

# Languaging Diversity



# Languaging Diversity

*Identities, Genres, Discourses*

Edited by

Giuseppe Balirano

and Maria Cristina Nisco

Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing



Languaging Diversity: Identities, Genres, Discourses

Edited by Giuseppe Balirano and Maria Cristina Nisco

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Giuseppe Balirano, Maria Cristina Nisco and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-7122-2

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-7122-8

# CONTENTS

Foreword ..... viii

Prologue..... xv  
*Jocelyne Vincent*

## **IN THE NEWS**

A MD-Cads Analysis of ‘Diversity’ in British Newspapers..... 2  
*Cesare Zanca*

Languageing the Riots: A Corpus-based Investigation of the Rioters’  
Identity in the British Press ..... 16  
*Maria Cristina Nisco and Marco Venuti*

## **IN POLITICS**

At the Intersection of Class and Race: Languageing and Picturing  
Diversity in Post-apartheid South Africa..... 34  
*Claudia Ortu*

Building Ethnic Inclusiveness in a Plural Society: Kamla Persad-  
Bissessar’s 2010 Election Campaign in Trinidad and Tobago ..... 47  
*Eleonora Esposito*

“Black Man Runnin’ and It Ain’t from the Police”: Rap Music,  
Political Endorsement and Black Identity ..... 61  
*Paola Attolino*

## **CONSTRUCTING IDENTITIES**

Languageing Diversity in EU Institutional Discourse..... 76  
*Vanda Polese and Germana D’Acquisto*

The Counter-Hegemonic Discourse of Biodiversity: CDA of Vandana Shiva's Honorary Doctorate Acceptance Speech ..... 99  
*Anna Franca Plastina*

“How are you feeling?”, “What’s happening?”: Identity Construction via FB Status Messages ..... 116  
*Nicola Borrelli*

Identity, Discourse and Translation ..... 130  
*Urszula Zaliwska-Okrutna*

### **ACROSS GENERATIONS AND GENDERS**

Old and Young: Changing Evaluations of Intergenerational Diversity ... 144  
*Alison Duguid*

The Construction of Age Identity in an Online Discourse Community: The Case of Boomer Women Speak ..... 163  
*Laura Tommaso*

Discursive Shifts and ‘Mis-premising’ in the Representation of Male Homosexuality in AVT ..... 176  
*Bronwen Hughes*

And What about Same Sex Marriages? A Corpus-based Analysis of Lexical Choices and Social Attitudes ..... 197  
*Francesca Vigo*

### **ETHNICITIES**

Representation of Ethnic Identity of Tatars through the Ethnonym ‘Tatar’ ..... 212  
*Nailya Bashirova and Marina Solnyshkina*

A Course of Life or a Curse for Life? Discussing the Name of an Ethnic Minority in Romania ..... 226  
*Raluca Levonian*

Using Difference as a Weapon: Phenomena of Verbal Impoliteness in Maghrebi Arabic Dialects ..... 249  
*Luca D’Anna*

**POPULARISING IDEAS**

TED Culture and Ideas Worth Spreading ..... 262  
*Margaret Rasulo*

Speaker Identity vs. Speaker Diversity: The Case of TED Talks  
 Corpus ..... 279  
*Stefania D'Avanzo*

Metadiscourse Diversification in English and Italian Scientific  
 Magazines ..... 297  
*Silvia Masi*

Diversifying Language according to the Context: Popularizing Legal  
 Language in TV Series ..... 312  
*Adriano Laudisio*

Language, Identity and Diversity: An Epilogue? ..... 325  
*Giuseppe Balirano*

## FOREWORD

This volume intends to explore the thorny issue of *Language and Diversity*, focusing on the discourses that emerge as bearers of the values of *alterity*. Language enables the deployment of multiple identities that offer a specific representation of the *self* through explicit linguistic means, lexical and stylistic choices, and grammatical structures. It is in language that diversity is articulated with discursive practices that conceptualise what they name (Halliday 1994). Therefore, language can be seen as a space fostering the articulation and differentiation of identity values.

Discourse identity has become an increasingly popular research area in recent years (Benwell and Stokoe 2006; Llamas and Watt 2010), with its crucial assumption that speakers' identities are dynamically negotiated as discourse unfolds. Therefore, language acquires a pivotal role, when the expression of individual and/or group diversity occurs within the social and discursive practices that represent identity as a process of negotiation, a performance (De Fina, Schiffirin, Bamberg 2006). Indeed, the speakers' linguistic choices can be interpreted as a means to signal and highlight the way they construe their own and/or others' identity (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller refer to 'acts of identity', 1985).

The essays included in this volume, which are based on papers presented at the *Languaging Diversity International Conference* (held in 2013 at the University of Naples L'Orientale), seek to respond to such a critical landscape. The fruitful and thought-provoking observations that emerged from the Conference were further developed to explore the topics surrounding the modes in which diversity is linguistically articulated *by* and *in* discourse, from a series of different linguistic and critical perspectives. The various studies deal with how individuals draw on linguistic resources to achieve, maintain or challenge the representations pertaining to their cultural, social, ethnic, sexual, gender, professional, and institutional identities. The contributions presented here reveal the need to devote a wider critical attention to the ways identities can be linguistically and multimodally articulated and represented in the various discourses produced by different societies.

The volume comprises six sections, which group the essays according to their specific focus, although a number of methodologies is employed for analyses and a variety of theoretical frameworks is referred to.



The first section, *IN THE PRESS*, opens with **Cesare Zanca**'s analysis of the wide range of interpretations and evaluations linked to the concepts of 'diversity' and 'alterity', and triggered by different contexts of use and discourses. With his emphasis on the socio-cultural relevance of the keyword 'diversity', Zanca carries out a corpus-assisted discourse study (CADS) investigation of British newspapers to examine the ways in which the press 'languages' diversity. **Maria Cristina Nisco** and **Marco Venuti**'s essay tackles the ways in which the British press linguistically represented the protagonists involved in the 2011 UK riots, by offering a series of construals that almost invariably locate them within the framework of law and order, crime and anarchy. By drawing a comparison between the reporting of the most recent events and that of the riots in the 1980s and 1990s (as emerging from the existing literature), the authors show that the way newspapers manage diversity is pivotal in conveying racial, social or age connotations.

