundreds of thousands of Jews who were leaving East Europe actually came to work in Israel.[33] The immigrants made up in ideological intensity for their small numbers: the slogan of *Ha-Poel Ha-Tzair* (the Young Worker movement) proclaimed in 1906 'Hebrew land, Hebrew work, and Hebrew language'. It was in these small groups, including people like David Ben-Gurion, Berl Katznelson, and Yitzhak Ben-Tzvi who became the leaders of the Zionist movement) that the first successful efforts were made to use Hebrew for daily life.

At the same time, there were two other critical developments. In 1899, Baron Rothschild ceased to be responsible for education in the Jewish settlements, and the way was left open for Hebrew to replace French, which probably happened by 1908. At this time, too, Hebrew was introduced to the city, especially in Tel Aviv, proclaimed from its beginning in 1906 as the 'first Hebrew city', with all its public business to be conducted in that language. The Hertzliya Gymnasium, a secondary school founded in Jaffa in 1906 and moved to Tel Aviv, and the Hebrew Gymnasium, founded in Jerusalem in 1908, were city high schools whose pupils learned in Hebrew and used it outside school.

The change to Hebrew use took place, then, between 1906 and 1914. Bachi (1956) reports that the 1916 census had 40% of Jews in Eretz-Israel (34,000 of 85,000) claiming Hebrew as their first or only language: the figures are higher

Table 2

Year	*Event*
1881	Eliezer ben Yehuda comes to Israel
1888–90	First Hebrew-medium schools in the settlements
1899	Rothschild leaves settlements
1906	Second Aliya, city schools
1913	Ezra schools switch to Hebrew

(75%) among the young.[34] The process of language revitalization, as I define it, then, took between twenty and twenty-five years, and while there remained a great deal to do to develop Hebrew as a full modern spoken and written language, the basis had been well established. A table summarising these events might be helpful (see Table 2).

Conditions for Successful Language Revitalization: A Preliminary Model

While the causes of language shift proved at first hard to sort out (Kloss, 1966), Fishman (1991) argues that (apart from obvious legal prohibitions on language use), the main reason seems to be dislocation of one kind or another. Physical and demographic dislocation are obvious. Physical dislocation is involved in immigration (as shown in the loss documented in the United States) or in urbanisation. Demographic dislocation refers to mixing of populations, as in the Soviet Union or in the Gaeltacht (O'Riagain). Social dislocation often results from physical or demographic dislocation, as bear witness the normally lower status of immigrants or higher status of colonists. Cultural dislocation is dangerous even — especially — when it is a consequence not of totalitarian oppression but of democratisation and modernisation. The traditional societies that maintained traditional languages were authoritarian and conservative.[35] The cultural changes associated with modernisation attacked both the traditions and the traditional language in which it was expressed.

For a language to have reached a situation where language revitalization is needed, where only a tiny proportion of intergenerational transmission is the result of home language use, one or more of the kinds of dislocation must have been operating. In principle, reversal of language shift would seem to require the use of the same force in an opposite direction. Physically or demographically, the language group needs to be returned to its original home or to its original demographic purity. Socially. the equality or superiority of the language group needs to be asserted or reasserted. Culturally, the traditional values and practices need to be restored or replaced by modified values or practices that can be shown or argued to derive from traditional values.

Various aspects of these relocations can be seen working in all the reversing

language shift efforts described in Fishman (1991), and they are particularly important in the ideological bases for Hebrew and Maori revitalization.

The Ideological Basis for Hebrew Language Revitalization

From the end of Hebrew monolingualism, and certainly by the late Second Temple period, Jewish society tended to what Rabin (1981) labelled triglossia. The H language in this pattern, used for prayer and study and normally for all writing was *Lashon kodesh*, a blend of Hebrew and Aramaic. The L language, used within the home and the community in most other domains, was a Jewish language. Yiddish is the prototypical Jewish language, but there were many others: distinctively Jewish varieties of Aramaic, of Greek, of Spanish, of French, of Venetian and other Italian dialects, of Arabic, of Persian. Alongside these functioned a third language, the language used for dealing with the non-Jews, labelled by Weinreich (1980) as the co-territorial vernacular.

This triglossic background helps to make clearer what was involved in the ideologically motivated revitalization of Hebrew as part of the development of modern Jewish national identity. The unusual success of this revitalization owes much both to the continued role of Hebrew among Jews for the centuries when it was not spoken and to the strength of the ideological basis of the new movement.

Jewish emancipation in modern times set new choices both of identity and of language. In Western Europe, many Jews saw the possibility of assimilation of external values, combined with a rejection of both Hebrew and the Jewish languages. This may be seen with the development of the Reform movement. German was to be the language in which Jews expressed their religious identity. Their differences from Gentiles were to be theological but not linguistic or cultural. The use of the standard coterritorial language in the synagogue, itself renamed temple, marked an attempt at building a new identity.

