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Abstract

This thesis explains the significance that bilingualism has played and should play in life. It consists of three chapters: Chapter 1 examines bilingual perspectives from different communities inside the United States; Chapter 2 presents a critical assessment of research from linguistics and psychology; and Chapter 3 explores the popular support for English-Spanish bilingualism sweeping through urban America. My first chapter highlights the interconnection of bilingualism with identity, exemplified in the Amish, Navajo, and Gullah communities. This analysis of ethnic groups represents more broadly the negative and positive experiences of bilingualism. My second chapter reflects on the validity and assumptions behind prevailing theories of what it means to be bilingual. Based on what those theories claim, I propose that bilingualism’s science should consider the fact that, from infancy to adulthood, thinking develops through the strength of our ability to generalize. Finally, I conclude that bilingualism should increasingly be the norm. The lessons from my first and second chapters strongly suggest that the US should fully embrace its Spanish-English bilingualism because of the way it enhances well-being, be it through self-actualization or a more robust ability to think. The central thread of my work is the development of a moral conscience that acts as a lighthouse to illuminate strengths and biases from different cultures, transmitted through language, up to each person to freely determine. The wisdom that emerges from bilingualism facilitates a more flourishing life for people and communities alike.
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Introduction to a Philosophy of Bilingualism

At first glance, studying bilingualism from the standpoint of philosophy is a peculiar decision. Hardly anyone would suggest this. A college of education or department of linguistics and psychology with established methods and concrete findings would seem to offer a reliable enough discipline to call home. From my professional experience in bilingual education and studying the academic theories of its science and general approaches, these departments are merely a starting point for an area of knowledge that has the potential to see further. In my view, the prevailing wisdom frequently leaves much to be desired, whether we look at the incompleteness of the science of bilingualism or the disregard of history, existentialism, and normative ethics to help determine what is possible and ideal. Thus, realizing the immaturity of these conventional approaches, I turn to philosophy to advance my own understanding of such an inter- and trans-disciplinary phenomenon. In the pages to come, I argue for a need to study and live bilingualism in a new way.

More than anything else, a philosophic understanding of bilingualism, in staying true to the origin of philosophy, provides the ability to think about it in terms of wisdom. Wisdom is to learn from experience, make better choices both for local and universal contexts, and bring reality closer to ideals. However, the humanities and social sciences do not have a consensus pertaining to ethical gold standards for thinking about bilingualism for the individual or society. This pragmatically creates a moral wilderness.

In effect, not having clear ideals stifles the ability to envision bilingualism on a higher aspirational plane and cultivate a more principled version of it. If we, as a society and community of educators, do not develop normative ethics for bilingual development, we leave

---

1 This definition is inspired by John Dewey who talks about it in “Philosophy and Democracy.”
subjective and cultural particularities to contingency and the day’s fashion—a bilingualism gone wild—where the ethos surrounding language and culture becomes anyone’s guess. Towards this end, this project clarifies the ethics of bilingualism and illuminates standards for the mentality that we should have toward our languages. Attempting to bridge the actual and the potential, I philosophize on bilingualism thinking about dispositions, existence, wisdom, and ethics.

Certainly, specific ideals already exist in the academic literature. Since the 1960s paradigm shift that overturned the antiquated idea that bilingualism primarily leads to mental confusion, a community of researchers throughout psychology and linguistics has made significant advances to what constitutes a positive experience. First, their clustered ideal recommends a “simultaneous bilingualism,” or “bilingualism as a first language,” where both languages are introduced from birth to be a native speaker of both. In addition, scientists have responded to the common injury of “subtractive bilingualism” among immigrants and minorities where their home language atrophies under society’s dominant language. They praise “additive bilingualism,” thereby maintaining a first language (L1) and pairing it with a second (L2). The third major pillar, heavily related to the previous one, is an aspirational “balanced bilingualism” where a similar proficiency is reflected in both languages and this bilingual knowledge extends to the many domains of life.