In the second section, *IN POLITICS*, **Claudia Ortu** examines how diversity is 'languaged' and pictured in post-apartheid South Africa. Widely known as the 'Rainbow Nation', South Africa is one of the most *diverse* countries in the world, and can therefore extensively contribute to the study of the articulations of the concept of diversity, as the author highlights. By taking into account a political text employed by the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) – which was meant to confront neoliberal policies while defending the interests of the workers affected by such policies – the essay offers an entry point into issues of race and class diversity as emerging from the cartoon strips construing the political narrative. Shifting the focus to another plural and heterogeneous area, the Caribbean, **Eleonora Esposito** examines the linguistic and multimodal strategies that enabled the Indo-Trinidadian political leader Kamla Persad-Bissessar to cross the ethnic and political divide in Trinidad and Tobago by proposing a new politics of multiculturalism in the country. Kamla Persad-Bissessar's political speeches, which constitute the corpus under scrutiny in Esposito's analysis, are based on the celebration of diversity and multiethnicity, a strategy that is used to avoid exclusivism and promote power sharing. The third essay included in the section, by **Paola Attolino**, concentrates on a remarkable political event: the 2008 elections of the 44<sup>th</sup> and current President of the United States, Barack Obama. As the first politician to get support from the Hip Hop community, Obama's candidacy was endorsed by African American rappers, who gave rise to an interesting new genre: Obama Rap. By analysing a corpus of rap songs, the author investigates to what extent

linguistic choices and pragmatic strategies in the lyrics reveal a reconciliation between rap music and politics, while advocating a new and upcoming idea of Black American identity.

The third section, **CONSTRUCTING IDENTITIES**, opens up with **Vanda Polese** and **Germana D'Acquisto**'s investigation of the ways in which diversity is 'language'd in institutional discourse on immigration and integration. By carrying out a qualitative and quantitative analysis of a corpus of legal texts – EU Directives – the authors identify the emerging and dominant notions related to immigration (assimilation, inclusion, intercultural or social integration, and so forth). The second essay, by **Anna Franca Plastina**, starts from the debated concept of globalisation (against which several commentators and activists urge alternative solutions for a more sustainable world), and analyses Vandana Shiva's honorary doctorate acceptance speech. The author shows that the keyword 'diversity' unlocks a discursive space in which biodiversity is articulated as a response to the legitimacy of capitalist globalisation and its hegemonic discourse. Moving to a different context, **Nicola Borrelli**'s essay examines how Facebook users codify their identity, offering a specific set of semiotic representations to the online community. FB status update messages, collected from British and Italian users and included in the corpus analysed by the author, constitute a digital extension of real-life discursive practices; indeed, the users' 'online persona' and multimodal identities are communicated via a digital medium. The last essay in this section, by **Urszula Zaliwska-Okrutna**, examines discourse diversity as emerging from J.K. Rowling's novel *The Casual Vacancy* (2012) which seems to pose a real challenge to the translator. More specifically, by taking into account the Polish translation of the text, the author focuses on the glottic identity of the translator and on how it influences the translation itself – glottic identity being not about group roles or identities but rather about the added individual flavours.

In the fourth section, **ACROSS GENERATIONS AND GENDERS**, **Alison Duguid** investigates how diversity is treated discursively in the language of the press as far as age is concerned. As a socio-cultural construct, age has always been employed to construct collective or individual identities; however, such identities are negotiated and renegotiated, with varying evaluations attached to them. By diachronically analysing a corpus of newspaper articles, using a corpus-assisted discourse studies approach, Duguid tracks changes in language usage which reflect extra-linguistic (social, political, historical, cultural, etc.) changes, revealing the several

ways of ‘linguaging’ age diversity and its changing evaluations. The construction of age identity is also the focus of **Laura Tommaso**’s essay, which concentrates on text-based online interaction in elderly online communities (an area that has received little empirical attention in linguistic research). After selecting the *Boomer Women Speak* discussions forums (a corpus that was analysed by adopting a corpus-assisted discourse studies approach), the author examines the discursive strategies that boomer women employ to present and negotiate their age identities, online communities providing a rich communication arena. The focus of the second part of the section shifts to gender-related topics and more specifically gay discourse. Starting from the assumption that gay discourses are often steeped in ideology and stereotypes that vary from nation to nation, **Bronwen Hughes** highlights the centrality of translation, and in particular audiovisual translation (AVT), in the representations of the ‘other’ from the source to the target culture and language. By concentrating on the dubbing of the TV series *Queer as Folk* UK into Italian – adopting the framework of descriptive Translation Studies – the author seeks to ascertain whether the dubbed target version is ‘adequate’ (namely, it respects the norms of the original source text) or ‘acceptable’ (that is complying with the norms of the target culture). While considering the potential crisis points in translation, caused by the extra-linguistic culture-bound references present in the source text, Hughes also reflects on the ‘mis-premising’ of social roles deriving from the crossing-over from English to Italian. Still on gay discourse, **Francesca Vigo**’s essay takes into account issues relating to same-sex marriages by analysing a diachronic corpus of British and Italian newspaper articles with the aim of tracing and describing how the two cultures deal with certain social phenomena and sexual preferences. Since the newspapers’ lexical choices may be seen as good indicators of cultural attitudes, after carrying out a corpus-based analysis, the author shows the extent to which both British and Italian cultures have changed their behaviour – on the lexical and sociological level – over time.

In the fifth section, ETHNICITIES, **Nailya Bashirova** and **Marina Solnyshkina** present a corpus and discourse analysis of the linguistic means of self-presentation of Kazan Tatar young generation in online social communities. The authors focus their analysis on the semantic evolution of the ethnonym ‘Tatar’ in the Tatar and Russian languages spoken in the Republic of Tatarstan. The word ‘Tatar’ is firstly analysed in the corpus of Written Tatar and Russian National Corpus in order to reveal its fixed connotations in the two languages creating a stereotypical image

of the Tatar. Secondly, the discourse analysis of the ethnonym in young Tatars' Internet social community names epitomises an altered self-awareness of Tartars' ethnicity. In the second paper, **Raluca Levonian** investigates the case of a campaign conducted by a Romanian daily newspaper, aiming to replace the term 'rrom/rom', the official Romanian name of the Roma minority, with the term 'țigăn' ('Gypsy'). The arguments provided contribute to the discursive construction of the national identity although, according to the author, the campaign pretended to be centered on the non-discriminative representation of ethnic diversity. The search for a marked linguistic differentiation of the minority from the majority does not show an attempt to be 'politically correct' as the newspaper claimed, but rather a strong desire for segregation. The study illustrates how language use plays a key role in the process of asserting and re-dimensioning identities and how 'linguaging' diversity is, ultimately, a matter of conceiving and expressing one's own identity. The third paper in this section, by **Luca D'Anna**, explores issues of linguistic diversity which can be concealed, stressed or even claimed in language usage when employed as effective weapons in order to find a prominent place in several manifestations of verbal impoliteness. The author focuses on similar linguistic phenomena which have occurred in the Arab-Islamic culture throughout its history and still occur in contemporary Arabic dialects. In Western cultures, the concept of race was presumably used to define *alterity*, at least in the modern age. Islamic societies, on the contrary, always leaned towards the definition of affiliations and differences on a religious basis. D'Anna discusses this issue taking into consideration the usage of religion, race and sexual orientation in the creation of slurs and dysphemisms in contemporary Maghrebi Arabic dialects, describing their underlining patterns by means of a wide exemplification.