The movement for the revival of Hebrew began in Eastern Europe and in Palestine in the latter part of the nineteenth century, under the influence of European national movements, which viewed the language of a people as inseparable from its nationhood. There was, however, as Rabin (1973: 69) noted, an essential difference between the Hebrew revival movement and the language movements associated with European nationalism. In the European cases, the usual task faced by the language revival campaign was to find a way to add literacy functions and formal status (H functions) to a spoken (L) variety of a language; in the case of Hebrew, the goal was opposite: to add spoken (L) functions to a language whose literacy status was already clearly established. Whereas the peoples mobilised by the European national movements could often be united by a common vernacular, the Jews were divided by their vernaculars, but they could be united by appeals to the symbolic association of Hebrew with tradition and peoplehood.

Emancipation offered the Western European Jews (transitorily, as it turned out) a chance to be reasonably like their non-Jewish neighbours, except in certain unexceptionable religious tenets. The adoption of the standard language was the mark of this identity. Carried further, it offered a promise of complete assimilation.

The rise of nationalism in nineteenth century Europe made this easy assimilation difficult or impossible for many. The growth of the new national identities automatically marked Jews as outsiders. One response to this phenomenon was to develop a modern Jewish national identity. There were at least two distinct varieties of national identity offered, each associated with its own language. The first was the ultimately territorialist version of modern Jewish nationalism, called Zionism and associated with the revitalization of Hebrew. The second was the more culturally oriented version that adopted the standardisation of the Jewish vernacular, Yiddish, as its main emphasis.

These two movements and their associated language policies and practices have been well studied, so that I need touch on only a few features of each. The Zionist movement of the late nineteenth century was ideologically focused on the rejection of the artificiality (as it saw it) of Jewish life in the Diaspora. For Jews to regain their national identity, they needed the same things that other nations possessed: a land of their own, and their own language. While there was some wavering, the overwhelming sentiment was for return to the land from which Jews had been exiled eighteen hundred years before. It seemed logical to make the case that the new language of Jewish identity should be the language spoken before that dispersion, and in which the prayers for the return to Zion had been expressed daily ever since.

The attempts at language revitalization and at resettlement began independently — there were those who started to write and even speak Hebrew in Europe, and the early settlers in Palestine continued to use Yiddish for some years. But the process of revitalization took place both in the settlements where the Zionist pioneers were returning to the land as farmers and in the new Hebrew towns. There was important support for the process from ideologues and enthusiasts like Eliezer Ben Yehuda, but the revitalization itself depended on the those who had adopted the new identity of Hebrew farmers and townspeople in their historical Land. Their use of the revived language marked their own new identity.

An alternative approach was taken by proponents of Yiddish. Fishman (1980) has shown the importance of the 1907 Tshernovits conference in the development of the Yiddish nationalist movement. There were contradictory ideological winds blowing at that meeting. The Conference resolution, for instance, satisfied itself with proclaiming Yiddish as *a* Jewish national language, alongside Hebrew. One of the key organisers, Nathan Birnbaum, was a few years later to found what became the leading anti-Zionist religious party, *Agudat Israel*. Many of the people at the conference wrote in Hebrew as well as Yiddish. But the central theme was the value of developing a secular, nonterritorial, but decidedly Jewish cultural identity, to be expressed in Yiddish.

The Zionists were at the same time making their own decisions about language. In 1907 Po'ale Zion (a part of the Labour Party) issued two numbers of a periodical in Yiddish. This was strongly criticised by another faction, *Ha-Poel ha-Tzair*. The Labour party decided at the end of long debate in summer 1907 to issue its official journal only in Hebrew. It is significant that this decision was made one year before the Tsernovits conference, which Fishman (1980) holds as marking the establishment of an ideological basis for the Yiddish language

movement; he (1980: 66) dates the proclamation of Yiddish as an expression and symbol of Jewish national identity to 1902–5. He also points out (1980: 69) that at Tsernovits it was possible to argue that because Zionists who favoured Hebrew had not rejected Yiddish, the conference in its turn should not reject Hebrew, and so the conference declared Yiddish *a* and not *the* national Jewish language.

It is important at this point to make clear the fundamental difference in the tasks undertaken by the proponents of the Yiddish revival movement and the Hebrew revival. For Yiddish, as with so many other European languages associated with national movements, the aim was to add or approve the addition of high status functions to a widely spoken but low status language; for Hebrew, the task was to add or approve the addition of daily use and speech (a low status function which could be raised ideologically) to a language with high status.