Derived from these a posteriori normative theories, researchers make an ethical promise. They state that if we listen to the advice of their science, broad benefits will follow. For good reason I would add: their recommendations enhance cognition and, thus, have normative salience.

---

2 Bayram, Miller, Rothman, and Serratrice, *Bilingual Cognition and Language: The state of the science across its subfields*, 2018
3 Annick De Houwer, *Bilingualism First Language Acquisition*, 2008
6 This promise is commonplace, viz. Bialystok (2018), “bilingualism, leads to adaptations in human cognition and in harnessing that mechanism to improve cognition broadly.” p. 299.
to them. Scientists promise anything from greater mental flexibility (an openness to approaching topics from multiple perspectives) and metalinguistic awareness (heightened thinking about thinking) to cognitive reserve (warding off dementia in senescence), all virtues that we would want present for the psychological well-being of our own families.

Thus, these perspectives have rightly become popular for K-12 educators and many intellectuals. Espousing a pluralist philosophy of knowledge, advocates send the message that students should strive for sociocultural competence, objective knowledge, and a positive attitude of both cultures and languages without further ado. Naturally, students’ linguistic development comes through studying about and through two languages. These pillars of dual language education are equated with equity and have been adopted by many dual language magnet schools such as the one I work for. Yet, there is potential for growth: moral judgments on culture and language, beyond obvious targets, e.g., Latin American machismo or American racism, are typically avoided in an ethos of tolerance and multiculturalism. Regrettably, reflection on the greater eudemonic ability of the language and community is out of bounds.

Other thinkers, recognizing that these standards are insufficient, crave stronger value judgments on a bigger scale. Towards this end, they promote a post-colonial ethics of care, where individuals decolonize themselves of pernicious ideologies attached to the linguistic assumptions embedded in the nation-state. Arguably the most famous philosopher representing post-colonial thought is Walter Mignolo, who coins an ideal of border thinking. To move beyond “colonialities” and hegemonic ethnonational traditions that marginalize alternative linguistic and cultural forms, he invites us to look at the meaning of bilingualism as “an educational and

---

7 El Paso High School, dual language magnet school for El Paso Independent School District
8 viz., Haugen (1987), “no one’s speech is inferior, only different,” p. 5.
epistemological project”⁹ in a “way of life between languages: a dialogical, ethic, aesthetic, and political process of social transformation”¹⁰ that casts doubt on nation-state logic. Defining border thinking as “thinking from dichotomous concepts rather than ordering the world in dichotomies,”¹¹ he wants bilingual individuals to move beyond the social reproduction that comes pre-packaged in two languages and, instead, orient themselves to what some scholars describe as a third space,¹² or what I would describe as a more ethical bilingual particularity.

Mignolo is on the right track with his border thinking. Nonetheless, widening his focus is also productive. Taking a step back from his concern for post-coloniality, we see that at the heart of what he addresses is, more practically, the development of a bilingual moral conscience. In reinventing the ethical wheel, his border thinking is one politicized dimension of a much broader mission that ought to be a moral ideal and therefore undergird the ethics of bilingualism. As Hegel discusses, we must find the larger governing rules of how to interact with one another, a process known as ethicality. Toward the beginnings of this process of determining interaction, we first subjectively develop a conscience, which he defines as an essential ability to determine and decide about particularity,¹³ ultimately in search for the true, the good, and the beautiful. I adapt this precept to a bilingual context and argue that a bilingualized conscience, with the right education, has an enhanced ability to discern truth not only for political issues, as Mignolo intends, but for any path leading to wisdom in any domain of life.