In the sixth section, POPULARISING IDEAS, **Silvia Masi** proposes a comparative exploration of the use of some meta-discursive resources in a small corpus of texts from popular scientific magazines in English and Italian, namely *Scientific American* and *Le Scienze*. Scientific popularization is a meeting point of different discourse communities with their own needs, intentions and modes of communication. Metadiscourse can be modulated and can modulate communication in different ways, as it covers a variety of linguistic elements which are aimed at organising the text for its readers – the interactive dimension – and at engaging them in exposition and argumentation – the interactional dimension. Masi's analysis shows indices of the dominant role played by scientific actors vis-

à-vis other social identities, thus providing insights for a clearer positioning of the text sample under analysis within the manifold modes of expression of scientific popularisation. **Margaret Rasulo** present study on TED talks, “TED culture and ideas worth spreading”, represents the first step in determining whether TED affords organisations and individuals the opportunity to stimulate dialogue and genuine knowledge sharing and whether it provides space-for-growth within its distinct culture. TED has stirred up everyone’s thirst for knowledge and it makes ideas freely available on the Internet taking the TED talks from the privileged and elitist scenario of the main conference venues to the online reality, and in doing so, they created an innovative platform that can propel ideas forward. According to the author, through the popularisation process TED has helped bring complex thoughts and theories to massive audiences of non-experts in a wide range of topics and fields. This paper convincingly suggests that ideas are also made to be challenged and tested before convincing people that they might be worth spreading. The third paper on popularisation by **Stefania D’Avanzo** focuses on speaker identity and speaker diversity in the TED talks corpus. The paper focuses on language differentiation deriving from different rhetorical choices made by speakers belonging to different professional categories. TED talks are delivered by experts – specialists in a great number of different fields – and are aimed at a non-specialist audience. The talks are made available online by a non-profit organisation devoted to “Ideas Worth Spreading”. In the present study, the author’s attention is mainly devoted to ‘how’ speakers belonging to a number of different professional categories build up their own identity through the employment of specific rhetorical choices. Thus, 1,131 talks have been investigated, subdivided into eight professional categories depending on the speaker: academics, entrepreneurs, employees in companies and consultants, politicians, artists, literary writers and lay people (both VIPs and ordinary people). Particular importance is also given to the distinction between expert and lay, in order to understand to what extent rhetorical choices aimed at achieving proximity with the reader are influenced by the degree of expertise of the speakers themselves. In the last article of this section, **Adriano Laudisio** draws a comparison of two corpora with the aim of investigating the genre of legal drama. The first corpus includes the scripts of all the episodes of the first four series of the American legal drama *The Good Wife*, and is a sub-corpus of a larger one, made up of the ten legal dramas collected to investigate the genre. The reference corpus is the Supreme Court Dialogue Corpus, which features the transcriptions of the Supreme Court. The aim of this paper is to investigate the genre of legal drama from a linguistic and

contrastive point of view in a preliminary attempt to define it as a genre, as well as to find out whether legal dramas can ease the popularisation of specialised – legal – contents. Along with the investigation of the ‘legal drama’ genre, Laudisio’s study aims at discovering the language choices made by the fictional speakers of the legal drama *The Good Wife* and the differences between the specialised language used by experts of law and popularised legal language when an expert addresses a non-expert interlocutor. As power relationships and aspects related to belonging to a discourse community are involved, this research appeals to Critical Discourse Analysis to analyse the relationships between speakers.

We do hope this volume may further contribute to the analysis of linguistic and cultural diversity in different fields of investigation by bringing an array of multifaceted complexities to the difficult analysis of language and identity. This introduction has given us the opportunity to present the single papers, inevitably only briefly exploring the important issues arising from the contributions, then leaving other non less marginal points to be made by the authors’ own voices. May this volume be considered a modest step in the direction of diversity studies in any field or sub-field of linguistic research.

Finally, our deepest gratitude goes to the scholars, and good friends, who read and commented on previous versions of this volume: Julia Bamford, Jocelyne Vincent and Mark Weir. It is impossible to determine their exact contribution to the volume, but the editors firmly believe that without their support, the book would not merely be different, it would be less interesting.

**The Editors**

# PROLOGUE

JOCELYNE VINCENT

## ***Languing Diversity: what were we thinking of?***

*Languing diversity* is an evocative, and rather busy title, not to mention a buzzy one, but what does it actually mean? What were we thinking of when we gave it?

We were, indeed, struck, if not surprised, by the diversity of interpretations of the terms of our title and of the issues involved in the responses to our call for papers.

*Diversity*, for a start, is one of those terms we do often use without realizing perhaps that we are using it with *diverse* meanings, that it is polysemous, that it itself displays diversity. Its *diverse* meanings intertwine to cover a conceptual field (held together by etymological, logical and metaphorical connections) co-articulated by synonyms and partial synonyms. Even without going to the dictionaries, thesauri and/or looking at its roots, or etymology, nor doing proper concordancing, a little reflection reveals its *diverse* (though related) meanings. We can see them reflected in its neighbours such as *different*, *various*, *alternate*, *alternative*, *variant*, *other*, *distinct*, *multiple*, and so on.

It would be opportune, conceptually, at this point, to try to explore and unravel the meanings and connections, even if necessarily only informally in these remarks, so as to prime us, or simply remind us, of the *diverse* issues, rather than blur them (as I have just done deliberately). So, bear with me, if you will, while I try, a little more in detail than I did in our conference's opening session. I felt it useful to do this, not just for a little intellectual satisfaction but also to try to glimpse a path through the trees and avoid tripping up in the undergrowth, in other words, of confusing the diverse issues.

## 1. Three diverse meanings of *diversity*

It seems to me that three diverse meanings can indeed be distinguished conceptually in the semantic field covered by uses of the term *diversity*, *diverse* and its derivatives and neighbours – cognate and otherwise – in English and in Italian, to take a Romance language conveniently to hand where most of the relevant terms share cognates, having come from Latin into both, via Medieval French into English.