The dispute between the supporters of the two languages was marked by strong rhetoric and worse. In 1914, for instance, Chaim Zhitlowsky visited Palestine and lectured in Haifa, Jerusalem and Jaffa in Yiddish. The last of a planned series of lectures by him was disrupted by a demonstration of Herzliyyah high school pupils. Zhitlowsky in an article in *Ha-Ahdut* argued that only Yiddish could maintain the unity of the Jewish people. In a reply, A. Hashin argued that Yiddish was not revolutionary; only Hebrew could be the national language.

After the end of the First World War, supporters of Hebrew, concerned that new immigration from Europe would strengthen Yiddish, led a renewed ideological campaign. A proposal by N. Twerski that knowledge of Hebrew be a prerequisite for election to the autonomous Jewish institutions in Eretz-Israel was adopted at the Third Constituent Assembly of the Yishuv (new Jewish settlements in Palestine) in December 1918. At a meeting in Philadelphia of the American *Po'ale Zion* at the same time, a resolution was passed calling for equal rights for Yiddish in Palestine. The language question became a major issue in the struggle to unite the Labour movement. From 1925 until 1930, the debate in Palestine was much more personal, and attempts to found a chair of Yiddish at the Hebrew University in 1927 were defeated. The distinguished Hebrew poet, Nahman Bialik, who himself continued to speak Yiddish at home with his wife, was in the 1930s involved in a public incident with members of the self-styled Legion of Defenders of the Language. The struggle with Yiddish continued even after Hebrew was firmly established. It was seen as a continuing threat during the immigration of the early days of independence in the 1950s. Yiddish was the prototype enemy of Hebrew. It was the language associated with the Diaspora, and so of a rejected identity of Diaspora Jew. It was the language of the religious anti-Zionists, a group seen as a constant reminder of another rejected identity. And it was the language espoused by an ideology that had rejected territorialism and the return to Zion.

The struggles were bitter, vitriolic in rhetoric and from time to time moving to physical violence. As late as the 1970s, it was easy to find continuing evidence of the official persecution of the language (Fishman & Fishman, 1974). Yiddish could not, until quite recently, be admitted to schools and universities, or used on radio.[36]

The ideological choices offered to a young Jew growing up in say Odessa in

the early years of this century were each tied to a language choice. If he chose to remain religiously observant, he would continue to speak his Yiddish mother tongue, study and write Hebrew all day, and learn the phrases of Ukrainian needed for dealing with his non-Jewish neighbours. If he were ready to attempt full assimilation — believing perhaps in the universalistic ideas of the new revolutionary socialist parties — he would feel bound to learn the local language. If he decided to follow the path of secular education, he would add to this a western language of science like German or French. And if he chose one or other version of Jewish nationalism, he would select either standardised and ennobled Yiddish or its rival, vernacularised and modernised revived Hebrew.

The beginning of Hebrew revitalization in these historical circumstances helps account for its ideological strength. The revitalization of Hebrew depended, I have argued, on this strong ideology. When Hebrew later spread to new immigrants, there was good instrumental motivation, as their acceptance in the new Hebrew-speaking society depended on their learning its language. But the settlements and towns where the language was revitalized between 1890 and 1910 were homogeneously Yiddish speaking, with no need for an internal lingua franca. Ideology was what counted.

Choosing Hebrew meant rejecting other languages. Arabic was perhaps not a serious choice, for while the Sephardim living in Safed and Tiberias and Jerusalem were fluent in the language, it was not the language of government. The Arabic used in Ottoman Palestine was a vernacular for street use, not a language for modern life. Turkish too was restricted to soldiers and senior officials.

French was a potential threat, partly because of its position as a high European language of culture, but more because it was the language of the Rothschild family who had supported the early agricultural settlements and their educational systems. Until 1899, secular education in the schools of the settlements was in French. Religious instruction was however in Yiddish, and at first, Hebrew was introduced for Jewish subjects and then, when the Baron's interests were turned elsewhere, for all subjects.

Another threat came from German, the language widely accepted at the beginning of the century as the language of advanced science and learning. The *Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden*, established in 1901, worked to help the language spread policies of the German government. In the early years of the century, it established in Palestine a school system that ranged from kindergarten to teacher training college, which came to accept Hebrew as medium of instruction. It was the *Hilfsverein* that set off a furore in 1913 when its board proposed to establish a tertiary-level institute of technology in Haifa. This new institution was to use German as the language of instruction for science and technology. This proposal ignited the 'Language War', with pro-Hebrew teachers and pupils from the *Hilfsverein* joining in public demonstrations that led to the reversal of that decision.

Rejecting these languages and choosing Hebrew was also rejecting ideologies associated with them, for as Harshav (1993: 92) makes eminently clear, the proponents of Hebrew revitalization saw themselves as establishing not just a new language but also a new society. 'It was', he points out, 'a revival not only

of the Hebrew *language* but also of Hebrew *culture* and a Hebrew *society*'. They set out to establish a new way of life in a new country. From the commercial life of the East European *shtetl*, they turned to life as farmers (the First Aliya) or, even more radically, to life in communal settlements.