Inside the typical monolingual moral conscience, one searches inside themselves for accurate normative judgments about a given situation. In most cases though, the ability to first

---

¹⁰ ibid, p. 265
¹¹ ibid, p. 52, italics in original
¹² Third Space refers to the distinctiveness of certain individuals that defies stereotypes, being an intersectional and cultural hybrid.
¹³ G.W.F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of Right*, p. 108
inspect metaphysical assumptions on life and then imagine serious alternatives is relatively limited, as someone who is restricted solely to their own neck of the woods. Science illuminates that the bilingual speaker is qualitatively different from a monolingual, and, in a similar fashion, so is a bilingualized conscience, which potentially entails the disposition to critically evaluate behaviors and practices learned at home as well as abroad. Bilingualism can sculpt the conscience because, as conscience’s etymology implies, the individual can access moral judgments of shared knowledge — insider views on that culture’s own terms — that run through more than one ethnolinguistic tradition. In putting distinct moral conceptions about a given domain of life in dialectical tension, e.g., views on parenting, we philosophically reflect upon these differences, projecting ourselves towards new possibilities and altering particularity. As we revisit, rethink, and improve upon culturally patterned behavior that is encoded in our language community, our own conceptions of the good morph, rendering bilingualism a source for self-expansion and actualization.

Moving beyond narrow politics, I term this disposition of reflection on two or more language traditions as elective bilingualism. I philosophically raise the issue from the social science literature, which defines it as a speaker who consciously decides to learn a language, in contrast to a circumstantial bilingual who contingently inherits two more or languages. The social science literature fails to see a bigger existential picture—each of us uniquely experiences our individuality over time and, reflecting on it, we can take possession of our own inner morality and self-relation to our languages based on their strengths. If we shift perspective to seek wisdom, we can free up a formerly fixed subjectivity and become born again ontologically

---

14 Grosjean, “Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person,” 1989
to partially determine our cultural-linguistic self. At its height of its power, bilingualism allows
one to examine—both to negate and reaffirm—one’s essential particularity, reconciling their
sociolinguistic existence to become an elective bilingual. Naturally, an expanded border thinking
implies not only overcoming unjust politics. Elective bilingualism can make a person see how
what initially makes a stranger strange or the family familiar could withstand moral scrutiny.

Thus, existentialism and normative ethics break ground by bringing bilingualism more
directly into the fold. What has been said about faith or religion, being but one type of meaning
narrative that allows one to experientially engage and have greater self-presence, can also bear
on bilingualism, a fact hereto underemphasized in the history of philosophy. Theorists indicate
that language and thought are interconnected; a given dyad of languages, say Mandarin-English,
commits its speaker to a certain particularity or ways of being that come through such a cultural-
linguistic prism. However, going the other way, a speaker, through a distinctive inwardness, can
also commit to their bilingualism and choose how to see their facticity. Bilingualism, then,
creates a relation to reality, an outlook, but one that rests on the subject and the extent that they
passively receive or inwardly embrace it. Bilingualism is certainly not all the same or just a
matter of degree of linguistic or conceptual fluency. My categorical imperative for a multilingual
speaker is elective bilingualism, a special disposition to size up the eudemonic ability of their
languages and the wider cultural-historical tradition.

Viewing bilingualism existentially, my first chapter entails historical perspectives on the
meaning of it in select communities. After a brief note on Roger Williams, I use case studies on
the Amish, Gullah, and Navajo people to show how bilingualism is interconnected with selfhood.
Each community displays a different philosophy of existence because of their history, resulting
in a different frame of reference and ethos surrounding their two languages. Existentially, their
bilingualism is at different points of health both quantitatively in terms of language vitality and qualitatively in the ways that each community morally embraces their distinct traditions. Here is where I take into direct consideration how the past shapes our communal language practices and how we see the significance of a language. For the Navajo and Gullah people, knowing English has been traumatic and is symbolically very different for the Amish people.

My second chapter returns to consider ideals, but through science. I solve an impasse in the current literature: what does it mean to be bilingual? To do this, I first review the prevailing methods and definitions of bilingualism. Going beyond accepted theories, I argue that we define bilingualism by knowing its background conditions, which entails what it means to think. Based on the thought of Lev Vygotsky, I outline this phenomenon as it develops in the first two decades of life and tie it to current research in philosophy of science and the social sciences. Knowing a language means knowing the generalizations that lay behind each word and how they connect to each other, or what Vygotsky calls relations of generality. Further, this is a developmental process. The cognitive structure of generalizations matures or, in other words, the intellectual operations behind the generalizations themselves change. The outcome is a periodization of cognition, which is essential to know if someone is age-appropriately bilingual or not. Lastly, I think about bilingualism’s aesthetics, reflecting on the iceberg analogy from Jim Cummins.