### 1.1 *Diversity/diverse* as ‘difference/different’

I have just used *diverse* above with the **first** of the three diverse meanings: *diverse/diversity* with the sense of ***different in type*** from something else, *dissimilar*, *unlike*; in other words, it is a **Quality** notion, one of relative difference, when two (or more) items are not identical to each other; there is a non-isomorphism of category features; they are ***not the same in quality or in essence***, as the OED puts it. Here, *diversity/diverse* is related to the notion of *divergence* and to being *distinct* or *distinguished* from something else. The *di-* prefix (cognate with Latin *bi-* and English *tw-* as in *two*), is common to these terms. Other terms that share and co-articulate this part of the woods are, for instance, *Other/ness*, *hetero-*, *alter-* as opposed to *ego/nos*, *homo-* and *auto-* and *self-* (e.g. as in *heterosexual/homosexual*, to describe a sexual preference for a partner from *different/same* sexual category).

Although informal English seems to be specializing away from this use of *diverse/diversity* to prefer *difference* to it, yet it is still very much alive in Italian, for example (where it is preferred, on the contrary, to *differente*: ‘*lei è diversa da me*’, is certainly the more normal or colloquial way of saying ‘*she is different from me*’, for example). This native intuition ‘data’ would certainly need to be backed up by concordances before being taken as fact. However, you don’t need me (or a concordancer) to tell you, moreover, that in some academic circles at least, *alterity/alterità* is the preferred specialized buzzword with this - or a similar - Quality meaning, as is *the Other*, without delving further into that thorny and intricate part of the woods. *Diverse* and *diversity* used to have a strongly negative meaning, as in *perverse*, *deviant*, *wicked*, *alien*, *queer*, but that is surely a thing of the past. Right?



## 1.2 Diversity/diverse as ‘variety’ of types or categories

A **second** meaning of *diverse*, *diversity* and especially *diversify*, captures, instead, a *plural* or **Quantity** concept, synonymous indeed with *variety*, and *various* (at least in one of *their* meanings), in other words, *more than one* – that is, to be more precise, more than one **type** or category is co-present (in fact, to be pragmatically sensitive to scalar values, more than two). It thus involves both **Quantity and Quality**, a plurality of qualitatively different category **types**. To *diversify* is to quantitatively distribute qualitative distinctions within a group or category.

Prefixes with this meaning would be, for example, *multi-* and *poly-*, as opposed to *mono-*, but also again *hetero-* as opposed to *homo-*, at least in the *heterogeneity/homogeneity* pair, since they are used to describe internal qualities of sets or groups. A heterogeneous group or set or category is one whose members are dissimilar in some respects.

We can take the opportunity at this point to remember to distinguish between *inter-* and *intra-categorical diversity*. Here we see *intra*-variation (heterogeneity of an entity, **within** an entity, with otherwise unifying/categorical characteristics - e.g. a nation, a language with its various and different ‘varieties’), while *inter*-variation involves differences **between** different sets – that which qualifies them as different sets or groups or categories (or identities) or languages in the first place. To be clearer, in meaning 2 here, there is an *intra*-categorical variability of features *within* a set, rather than *inter*-categorical difference *between* two or more sets, as in meaning 1. At any rate, *hetero-* like *diverse*, seems to be able to cover both of these two meanings. *Heterogeneous*, we might also notice, however, can take on negative connotations in some collocations or contexts, e.g. in “It’s a very heterogeneous class of students”, while *diversity* would be, in this context, the positive side of heterogeneity, the optimistic view of possible confusion and disorder, its celebration.

To trace the connection between meanings 1 and 2 we could simply say that if there exist non-identical objects/sets, then there necessarily exists a plurality (at least more than one), a diversity of sets. Needless to add here, perhaps, there are further complications and nuances to consider if we look at collocates of the various word class forms, such as of the adjectives *diverse*, *various*, *different*, or as abstract, mass or countable noun, *diversity*/*difference*/*differences*/*variety*/*varieties*, *variation* or the verb forms, *divert*/*diversify*/*defer*, *differ*, *vary*, (we would note, among other things, also their asymmetry of distribution of transitive and intransitive uses) but we cannot explore these further here.

### 1.3 Diversity as ‘numerical distinctiveness’ of *tokens*

The **third** meaning, as given with earlier English *diverse* and still very much alive at least in Italian *diverso*, would be that of merely **Quantitative plurality of *tokens*** (i.e. *instances* of a type), as in a Kantian ‘numerical distinctiveness’, as found in *sundry*, *several* of the *same type* (and as before, more than two). This meaning is interestingly still found especially in the neighbourly ‘*various*’ (though not in *varied* or *varying*), in *several* and most certainly in Italian *vari*, *as well as in diverso/i*. Since this meaning is hardly if at all still present in English ‘*diversity*’ or ‘*diverse*’ it will thus concern us less here.

The following examples for each of the three meanings might help to clarify or summarise:

1. *ho amici diversi (da me)/I miei amici sono diversi/differenti (da me) (my friends are different from me – not the same type as me);*
2. *ho amici diversi tra loro / ho amici molto vari (my friends are very diverse/are different from each other/I’ve got friends of various types);*
3. *ho diversi amici /ho vari amici (I have several/ various friends).*

## 2. Tracing and chasing meaning connections and shifts

Investigating etymology is fun, and useful for seeing how metaphorical extensions chase each other and coalesce into new meanings; even more so is investigating usage, synchronically and diachronically, through concordances, as is necessary for accurate current and historical usage insights. For example, it would be useful, and fun, to trace how *distinctive/distinction/distinguished/distinto* became positive, as did, eventually, *diversity*, when *different/diverse* started out as negative (once meaning *wicked*, as in *perverse*, or indeed, *deviant*) retained to some degree in *diversion*. The common Latin/Romance root element of *differ*, *diverse*, *deviant* and *divergence* (and also of *defer*, just to remind us of the basis for Derrida’s punning distinction between *différence* and *différance*) bears their shared essential common core meaning of ‘moving /carrying/ turning aside/ moving on/ in another direction’ as in *deviating*, *diverting*, *dividing*, *differentiating*, *deferring*. Or again, one could look to see how *alternative/alternativo* (as in *John leads an alternative life-style/ Gianni è un alternativo*) and *distinguished/distinto* (*he’s a rather distinguished gentleman /è una persona molto distinta*) – both sets starting out simply as meaning ‘different’ - have taken on specific new (positive) meanings, sometimes also slightly differently in different languages. Another side-

thought flickers out to how ‘*diverting*’ can also mean ‘fun, funny, entertaining’ as it still centrally does in It. *divertente* and Fr. *divertissement*.