> A handful of young people in strange landscapes, in a desolate and hostile world, the first generation of a budding society, a society without parents and grandparents, they surrounded their precarious existence with a brand-new fence — a fence of an emotionally perceived ideology and a new Hebrew language. (Harshav 1993: 9)

Those who planned to build cities planned that the cities would be Hebrew-speaking and clean:

> We must urgently acquire a considerable chunk of land, on which we shall build our houses. Its place must be near Jaffa, and it will form the first Hebrew city, its inhabitants will be Hebrews a hundred percent; Hebrew will be spoken in this city, purity and cleanliness will be kept, and we shall not go in the ways of the goyim. (1906 Prospectus for Tel Aviv, cited and translated in Harshav 1993: 143)

In rejecting other languages, the proponents of Hebrew were rejecting other ways of life as well:

> The revival of the Yishuv, the new Jewish community in Eretz-Israel, was also formulated to a large extent in contrasting oppositions: Zionism as opposed to a Socialist solution in the Diaspora; Hebrew as opposed to Diaspora Yiddish; the 'Sephardi accent' as a 'pioneer' and 'masculine' language as opposed to the 'moaning' and religious Ashkenazi Hebrew; a 'Hebrew' people and 'Hebrew' work as opposed to the distorted 'Jewish' character … (Harshav, 1993: 21)

It was the force of these ideologies, strong enough to bring those who held them to a 'hostile and desolate world' that accounted for the strength of motivation to adopt a new language from within. Of the two million or so Jews who left Eastern Europe between 1882 and 1914, only a select and highly motivated group chose Eretz-Israel, and many of them left before or during the First World War. For those who moved to the West, or for those others who left the *shtetl* for the cities, the switch from Yiddish to the co-territorial vernacular was largely the normal acculturation of immigrants to the instrumental claims of the receiving society. For the tiny group who came to Palestine, there was no instrumental push to adopt the language of the surroundings, but a much more difficult task to develop and revitalize a language. They accepted physical dislocation, but found a way to relocate demographically, socially and culturally. The result was successful language revitalization. It took some forty years, but by 1921, Hebrew, changed as it was in the process, was once again a living language.

The Ethnic and Ideological Basis for Maori Language Revitalization Efforts

Looked at from outside, the Maori revival efforts appear to be simply a part of a politically and economically motivated ethnic movement. There is no denying that Maori people are economically, educationally and culturally disadvantaged. They have moved to the cities (physical and demographic dislocation) forming a large and worrisome underclass, with high levels of unemployment, suicide, drunkenness and crime (social dislocation) and given up on much of their traditional language, culture, and way of life (cultural dislocation).

The language revitalization programmes can be seen — as the Ministry clearly does — as simply a way of dealing with the social problem, by improving retention at school and trying to catch up with the still widening gap between Maori and non-Maori education. The economic aspects of the other Waitangi Tribunal activities are also salient, with conflict imminent about the enormous cost of meeting claims for lands seized contrary to the terms of the Treaty.[37] The claim for Maori language restoration look as much like an economic matter as do the claim for restoring fishing rights or the claims for access to public radio and television channels.

If no more than this is involved, there is the possibility that meeting the political or economic claims will lead to a loss of interest in language matters. One is reminded of what happened with Navajo education. The initial campaign in the early 1970s for Navajo control of schools on the Reservation was language related. During the 1970s, the Tribe gained increasing control of the schools, and over a 1000 Navajo teachers were trained and appointed. With a handful of exceptions, these schools and teachers use English, and Navajo language loss is proceeding at an increasing pace.

The question, then, is the strength and nature of ideological support for the language revitalization movement. Does it go beyond the linguistic, the economic and the social spheres? Are there signs of the strength of ideology, of the cultural motivation, that will lead educated Maori native speakers of English to shift to their less well controlled Maori?

There are hints of this. First, the *Kohanga reo* movement was community based and has constantly shied away from too cosy a relationship with government. Only now, fourteen years after the movement started, has a university-based training programme been started for all Maori immersion early childhood teachers,[38] complementing the Whakapakari programme operated by the Kohanga Reo Trust. In developing the curriculum, the need for Maori control was asserted:

> It is therefore important that Maori retain control of programme design and development, are at the centre of gathering a knowledge base and are responsible for programme implementation. (Ritchie, 1994: 4)

Both the *kohanga reo* and the bilingual and immersion programmes within public schools have been concerned with maintaining ethnic identity. In my earlier paper, I described the ceremonies I went through to enter the immersion classrooms. I cite that description:

I mentioned the formal *powhiri* or welcome at Wilford School, but it was on the trip to the Waikato and East Coast that I really started to learn protocol. My escort (a Maori education adviser) had told me that we would be met by some of his colleagues who would look after us, and while we were sitting talking to the newly appointed Maori principal and his Maori school committee chairman at Rakaumunga School, four women (education advisers and itinerant teachers of Maori) arrived to fill an important role in the ceremony.