My last chapter brings my findings from the history and science chapters to help analyze the bilingual situation in the U.S. I return to the topic of its normative significance but in the context of Spanish and English that is presently enjoying popular support and institutionalization across the urban U.S. This thesis contributes to an existing Interamerican conversation on the encounter between the two civilizations. I argue that, with normative ethics, we can be better together if we so choose. Undeniably, this is a big if. My ethics and philosophy of science pave
the way to an ideal I name Great Society Bilingualism. The critiques that we get from each other offer an opportunity to grow, learn the virtues of each other, and write a new chapter in our country forged from the strengths of our differences. This ethos combines a self-actualizing relation to bilingualism that we see in history, with bilinguality’s dual structures of generalization that we observed in science to make a case for elective bilingualism.

Finally, given the world is statistically more bilingual than monolingual, the odds are that the reader will see themselves reflected in this thesis in one way or another. In this case, they will have understood a duty to become an elective bilingual. I encourage them to follow this moral epiphany with dialogue on if I have successfully met the novel challenge of explicitly highlighting the philosophical dimensions of bilingualism and if my proposal for ethical constructs has broad applicability. As my title states, I am convinced that history and science go a long way to inform an ethics of bilingualism and that the resulting framework, in part, must come from experience but also from ideals. Further, by this project’s end, a chorus of bilingual experiences will provide strong evidence to prescribe elective bilingualism. My hope is that this set of ideas is implemented within the family and formal education. But also, remembering the critique that Plato leverages against the youth and their ephemeral and superficial study of philosophy, I hope that these ethics are also inwardly felt to refine beliefs and find wisdom throughout life.
Chapter 1: The Normative Meaning to Different Communities

This chapter serves the practical function of helping us rethink our own language identity through historical interpretations of the ethics of bilingualism. Before we consider the broader situation facing the US, I open a window to the normative significance of bilingualism — what does it mean and ought to mean philosophically? — as seen through the more easily surveyed experiences of the Amish, Navajo, and Gullah. Studying other peoples’ bilingualism gives new awareness and suggests possibilities about our own bilingualism. This familiarization with others’ experiences and their existential views puts up a mirror to our own beliefs. Self-reflection is enhanced. Hence, I add to the philosophical tradition of cosmopolitanism to respect and learn from difference but intend to take a step beyond it by offering standards to judge the variants of a bilingual ethical formation that inhere in our multiethnic front yard.

First, I further explain what elective bilingualism and a bilingual moral conscience imply, providing an example of them in Roger Williams (1603-1683), a British-born Puritan minister and founder of Rhode Island. Then, I describe and contrast the normative significance of the phenomenon of bilingualism to the Amish, Diné, and Gullah peoples. Finally, towards a reacquaintance with our own sense of language, I discuss the commonalities in their bilingual experiences and meaning narratives.

Roger Williams and the Ethos of Wisdom

A philosophic spokesperson for elective bilingualism and a bilingual moral conscience in the history of the United States is Roger Williams. Given that in many ways he was ahead of his time—including but not limited to his advocacy for the separation of church and state, the illegitimacy of land transfers from Native Americans to European colonists, and the abolition of slavery—unsurprisingly we find that his iconoclasm and ethical tenor was subjectively enhanced
through his peculiar way of embracing his bilingualism. What impresses most is that epistemic conditions predated the word’s emergence in 1818 in the English language. That is, he intuitively felt and acted on how bilingualism can break down barriers, predating the contemporary economic and accompanying epistemic conditions that have put it on the radar for us. His 1643 publication, *A Key into the Language of America*, can be considered an early contribution to the scholarly canon on bilingualism and entails historical evidence for such an ethics.