At any rate, for *diversity* (meaning 1, *different*, non-identical quality) to move to *diversity* 2 (*variety*, qualitative plurality), can be seen as a natural metaphorical and logical step, that hardly needs spelling out again. If there exist non-identical objects, then there exists at least a plurality (more than one) of them.

### **3. Identity and diversity/alterity two sides of the coin**

Can you have identity without alterity? Alterity without identity? Can you have meaning without difference? In structuralist terms, no, of course. Our focus here is nominally *diversity* (whether in meaning 1 or 2), but many presentations and papers speak of identity without necessarily even explicitly mentioning diversity, or difference or, even more, alterity.

I have no trouble affirming that one of the reasons is because ‘diversity’ in this meaning is somewhat old-fashioned a term, but also because difference/diversity/alterity and identity are on either sides of the coin to each other. They implicate each other logically. My alterity (if it is different from yours) is not-your identity. Difference/alterity/otherness is relative to another entity, the paragon identity, to which it is compared. You define yourself, your identity, in counter-position to something else, or other. This is in the first meaning of *diversity*, as otherness, difference. Although the term *diversity* is little used in English now with this meaning, being supplanted by *difference*, or more technically with its baggage of specialist meanings by *alterity*, its flip side *identity* is certainly ubiquitous.

I don’t know which precedes which logically (perhaps it is alterity which precedes identity as Deleuze would have it) but I would tend to say ‘difference’, otherness, comes into being simultaneously with what it is different or other from, the base-line paragon. *X is different* means, it logically entails, that *x is different from y, z* or whatever. X and y are both essential to the concept of otherness, and also of identity, if my identity needs to define itself in comparison to that of others. At any rate, you can’t have one without the other. Just as you can’t have meaning or value without difference, a simple structuralist tenet that as far as I can see has yet to be refuted. It is difference which allows us to conceptualize – to categorize – to understand our *selves* as well as any other category; categorization is based on difference, concepts cannot exist as absolutes in a vacuum but as relative to others. Even with categories seen as fuzzy sets

of properties, with focal or prototypical members and grades of peripheral membership – should we be beguiled to think differently because of the fuzziness connotation – everything still holds relatively, perhaps even more so, both within and without.

So, diversity is defined from both sides, it is reciprocal. I am diverse from you, you are diverse from me. At the risk of confusing things, we could say that it is a difference which ‘makes a difference’. In the buzzword and politically correct current climate (to which we adhere) indeed it makes all the difference (but that is playing with words, Bateson’s words).

In this volume, and in our overall project, this is a basic tenet, however. Diversity is implicitly and explicitly celebrated and its ‘linguaging’ of others with negative connotations is deplored, or rather, denounced, critiqued, deconstructed. This doesn’t mean that we think that all ‘othering’ is negative or unnatural, and, as should be obvious, othering is also an act of identity, the flip side of the creation of one’s own identity created together with and in contraposition to that of the other.

## 4. Whats, whos, hows, wheres and whys

### 4.1 Whats: Types of identities/categories

Needless to say, otherness is also various, diverse. There are many *types* of otherness. It depends on **what** category of otherness (what categorical or definitional features or characteristics of identity) is being focussed on or used as definitional for the type or category, by anyone at any one time, in any one culture, be it to do with regional, class, age group, ethnicity, gender, professional characteristics. Indeed, anything on the so-called diastatic, diaphasic and diatopic or other dimensions of variation could be the ‘**whats**’ of the identity definition-

### 4.2 Who languages whom

It is also important to consider ‘**who**’ is involved; **who** is the **agent** of the category’s defining features; and also who is the **object** of the act of definition or ascription of belongingness or not in the category, or of the various degrees of belongingness of the **self** and of **others**. Who decides for whom? Who languages whom?

We can, or should, thus talk of Auto- or **Self**-linguaging: where  $x$  languages  $x$ , or identifies  $x$  as diverse/different from  $x$ ’s surrounding context, or from  $y$ , or  $z$ , and then of Hetero- or **Other**-linguaging: where  $x$

languages *y* as different from *x* (or *z*) directly (in *y*'s face) or to *z*, for example, in the Press. Let's not forget that one must consider not only a distinction between the agent and the affected objects but also with the recipients or addressees of the languaging.

Talking of agents and objects we have needed to think of the action, the process, the '**how**', so we turn now explicitly to the verb we have chosen to use to capture the how, *languaging*.

### 4.3 How: *Languaging*

As one might have expected by now, this term too may have diverse meanings, despite its apparent novelty and creativity, perhaps *because* of its apparent novelty. To cut to the point straightaway, we intended by it simply to especially focus on the process of *constructing* through language, or *expressing* or *performing* through language, in this case, the *otherness*, the *difference* or the *variation* or the *variety/ies* and - to bring in the **whos** again - of constructing another's or one's own otherness/identity. We were also, but not only, using it to refer to representing or reflecting perceived differences or attitudes to others as embodied by other agents in the language one has inherited.

We see 'languaging' thus as "the making of meaning through language" in our case, of social meanings or categories, rather than as, for example, "mediating cognition", a cognitive tool to clarify ideas, to "talk something through", as simply using language (i.e. *use* as opposed to metalinguistic *mention*), or as in any of the other diverse meanings which each of the authors discussed by Merrill Swain (2006), for example, thought they had coined it to mean.

We saw it thus simply as category or meaning construction, and category membership assignment, through language, for the language community, without, moreover, necessarily going as far as hypothesizing strong linguistic determinism, nor, even less, any static permanence or immobility of the categories so created.

We also assume it is possible to glimpse, and deconstruct, others' categories and their attitudes to their members, at any one time, and across time, through their use of language (their *languaging*), for example, through their choices of collocations, and of substantives, adjectives, verbs, variously loaded. This is too well known and well-studied by Critical Discourse Analysis to need further comment here.

#### 4.4 Where and when

It is also important to remember to consider as significant the different *wheres* or loci of languaging. It merges with considering the *whos* and *whoms*, admittedly, and to some extent the *when*; it pertains to the relationships among those concerned (the *x*, *y* and *z*), and the affective loading possible. What is especially important would be the difference between *private* and *public* places or contexts, between mass and non-mass communication, whether or not and to what extent there is an audience, and what *its* extent is, beyond the direct object of the languaging and/or the addressee (e.g. at a dinner party, at a football match, in a newspaper article, on television, whether fiction or documentary, email, texts, facebook posts, tweets, etc). Indeed, the *medium*, whether oral, written, traditional or digital, one-to-one or social, synchronous or asynchronous may also be significant.