The greeting ceremony in the Waikato and East Coast generally followed the same pattern. Our party would wait, in a staff-room or principal's office or at the school gate, for a signal that it was time to enter. Preceded by one of the women with us, we would then walk in procession towards the classroom or building where the greeting was to take place. A local woman (a teacher or a pupil), would then appear and sing the *karanga*, to which our escort would reply. We would enter the room and sit down on a row of chairs. Facing us would be the school, or the class, with at least two men (teachers or school committee members) on their right. The *powhiri* started with a speech in Maori from the senior (in Maori terms) local person — sometimes the school principal or deputy principal, or school board chairman. At the end of the speech (which lasted about five minutes), the school would stand and sing a *waiata*. After a second speech of welcome and *waiata*, the male education adviser escorting me would give the first reply, after which the visiting group would stand and sing its *waiata*. I gave the second reply, starting my speech (at the suggestion of my escort) in Hebrew and then going on to explain (in English) something about Hebrew language revival.

After a *waiata*, we would hand over an envelope containing money as a substitute for the offering of food that is a traditional part of the visitor's role. The *powhiri* would conclude with the visiting party moving along a row of the local group (the adults and a few of the children) in order to shake hands and press noses.

It took me a while to grasp the significance of these formal Maori receptions that preceded most of my visits. In Wilford, it had seemed like a rather charming display of Maori culture, but on the Waikato and East Coast trip I came to appreciate that it served a number of important functions. In part, of course, there was the traditional Maori concern for showing respect to a visitor. One important aspect of this was the reciprocal effect. The more impressive the ceremony, the more important the visitor; but the more important the visitor, the more important the place he has chosen to visit. The showing of respect to an international expert in bilingual education showed in its turn the importance ascribed by the Department of Education to the particular programmes I was taken to visit. The ceremonial then had a positive value for the local community, and served to proclaim the importance of the bilingual programme.

The second interesting function performed by the traditional ceremony was

its definition and underlining of the Maoriness of the bilingual programmes I visited. The *powhiri* is the ceremony performed when guests come to a marae-atea, the physical space designated by a Maori group for traditional formal activities. One might consider the analogy of the sign found in many American schools that says 'Visitors must report to the Principal's Office'. The purpose of the sign is to make clear that access to the school is through the administrative bureaucracy; like the special badges given to visitors to a building with special security, they determine the degree of access allowed. These traditional Maori ceremonies made clear that access to the bilingual programme is under traditional Maori community control: the decision to admit a visitor is made not in an administrative but in a traditional way; visitors report not to the principal but to the local Maori community, and are clearly labelled as visitors. This was brought home to me by the remark of one European school principal, as I was leaving after a morning spent in his school's bilingual programme, that he has a policy requiring visitors to spend at least three days and look as the school as a whole; I interpreted this as an explanation of how my formal welcome by the *whanau* had replaced his regulation.

The establishment of the Maori bilingual programmes as Maori space was also emphasised by the physical surroundings; the classrooms were decorated with Maori art, and a number had traditional carvings in them as well. Thus, the bilingual programmes are establishing physical and social space for the process of linguistic and cultural revival. The schools I visited were state schools, but they had found ways, in the use of Maori as sole language of instruction and in other symbolic ways, to declare Maori space, a move towards the possible establishment of *Kaupapa Maori* schools, schools with a complete Maori philosophy. (Spolsky, 1989)

The *kura kaupapa Maori* are the third of the signs of ethnicity, revolutionary proclamations of opting out not just linguistically and ethnically but also ideologically from the mainstream. The terminology of the *kura* is Maori. It incorporates *Tikanga Whakaako* (Maori pedagogy), which uses culturally preferred methods and *Te Reo* (the Maori language) based on *Tikanga* (the ethical basis of Maori philosophy and practice) to teach *Taonga Tukuiho* (cultural aspirations principle), with full emphasis on the past, in order to assure *whakapapa* (intergenerational continuity) for the *whanau* (family and community).[39]

The rapid expansion of the *kura kaupapa Maori* over the past few years has been facilitated by the reform in the New Zealand educational system introduced in the closing years of the Labour Government. Under this Thatcherite scheme, regional school boards were abolished, and each individual school was required to set a board to negotiate a charter directly with the Ministry. The National Government has continued this policy, which makes provision for Government funding of approved non-public schools. Under this provision, the present Minister has approved sixteen new *kura kaupapa Maori*, and changed nine other schools to the status.