Twelve years after immigrating to New England, Williams published his key detailing cross-language equivalents between English and Narragansett, a once widespread but now extinct Algonquin language in current day Rhode Island. First, he held that knowing Narragansett was essential because its semantic intricacies revealed the conceptual thinking and worldview of the tribe. Grasping their language and the self-understanding contained within would facilitate better relations in travel, discourse, and commerce between the two civilizations. Secondly, he believed that the indigenous languages of the Americas were genetically related. As such, gaining access would unlock a more global key. Further, another reason that he wanted to comprehend them on their own terms was because he believed that Westerners should not attempt to spread Christianity without this understanding in place.  

17 Previewing our multiethnic history, we have a sample of the pull of religion to historically actualize both bilingualism and what it means to have a conscience.

Most notably, Williams espouses a dispositional philosophy of wisdom. His project on English and Narragansett was an implicit dialogue that he carried out on the moral sphere. He does more than find common ground or provide contrastive analysis of each party’s ways of being across domains of life; rather, he took these linguistic experiences to heart to actively

strengthen his own ethical formation. Putting on the gloves of a philosophy of wisdom, he “feels his way into everything”\(^\text{18}\) and ethically explores both civilizations’ mentality, deciding which facets of indigenous culture he should learn and incorporate in his own life, e.g., being a bit more kind and accepting of strangers.\(^\text{19}\)

William’s book testifies to how elective bilingualism can bring about personal change. In learning about other traditions, we can enhance the quality of our choices that evaluatively play out on the plane of a bilingual moral conscience. Putting it with Sartrean precision, reflection on bilingualism reveals a more-layered self-presence and new possibilities to being. If these additional possibilities are met with an openness, then one can see himself in a new light which influences subsequent choices. Interpreting Williams’ life through the lens of bilingualism’s moral conscience as I do gives us the possibility of creating a disposition of an elective bilingual marked by its existential ethical reflection. Avoiding the bad faith of a passive relation to facticity, his bilingualism helps him transcend biases and responsibly self-determine.

Exiled from British colonial New England for allowing his actions to be dictated from his conscience, Williams founded Providence, Rhode Island and championed exactly this, freedom of conscience.\(^\text{20}\) While freedom of conscience is associated with the belief to worship as one saw fit, I read it in a second sense. The more traditional freedom of conscience in religion comes with the ability to critical passing judgment on the value of culture due to linguistic proficiency. That is, the important takeaway for the ethics is the freedom to develop a bilingual moral conscience.

\(^{18}\) Johann Gottfried Von Herder, *This Too a Philosophy of History for the Formation of Humanity*, p. 292
\(^{19}\) See the section “Of Salutation” in Roger Williams, *A Key into the Language of America*
\(^{20}\) ibid
Amish and the Ethos of Geh Lessa

As much as exceptional bilingual dispositions of select individuals may invoke moral wonderment, they pale in comparison to the ethical potential of a community at large. Not disappointing, the ethnoreligious Amish are acutely aware of their own particularity. The Amish’s robust existential pulse makes them more than just a mere curiosity of Middle America that deserves a weekend visit. They would be sympathetic to Sartre’s criticism that mass, popular culture pushes societies towards inauthentic homogeneities because of how they perceive modernity as distancing us from practicing Jesus Christ’s teachings. Preventing this, the Amish strive to hold at arm’s length all thoughts and actions, committing themselves to a heightened awareness and clarity in their ways of being. Furthermore, each young adult has the choice to commit to their Amish community, turning Sartrean existential individuality into what might be better called an ethnoreligious case of elective bilingualism. While Sartre rejected theism and their meaning narratives, the Amish philosophy of existence vigorously hinges on a collectivist and scripturalist interpretation of Christianity.

This zeal of the Amish existential project dates to the Radical Reformation of the sixteenth century. Amidst the modern world’s tumultuous birth, an extremist group of theologians called for reform of Christendom that went beyond Martin Luther’s or Ulrich Zwingli’s proposals for a return to the scripture. As Luther himself described them, these theological Schwärmers, or fanatics, believed that neither Lutheran, Reformed Protestantism, nor Catholicism’s Counter-Reformation solves the central tension of what it means to be a loyal follower of Jesus Christ.