Perhaps it is the audience design aspect, if I can call it that, however, which is of most significance here in the shaping of othering.

As said above, For one thing, the object of *languaging* can be the self (*x*), or it can be another person different from *x* (not-*x*). Not-*x* can be the person or persons *x* is addressing (*y*), or another third party or parties (*z*) who may or may not be present (in co-presence if oral, as potential readers if written). In other words, *x* can be *languaging* *x*, *y* or *z* in public or in private, i.e. in the presence of other *y*'s and/or *z*'s. Furthermore, of course, *y*'s and *z*'s may belong or be attributed to the same or a different 'what' category group to *x*). Some of the combinations may be expressed as follows:

- X languages *x* (self-languaging)
- X languages *y* as same group as *x* (*x* languages *y*<sup>*x*</sup>)
- x* languages *y* as different from *x* (*x* languages *y*<sup>*x*</sup>)
- x* languages *z* as same as *x* (to *y*)
- etc.

We might also remember the enlightening metaphor of 'emotive conjugation' given by Bertrand Russell Where negative loading increases with distance from ego, the first person (I, we), as you go from the second person (you) to the third person (he/she/they), as in, for example: I am *firm*, you are *obstinate*, he is *pig-headed*.

Talking to others and calling them names to their face, or talking about others to an audience are quite different.

## 4.5 Why

Let's not forget too that the function and purposes or genre of text may also be significant in how and whether others are language. Whether jokingly, or in an academic article for scientific purposes, as an insult or dysphemism, as a euphemism, in an attempt at 'politically correct' reference - to name just a few possible diverse modes - these are all revealing of 'other' categories, and often of the existence of a locus of taboo or, at least, of otherness.

## 5. Varieties and variation within language, identities, multiplicity and hybridity

### 5.1 Variety, Multiplicity

*Variety* and *variation* are key words in sociolinguistics where the focus is, among other things, on different language varieties *within* a category (meaning 2), a language in this case, and the way any member of a category/set, or speaker of a language, displays *variation* in their behaviour in that language for different or various purposes in different contexts, for example, to assert, construct, their own or others' different and various group identities, which are variously professional, generational, ethnic or cultural, glottic, social, gender-based or sexual, and so on.

We all know that an individual person or group can have and use a variety of languages (as well as varieties) too. A single individual or a single nation, for example, can be *diglossic*, or have a *multiple*, qualitatively plural *range*, *repertoire* or diversity of languages.

I want to also mention and even issue a caveat to remind us all, just in case, not to confuse *multiple* varieties, *multilingualism* or *multiculturalism* with *hybridity*, another currently salient buzzword, which our group also engages with, with conviction, as a relevant and germane concern. In *multilingualism* there is a repertoire of two, or more than two types, languages, identities, cultures, side by side, *between* which one may or may not switch, *sequentially*, or *consecutively*, *alternately*, whenever appropriate. *Hybridity* is also intuitively related to diversity and its types but the concept and the relationship are perhaps more tricky to pin down.

### 5.2 Types of Hybridity- *blend* or *collage*?

As far as its relationship with multiplicity/plurality is concerned it may be useful to put it this way: while multiplicity, as in *multilingual*,

*multicultural* etc., could be said to concern or focus on *external* diversity, a collection, range or repertoire of *different* types or sets, *hybridity*, instead, could be seen to characterize or refer to *internally* diverse or varied sets.

At any rate, *hybrid/ity* too may be referentially unstable or even polysemous in general use (though not in animal husbandry or biology whence it derives). On reflection we seem to use the term *hybrid/ity* too for different types of things and we use other terms to describe or label other realizations of the different phenomena. It might be useful to point to some of this terminological mix.

As far as I see it, *hybridity* does have a common feature in that it can be said to focus on a *mixing* of differences, in contrast to the *multi-poly*-type plurality concepts which we might see as involving a focus on the *juxtaposition* of differences. This internal mixing captured by *hybridity*, is of (at least) two types, however.

The first kind of hybridity (hybridity proper, perhaps) might be said to be a *simultaneous* (and homogeneous) mix or fusion of characteristics originally from separate sets, producing a third new, distinct, different, entity, a hybrid one (which may or may not stabilize, for example, into a *creole* language). This new entity, moreover, may or may not even display ‘pure’ elements recognizable as such from its ‘parents’ (you can’t distinguish horse and donkey bits separately in a mule, blue or yellow bits in green, beer and lemonade parts in shandy).

I think we should, in language studies anyway, be careful to distinguish it from that other use of *hybrid*, as in *hybrid vehicle*, where you can distinguish and separate the various diverse contributing characteristics (able to use electricity, gas *or* petrol at any one time). Differently from *creolization* (an example of hybridity ‘one’), *code-mixing* (which is really code-switching within an utterance, rather than at a higher level - *between/among* languages, registers, styles - or for different purposes or interlocutors) could be seen as exemplifying this second type of hybridity.

The first type mentioned, results instead in a *novel* entity, like a creole, indeed. The second type of hybridity is the one that can therefore confuse the issues, since it overlaps in some way with *multi-* and *diverse* (indeed in Italian it is also a synonym of *vario*, and *eterogeneo*). Hybridity ‘two’ is an *a or b* thing (alternating, a *union* set where two (or more) separate things are present, as in a repertoire), while the first type, Hybridity ‘one’ is an *a and b* thing (one *mingled* together). But, lest we jump to the easy conclusion: it is *not* the *intersection* either, which would be composed only of what the contributing sets have in common. A hybrid set (let’s call



it *c*) might, tentatively, be described as the result of a *mapping relation* with its two contributors *a* and *b*. Furthermore this relation is one of a type of possible ‘correspondence’ relations<sup>1</sup>; in other words, it is not easy to distinguish the specific elements of the original sets. You would need very sophisticated ‘reverse engineering’ to reconstruct the contributors.

Analogies or metaphors from more concrete fields may help clarify more appropriately perhaps what I intend by *hybridity ‘one’*, where donating components are not easily distinguishable and where there is the creation of a new entity. Hydrogen and oxygen molecules can *combine* and through a *chemical reaction* create a new molecule, that of water, for example, which has different properties from either of its parents (it is liquid, it is polar, etc). From metallurgy, we know of new entities, *alloys* (e.g. bronze) produced by the combination of different metals (copper, zinc) whose new properties are different from either parent again. A barman will have a range of brand *blended* whiskies (as well as single malts), whose components are not distinguishable to the general public; he will create *cocktails*, perhaps with a blend of secret ingredients; a coffee house will prepare and patent its own special and novel *blend*. These blends and cocktails are, arguably, not just the sum of their components but new entities. These can be said to be *homogeneous* mixtures or blends (except for some cocktails not involving all water soluble ingredients).