These three initiatives show the leaders of the Maori revitalization movement both opting out of the mainstream and working for the maintenance of *Te Reo*

Maori as a critical method of re-establishing the *whanau* (family) and iwi (tribe). The social and cultural relocation are being combined with physical and demographic relocation. While there has perhaps not been a great deal of return to the traditional village, there has been the building of Maori space in the cities, both in the new *maraes* and in the defined educational space of *kohanga reo*, immersion programme, and *kura kaupapa Maori*.

Maori and Hebrew: Contrasts and Similarities[40]

The comparison of Maori and Hebrew revitalization efforts is especially illuminating for the light it casts on the phenomenon of ideological revitalization. It is of course important to recognise the major differences, and I do this at the outset. The situation of the two languages at the beginning of the process was quite different: Hebrew had been unused as a spoken language for some 1700 years, while Maori still had significant numbers of older native speakers alive (see Table 3).

With its long literary tradition, Hebrew had the potency of a language with an immense storehouse of written material that recorded the constant shaping of the language to changing intellectual and practical needs. Maori depended on

Table 3

Stage	***Hebrew***	
	Year	*Event*
Language Loss	100 BCE	Bilingualism.
	200 CE	Loss of vitality.
Revitalization efforts	1881	Eliezer ben Yehuda comes to Israel.
	1888–90	First Hebrew-medium schools in the settlements.
Fluent use	1906	Second Aliya, city schools.
and vitality	1913	Ezra schools switch to Hebrew.
Stage	***Maori***	
	Date	*Event*
Language loss	1900	Bilingualism.
	1960	Loss of vitality.
Revitalization efforts	1981	*Kohanga reo* movement starts.
	1986	Maori official; Language Commission bilingual schools.
	1987	480 *kohanga reo*; a dozen bilingual schools; one or two *kura kaupapa Maori*.
	1990	Six *kura kaupapa Maori*.
	1993	38 *kura*, 335 other schools offering Maori-medium instruction.

an oral tradition, good parts of which were recorded in writing in the nineteenth century, and on a period of adaptive literacy during the second half of the nineteenth century.

There was also a major difference in the changes involved. Hebrew had the task of adding an L variety to an H language. That is to say, the process of revitalization was at the same time one of vernacularisation. For Maori, the task was adding modern H functions to a language restricted in its domains. The tasks then is standardisation.[41] Allowing for these and other differences, the similarities remain notable. The first was the initial attempt to make the transition by gaining control of the school system, and when that seemed insufficient, by adding a pre-school component. The second was the independence of government initiative. The Hebrew and Maori efforts were neither of them the result of a government planning decision, but rather the activity of minority ethnic-based ideologies working to establish new identities. Both had to deal with physical, demographic, social and cultural dislocation.

Hebrew has succeeded in its goals, although the results have turned out somewhat differently from what was envisaged. Certainly there are complaints voiced by normativists that the language has changed unrecognisably.[42] And there are concerns expressed about the future vitality of the language, but they are no more than are found with most languages in the world today threatened by English.

For Maori, the issue is undecided as yet. Language revitalization efforts have reached the critical state, perhaps a little faster than with Hebrew, where the important breakthrough into vernacular fluency followed by *whakapapa* (normal intergenerational transmission) is still a challenge.

Notes

1. In MERCATOR-EDUCATION, issued by the Fryske Academy, April 1995.
2. Krauss (1991) is one of the first papers to make this point.
3. Fishman usually prefers positive titles: *Advances …*, *Progress …*, *Spread …*, etc. Although it is true that lately he has acknowledged *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival* and the need for *Reversing Language Shift*.
4. Spolsky & Kari (1978) for instance, while talking about language maintenance, trace the gradual loss and extinction of the Athapaskan language.
5. Summed up in Spolsky (1975).
6. Fishman (1991: 189–90) reports that 'the slow shift to English is now noticeable even in Reservation-interior communities'.
7. Dorian (1981) shows what can be learned about the process of language death.
8. It is not surprising that the study of minority languages is largely a-theoretical, as scholars' feelings of regret or triumph, cloud or brighten their perception of the object of their study, and of the forces working on it. This said, I am not sure that I would like the situation to be very different: dispassionate scholarship is possible only from a valueless position and easily serves to justify the absence of concern for the people whose fate is being studied. For a moving presentation of this point, see the author's preface to Fishman (1991).
9. For a fuller discussion of reasons to attempt to maintain threatened languages, see Fishman (1991: especially Chapter 3) who stresses the ethnocultural value, and Krauss (1991) who stresses the need to maintain differentiation in human species.
10. Haugen (1991) shows that the term was originally pejorative: fathers could teach Latin, but mothers could only pass on the vernacular, but by the time of Dante, it had acquired more elevated and less chauvinistic usage.