---

Out of these dissenting voices a distinct radical protestant church would emerge known as Anabaptism. Their discontent came from what they saw as the hypocritical nature of those professing faith in Jesus Christ but living contrary to his teachings. More specifically, the Anabaptists identified infant baptism as hypocrisy \textit{par excellence}. Baptism was supposed to signify personal right of entry to the Church, which placed a moral code on all believers. But this admission was in name only, evidenced in worldly behavior and, more importantly, the fact that the infant was not capable of exercising free will. As the Anabaptists saw it, infant baptism, upon scrutiny, proved to be an invalid pact between man and God not backed by scripture. Their solution was to establish the rite of believer’s baptism, available only to consenting adults who intentionally choose and desire to live based on the Bible.

The gravity of adult baptism for Anabaptists extended beyond a need to emphasize one’s individual relationship to God. The Anabaptists also wanted to free themselves from institutions—both churches and governments—which cared more about earthly power than living for Christ.\footnote{Steven M. Nolt, \textit{A History of the Amish}} In an epoch where church and state converged, there would be hell to pay for breaking away from the established political order and refusing to baptize their children in state-sponsored churches. Both Catholic and Lutheran Protestant churches persecuted them, triggering the movement to go underground. Thousands were hunted down, imprisoned, and murdered, leading some Anabaptists to become a covert local phenomenon that wanted to separate itself from what they saw as the impious arrogance and bad faith choices of wider society.

At the same time, other Anabaptists had other ideas. More militant and righteous-minded members wished to institutionalize their confessional principles, which further engendered warfare and antagonized their relationship to wider society. In this backdrop, a former Dutch
Catholic priest called Menno Simons (1496-1561) rose to prominence created ideological coherence among the Anabaptists and gave birth to the eponym of Mennonite that stands to this day for the larger Anabaptist movement. Finding a fragmented movement, Simons nurtured nonviolence and preached that his followers disassociate from and shun the militants as well as anyone who failed to live up to the expectations of scripture.\textsuperscript{24}

Fast forwarding through several generations that bore witness to the gradual acceptance of Mennonites in parts of Europe, Amish history proper begins. Like Menno Simons’s conversion from Catholicism to Anabaptism, Jakob Ammann (1644-c. 1730) also was a convert from the Reformed Church who would go on to become an elder within the Anabaptist sect. With these outsider eyes, Ammann advocated for reform. He perceived that, on the back of increasing tolerance and recognition in wider society, spirituality had been compromised.

Specifically, ethics was at the heart of Amman’s reform agenda. At this historical juncture, the Anabaptists had been persecuted for over a century and naturally had, at times, relied on others to come to their assistance. Over time, as the threat of Christian pluralism remained yet weakened and the Anabaptists themselves proved their value, an increasing number of their neighbors supported freedom of conscience and their general cause. The Mennonites began calling these allies by the nickname of \textit{Halbtäufer} and \textit{Treuherzige}, or Half-Anabaptists and True-Hearted. This resulted in an ongoing controversy because some Mennonites were willing to accept that the True-Hearted would reach salvation, despite their not re-baptizing and continued adherence to their own state-sponsored denomination, while others did not.\textsuperscript{25}

In 1693, the controversy would come to a head. Ammann admonished Mennonite leadership, which led to a public debate and a subsequent formal schism. Based on a more

\textsuperscript{24} ibid
\textsuperscript{25} Nolt, \textit{A History of the Amish}, p. 28
conservative Mennonite interpretation of Christian ontology, outsiders, including those who have left the Church, are not saved and should not be invited to partake in Church practices such as communion and daily meals together. The interpretation resulted in disagreements to the extent to which that the community at large should shun and socially avoid outsiders. This controversy led Ammann and his followers to sever themselves from the larger Mennonite community, spawning the sect we now call the Amish and solidifying their unwavering commitment to the authentic Nachfolge Christi\textsuperscript{26} and nonconformity.