On the other hand, technically at least, the *mayonnaise* in the canapés at the cocktail party is an *emulsion*, a *non-homogeneous* hybrid mixture, of oil, egg and vinegar or lemon juice, whose separate components though well amalgamated for a while will nevertheless still be mainly distinguishable (though in minute droplets; the *mixture* will separate out again (at least into oil and vinegar) if left to stand, for example in a warm room. Chefs’ *sauces* are mainly also emulsions, *amalgamated* ingredients of non-homogeneous ingredients (e.g. flour, cream, meat juices, vegetables, herbs, etc.) as well as homogeneous blends.

Certainly neither blends nor sauces, however ‘rich’ or creative, would ever be *called* ‘hybrids’, but that is, surely, essentially what they are: mixtures of separate ingredients *simultaneously* forming a new amalgamated entity (sub-types of hybridity type ‘one’)<sup>2</sup>. Though technically their separate ingredients can be distinguished by experts, (the chemical engineer, the whiskey expert, the geneticist, the chef or gourmet) there is no felt distinction between the two types of blend, the homogenous and the heterogeneous (at the micro-level).

Note that we tend to use *hybrid* only technically in the linguistic and in the biological fields. Otherwise *blend* or *mixture* or *fusion* or *alloy* serve to indicate this. An overlap in terminology does occur in derivational

morphology, when lexicologists speak of portmanteau terms or *blends* (e.g. *netiquette*), and speak of hybrid etymology (e.g. in *polyfunctional* - Grk + Latin roots). And this is where some confusion can creep in. The last, ‘hybrid’ example is also, rather than a blend, actually what is called in lexical morphology a *compound*.

The two subtypes of hybridity ‘one’ need to be distinguished, indeed, from hybridity ‘two’, where *alternation* of separately distinguishable components or *modules* is involved, and which for simplicity’s sake we could also liken to *compounding*, and even more clearly appeal to the *collage*, *montage* or *assemblaggio* type of combination of diverse elements, and even perhaps to *modularity*.

It may boil down to a question of scale and whether separate donor units are distinguishable. There seems to be a gradual passage from one to the other? Or is it not also qualitative?

It is difficult for the non-expert to speculate on what type of hybridity is represented, for example, by so called *Mediterranean*, *World* or *Ethnic fusion*<sup>3</sup>, or *World fusion jazz*<sup>4</sup> or to be found in *folk rock*, or Neapolitan blues, Algerian Rai, or East End Bangla, etc.

As Lev Manovich reminds us, we

live in a ‘remix culture’. Today, many cultural and life-style arenas – music, fashion, design, art, web applications, user created media, food – are governed by remixes, fusions, collages, or mash-ups (Manovich 2006: 368).

These are all terms capturing different types of hybridity and mixing, their differences which I have attempted with difficulty to at least glimpse.

What, indeed, is happening in “*remix*”, or in software *mash-ups* where separate elements are identifiable - that may be part of the fun or purpose, indeed - but which do fuse in some parts and anyway most certainly involve the creation of new entities, whatever their inner micro-structure (blend or collage)? In his cultural historical discussion of *remixing* and the other terms and practices (in addition to those mentioned above, also *sampling*, *quoting*, *montage*) inherited from various artistic arenas, Manovich makes a distinction, partly relevant here, between types of mix at least in electronic music:

In my view, these terms that come to us from literary and visual modernism of the earlier twentieth century [...] do not always adequately describe new electronic music. [...] Firstly, musical samples are often arranged in loops. Secondly, the nature of sound allows musicians to mix pre-existent sounds in a variety of ways, from clearly differentiating and

contrasting individual samples (thus following the traditional modernist aesthetics of montage/collage), to mixing them into an organic and coherent whole. To use the terms of Roland Barthes, we can say that of modernist collage always involved a ‘clash’ of elements, electronic and software collage also allows for ‘blend’ [...] (Manovich 2006: 371-372).

The distinctions between the *blending*, *fusing*, *mingling* and *collage* (if not clashing) types of mix/hybridity, may even fade into each other to some degree, but at some point there is a qualitative difference between *blend* and *collage* on the one hand, and then between both of these and *repertoire* to-hand (e.g. repertoire or *multi-lingualism* or *multiculturalism*, *plurality*, i.e. the possibility of *alternating* between elements) on the other.

All three categories are different ways or types of possessing *diversity*: internal or structural diversity vs external or functional diversity.

Incidentally, and to briefly contemplate etymologies again, it’s no accident that *alternate* and *alter-* have the same root (Latin for *other*, *different*), while that of *mingle* is cognate with *mongrel* (mixed). Not incidentally, and to anticipate issues for my next section, we might remember that of course the negative loading of terms like *mongrel*, *mulato*<sup>5</sup>, *métisse*, *mixed-blood*, *half-caste* a few of the terms for mixed race around the world, seem to overwhelmingly have very heavy negative loading (even *criolo* by association when it originally merely meant *native born and raised*).

*Hybridity*, the new old word for this miscegenation, is only now becoming a good thing. In Latin, *hybrida* was originally specifically (see Pliny and Isidorus cited in Warren 1884: 501-502) a cross between a tame sow and a wild boar, and later extended to mean ‘mongrel’ (‘bastardo’ (sic) in Italian), generically. It may have been cognate with Greek (*hubris/hybris*) meaning something like *an outrage*, *a presumption offending the gods* (which would be significant, but this is disputed).

At any rate, to speculate further, hybridity (of both types), and perhaps also individual (rather than societal) multilingualism, multiculturalism and multiple identities, could perhaps credibly be seen as denying alterity, or otherness (in that specialised meaning of separateness and incommensurability), if not diversity, by making it one’s own, by incorporating it into one’s new hybrid self or even one’s repertoire/range/diversity of elements, albeit originally ‘other’. I say this with more conviction only for hybridity admittedly. The espousing of multiculturalism and its joys, could best be seen perhaps, rather than as denying alterity, instead, as welcoming it, as advocating it, as rejoicing in diversity<sup>6</sup>.

In any case, to return to less speculative ground to end this section, rather than being able to identify or not separate elements in the mix, i.e. whether it's homogeneous or heterogeneous, the important difference between multiplicity and hybridity might more simply be the external-outer / internal-inner focus.