11. Fishman (1991) uses the term *revernacularisation* specifically referring to cases like Hebrew, where the vernacular was added to a classical language.
12. In this statement he was agreeing with Fellman (1973, 1974) and Rabin (1973).
13. This paper revises in a number of significant ways the model and claims presented in Spolsky (1991) and in Spolsky and Cooper (1991).
14. In doing this, I will be updating information and tentative conclusions in Spolsky (1989b).
15. Inability to observe the process with Hebrew, and difficulties in interpreting contemporary descriptions have led some scholars to give up on the 'examination of the problematic evidence and investigation of every person who spoke or taught Hebrew (the accounts of which are not clear anyway)', as Harshav (1993) confessed.
16. Other cases that might be equally revealing are Basque and Frisian.
17. Spolsky (1989b) was based on a study carried out at the request of the New Zealand Ministry of Education. The recommendations of the study are remembered, but have yet to be implemented.
18. A series of armed struggles between Maori *iwi* and British settlers and soldiers, lasting until the late 1800s.
19. While the full details of this report remain unpublished, the most recent analysis provided by Benton (1991) supplies the basis for this summary.
20. Graeme Kennedy (personal communication) suggested this to me.
21. Ritchie (1994) reports that 49% of the Maori children enrolled in early childhood services (some 46% of Maori children under the age of 5) are in *kohanga reo*. The Ministry of Education reported that Maori enrolment in early childhood coeducation doubled between 1983 and 1993.
22. In this Treaty, signed in 1840, Britain asserted sovereignty, with the undertaking that Maori land and other rights would be protected. The Tribunal rules that language was one of the protected rights.
23. *Te Komihana mo te Reo Maori*, chaired by Professor Timoti S. Karetu.
24. It is significant that *kura kaupapa Maori* is the first language initiative mentioned in the 1994 Ministry Report on the Ten Point Plan for Maori education.
25. In a document entitled *Maori Educational Trends* dated January 1995. My thanks to Rawiri Brell, Group Manager Maori in the Ministry of Education for these data and for comments on an earlier version of this paper.
26. The Ministry reported the existence of two *wananga* or Maori tertiary institutions, with 281 full-time equivalent places for 1994 and 473 places promised for 1995. These two Maori universities are in addition to Maori programmes in mainstream universities and in teacher training institutions. Maoris make up 8% of university students, 11% of polytechnic students, and 10% of college of education students.
27. In my 1987 visit, and again during discussions in 1995, I asked if there was evidence yet of informal use of Maori by pupils outside school. There was not, and the people I spoke too (active as teachers of Maori) confessed that they found it difficult to keep up Maori with their children at home. I observed English being used by Maori children in a *kohanga reo* especially when they were addressing the adults who were their own parents.
28. The date of this is disputed. Rabin has suggested that the last monolingual speaker would have been at the time of the Bar Kokhba Revolt (c. 120 CE); Fraade (1990) believes that Hebrew was still being spoken as a daily language in the Galilee as late as the 6th Century.
29. First published in Hebrew in Hungary in 1864. By 1908, more than twelve editions — 400–500,000 copies — had appeared, including plagiarised ones.
30. Fellman (1973: 51) cites the account of one of these early teachers, Yizhaq Epstein, who claims to have had little Hebrew education beyond elementary school; but this included Talmud until he entered High School, after which he read 'very little' modern Hebrew literature.
31. It would be ironic if continued research were to establish that the contemporary Hebrew language owes its basic Indo-European bent to the Yiddish with which it successfully competed for loyalty.

32. To distinguish it from the earlier cultural revival associated with the *Haskala*.
33. Harshav (1994: 135) cites an estimate that the number of immigrant workers in this period was not more than 3000.
34. Harshav (1994: 111–12) is doubtful of these numbers.
35. Consider for instance the place of women in most of them.
36. But things have changed in the last decade or so: see for instance, Hallel & Spolsky (1993).
37. The demonstration that prevented the Prime Minister making his speech about his commitment to bilingualism was aimed at a proposal by the government to set a cap on the amount of compensation to be paid on all outstanding claims under the Treaty of Waitangi.
38. It is significant that this initiative began under the aegis of the Maori-controlled *Te Puni Kokiri* (Ministry of Maori Development) but has now moved to the Ministry of Education.
39. The terms and their translations are taken from Appendix 1 to Ritchie (1994).
40. It is intriguing that one of the important assignments in a course on language revitalization, as part of the programme for training Maori early childhood teachers, is to compare the Maori and Hebrew cases. See Appendix V to Ritchie (1994).
41. Both also involved modernisation.
42. Both the Hebrew Language Academy and the Maori Language Commission express these concerns regularly.

References

Bachi, R. (1956) A statistical analysis of the revival of Hebrew in Israel. *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 2, 179–247.

Belich, J. (1986) *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Benton, Richard A. (1979) *The Legal Status of the Maori Language: Current Reality and Future Prospects*. Wellington: Maori Unit, New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Benton, Richard A. (1991) The Maori language: Dying or reviving. Working paper prepared for the EastWest Center Alumni-in-Residence Working Papers Series.