## 6. Loading

*Diversity*, as we all know, is today's positively loaded, politically correct cultural buzz word, rejoiced in and celebrated in at least two of its various senses. There is probably no need to remind us, but I will, anyway. Difference and alterity rather than being seen as, at best, 'exotic', 'odd', or worse, 'queer' or 'alien', and at worst, as perverse, frightening and threatening thus to be avoided or suppressed, and more often than not as basically 'inferior', are now (to be) seen as positive, as 'good', and their celebration as right and fair, humane, empathetic. Diversity, difference, is now also seen as useful, in that thanks to it one can entertain other horizons or worlds, other possible life and mind-styles. This can go further than tolerance, and even than solidarity. It goes as far as rejoicing in difference, and even perhaps as making the other into one's own, as becoming the other, or perhaps, as no longer noticing difference.

At any rate, intra-personal or intra-societal diversity - having more than one identity- can be useful. Plurality, diversity, multiplicity, non-homogeneity, that is, possessing a variety of, a mixed repertoire of skills, approaches, points of view, competences, knowledge bases in a society, a company, an individual is now considered desirable. Successful *inter-cultural* interaction, collaboration, is considered a given for the benefit of mutual seeding and enrichment for novel, creative and more successful outcomes. Being able to assume or having more than one identity is adaptive and, as sociolinguists have always known, normal, in that we do it all the time, at least on different levels, within our so-called single languages, when we assume our diverse range of professional, personal, social identities. This is the essence of adaptability, of flexibility, being able to do and be different things according to needs, to the context. Companies now go out of their way to *diversify* and to promote diversity, to engage indeed in 'diversity training'<sup>7</sup>. Preserving bio-diversity is a by-word these days, along the same lines as - since Joshua Fishman<sup>8</sup> at least - we (ethno-pragma-socio-) linguists have always believed that humanity must preserve and make the most of the treasure house of different survival strategies held in different and diverse cultures and world-views.

*Diversity* is now up there as a positively loaded term/concept with *flexibility*, *adaptability*. And, being ‘constant’ is no longer best. ‘*Inconstant*’ still sounds negative but surely it is just the uptight way of defining *flexible*, *adaptable*, something you can only do if you have a repertoire of diverse traits and skills, if you are or have ‘more than one’, if you have multiple skills.

Incidentally, that *duplicity* and *ambiguity* (unlike *multiplicity* or *flexibility* or *diversity*) should retain negative meanings and an aura of suspicion and of threat in the encounter, is significant. They are perhaps referring to the entertainment of two incompatible or incommensurable identities or worlds (they can’t both be true at the same time, one is a *lie*, and they are therefore *deceptive*). The entertainment of mutually compatible, non-exclusive identities would be easily acknowledged and accepted as positive. One can simultaneously and inter-compatibly have a gender identity, a professional one, even a cultural multiplicity (a diversity of type two). What still provokes suspicion (in some mono-cultural individuals) is the co-existence of different, apparently mutually exclusive categories (how can you be both English and Italian, or Scots and English, say? - plurality of type one). The possibilities again depend on what you mean. Both - but simultaneously or consecutively? And that they should be of the same category or categorical level – e.g. you can’t be both young and old, a homosexual and a heterosexual (though you can be bi-sexual), black and white? It depends on how you define your labels and/or your category. It depends also on what type of set logic you are envisaging. Classical formal logic or fuzzy set logic?

And this brings us back to hybridity again. Just to pick up again on my tentative distinction. The bi-/multi-cultural/-lingual individual can *alternate* between/among different cultural identities and languages. While the culturally hybrid individual is a new mixture, a fusion, with perhaps just this one cultural identity (historically new, albeit also often double-barrelled at least for a while, like *Afro-American*, *italo-inglese*, but see *Trinidadian* where the result has now coalesced, at least lexically).

At any rate, hybridity, as recalled earlier, also raises suspicion traditionally, witness the practically universal negative loading of the terms (at some point) referring to it (*mongrel*, mixed-blood, *half-caste*, *half-breed*, etc.), as if being a mix, logically of different/various things, were naturally suspect or inferior<sup>9</sup>. Untrustworthiness is often associated with *miscegenation*, indeed, especially of the racial mix. In SanSan Kwan and Kenneth Speirs’ *Mixing It Up: Multiracial Subjects* collection of essays (2013) also discussing this, it is also worth noting en passant the use of *multiracial* in the title to mean *mixing* i.e. as synonymous with

hybrid (with hybrid ‘one’, hybrid ‘proper’). Perhaps we cannot *but* have hybridity proper when mixing involves biology or genetic traits, but surely we must distinguish (as I attempted in the section above) the two types of outcome (of inter-‘cultural’ contact) - blending/fusion/mixing as opposed to plurality - if one is thinking of behavioural patterns, or cultures/languages, i.e. in linguistic terms, *creolization* vs. *multi-lingualism*.

But back to loading again. We have, furthermore, ‘language’d’ our suspicion especially of the being of two things at the same time not only in such terms as *duplicity*, *ambiguity*, but also *double-agent*, a spy with *divided loyalties*, a *double-personality* means that the two are not reconcilable, *double-talk* or *double-speak* means you’re not talking straight, truthfully. Anyone who can be different things at the same time, must be hypocritical, *two-faced*, a trickster, like Janus, and Iago: *I am not what I am* (Vincent 2004: 247-288). Yes, just what *is* it with ‘double-’ (and with *half-*, for that matter)? This would be interesting to go into further, but some other time, perhaps.

Certainly, negative loading of all types of diversity, of any combination of differences, whether *multi-* (or *double-*) or mixed or mingled, i.e. hybrid, does seem to bedevil us.

Beneath the one further distinction I wish to remind us of before closing. Beneath the calls for diversity training, for multicultural, intercultural, cross-cultural awareness and education, there is often an implicit loading of asymmetry. As if the different cultures involved were not on the same level. Sometimes this is explicitly acknowledged and addressed, as when ‘*inclusion*’, ‘*equal opportunities*’ for ‘*minorities*’ is invoked. We must stay alert also when it is not explicit, in popular usage or even in our own, the *different* = *inferior*, not just *different* = *bad/suspect/untrustworthy* equation, has been a constant companion since the dawn of time and may well be lurking beneath the surface as well as loaded onto it; but this is naturally what critical discourse analysis is all about, so there was perhaps little need to remind us here of this.

Whether or not my notes on the pitfalls of terminological confusion and my attempted outline of categorical distinctions are convincing, I trust that there will be agreement at least that our methodological attention to multiple, hybrid, peripheral/focal or prototypical belongingness must stay alert, as should our vigilance concerning the terminology used, not only by the agents of languaging diversity, the subjects of our analyses, but also by our own selves.