Cooper, Robert L. (1989) *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dorian, Nancy (1981) *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dorian, Nancy (1987) The value of language maintenance efforts which are unlikely to succeed. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language*, 68, 57–67.

Fellman, Jack (1973) Concerning the 'revival' of the Hebrew language. *Anthropological Linguistics* 15, 250–7.

— (1974) *The Revival of a Classical Tongue: Eliezer Ben Yehuda and the Modern Hebrew Language*. The Hague: Mouton.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1983) Language planning and language change. In Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds) *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives* (pp. 29–40). Berlin: Mouton.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1976) Yiddish and Loshn-Koydesh in traditional Ashkenaz: Problems of societal allocation of macro-functions. In Albert Verdoodt and Rolf Kjolseth (eds) *Language in Sociology* (pp. 39–489). Louvain: Editions Peeters.

— (1980) Attracting a following to high-culture functions for a language of everyday life: The role of the Tshernovits Conference in the 'Rise of Yiddish'. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 24, 43–73.

— (1982) Whorfianism of the third kind: Ethnolinguistic diversity as a world-wide societal asset. *Language in Society* 11, 1–14.

— (1989) Language spread and language policy for endangered languages. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

— (1991) *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, Joshua A. and Fishman, David E. (1974) Yiddish in Israel: A case study of efforts

to revise a monocentric language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 1, 126–46.

Fishman, Joshua A., Gertner, M.H. Lowy, E.G. and Milan, W.G. (1985) *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin: Mouton.

Fishman, Joshua A., Vladimir Nahimy, John Hofman, Robert Hayden *et al*. (1966) *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.

Glinert, Lewis (1987) Hebrew-Yiddish diglossia: Type and stereotype implications of the language of Ganzfried's Kitzur. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 67, 39–56.

Hallel, Michael and Bernard Spolsky (1993) The teaching of additional languages in Israel. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13, 37–49.

Harshav, Benjamin (1993) *Language in Time of Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California.

Haugen, Einar (1991) The 'mother tongue'. In Robert L. Cooper and Bernard Spolsky (eds) *The Influence of Language on Culture and Thought: Essays in Honor of the 65th Birthday of Joshua A. Fishman* (pp. 75–84). Berlin: Mouton.

Kloss, H. (1966) German-American language maintenance efforts. In Joshua A. Fishman *et al.* (eds) *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.

Krauss, Michael (1991) The world's languages in crisis. *Language* 68 (1), 4–10.

Nahir, Moshe (1988) Language planning and language acquisition: The 'Great Leap' in the Hebrew revival. In Christina Bratt Paulston (ed.) *International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education* (pp. 275–95). New York: Greenwood Press.

Rabin, Chaim (1973) *A Short History of the Jewish Language*. Jerusalem: The Jewish Agency.

— (1981) What constitutes a Jewish language. *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 30: 19–28.

Ritchie, James and Jane Ritchie (1979) *Growing Up in Polynesia*. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Ritchie, Jenny (1994) Development of Maori immersion early childhood education. Paper read at the International Language Conference, University of Hong Kong, December 14–16, 1994.

Smilansky, Ze'ev (1930) Letoldot hadibur ha'ivri be'eretz yisrael. (Towards a history of spoken Hebrew in Palestine). *Hapo'el Hatsa'ir* 23, 7.

Spolsky, Bernard (1975) Prospects for the survival of the Navajo language. In M. Dale Kinkade, Kenneth Hale and Oswald Werner (eds) *Linguistics and Anthropology, in Honor of C.F. Voegelin* (pp.597–606). Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.

— (1989a) *Conditions for Second Language Learning: Introduction to a General Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— (1989b) Maori bilingual education and language revitalization. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 9 (6), 1–18.

— (1991) Hebrew language revitalization within a general theory of second language learning. In Robert L. Cooper and Bernard Spolsky (eds) *The Influence of Language on Culture and Thought: Essays in Honor of the 65th Birthday of Joshua A. Fishman* (pp. 137–55. Berlin: Mouton.

Spolsky, Bernard and Robert L, Cooper (1991) *The Languages of Jerusalem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Spolsky, Bernard and James Kari (1978) Trends in the study of Athapaskan language maintenance and bilingualism. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism* (pp. 635–664). The Hague: Mouton.

Stewart, William (1968) A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 531–545). The Hague: Mouton.

Tsemakh, Shlomo (1965) *The First Year*. In Hebrew, Tel Aviv: Am Oved.

Waitangi Tribunal (1986) Findings of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to *Te Reo Maori* and a claim lodged by Huirangi Waikarapuru and *Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo* Incorporated Society (The Wellington Board of Maori Language), issued April 29, 1986.

Weinreich, Max (1980) *History of the Yiddish Language* (translated by Joshua A. Fishman and Shlomo Noble). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.