For the next century, and perhaps ironically, the Amish circuited Europe, seeking place after place to call home as they continually responded to being shunned and socially avoided. However, in the early eighteenth century, a turning point occurred: the first 500 or so Amish immigrants arrived in Philadelphia,\textsuperscript{27} the largest city in the Thirteen Colonies. This emigration marked the beginning of the end of the Amish in the Old World that would conclude by the early twentieth century. Furthermore, their arrival at the Port of Philadelphia was part of a much larger influx of 80,000 German-speaking immigrants who would make Pennsylvania their home.

Amish bilingualism, as we know it today, begins there in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century. In addition to the German speakers contributing to the larger cosmopolitan fabric of colonial US society, which helped break down old national loyalties,\textsuperscript{28} scholars note a language genesis between 1750 and 1775. These immigrants, coming from disparate parts of the German-speaking world, i.e. what is nowadays Germany (especially Palatine), France, and Switzerland, clustered together in ethnic communities concentrated in Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{29} Naturally, immigrants brought with them a diversity of dialects and thus had to engage in dialect leveling, which would subsequently go on

\textsuperscript{26} ibid, p. 88, this translates as Christ discipleship or “Following Jesus daily.”
\textsuperscript{27} Nolt, p. 117
\textsuperscript{28} Allen Walker Read, “Bilingualism in the Middle Colonies, 1725-1775,” American Speech, 1937
\textsuperscript{29} Mark L. Louden “The Pennsylvania German Language,” Pennsylvania Germans: An Interpretive Encyclopedia
to morph and give rise to a novel variety known as Pennsylvania Dutch. Today approximately 15% of its lexicon is borrowed from English. fellow English-speaking colonists gave them their demonym, reflecting their syncretism of a rooted American-ness and pastoral German-ness.

A byproduct of this clustered migration was the indigenization of German on US soil. By indigenization, I intend to go beyond the notion of just being a transplant. To be clear, indigenization refers to the process of a unique phenomenon being rooted in each place and time, in this case the rise of an ethnolinguistic formation distinctively being tied to American history and its land. Thus, this gaining of a native homeland carries an ethical dimension where the talk of rights arises. True, Pennsylvania Dutch’s DNA is inherently German. But its constant contact with the English language and its geographic isolation from other German speakers over the centuries has put it in a class of its own as a distinct daughter language. That is, the language itself not only shows distinctive elements of English and German but shows a hybridity that renders it neither. It is a cultural-linguistic product clearly endemic to the United States and contributes to a larger mosaic of enduring homegrown bilingualism in the American context.

Pennsylvania Dutch gradually became solely Amish. While non-Anabaptist Pennsylvania Germans proudly carried on their cultural legacy throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they were unable to sustain it beyond the three-generation rule that has similarly led to the attrition and eventual linguistic graveyard destined for most immigrant languages. However, among Amish sectarians, this Pennsylvania Dutch tradition has not only been maintained but thrives to this day. At a time of wide scale language contraction and mass extinction, the sustainability of Pennsylvania Dutch goes against the grain seen in other case studies. The nature
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31 In the next century, thousands of the world’s nearly 7,000 languages are expected to disappear (cf. Languages: A Very Short Introduction)
of its durability depends on not only forms of community and economic self-sufficiency, but also, beyond that, the resulting inwardness or moral dispositions from their upbringing.

Let us consider, then, what makes the linguistic education of the Amish distinctive. As if they were still enmeshed in the linguistic diversity of Europe, the Amish have been able to maintain a quasi-trilingualism speaking Pennsylvania Dutch, using English with the outside world, and reading High German during worship. This bilingualism buoys and sustains their existence. Each language is given its proper ethical place in the corresponding domains of Amish life. In effect, the Amish linguistically compartmentalize.

At mother’s knee, the Amish learn Pennsylvania Dutch. As three leading Amish scholars recently state, it represents “the language of family, friendship, play, and intimacy.”32 Strictly an oral language, Pennsylvania Dutch is the in-group means of communication that maintains their linguistic distinctiveness as a people. They invert the idea of a language barrier; Pennsylvania Dutch is a supporting beam for their existential self-actualization. In many ways true, their primary language is the foundation on which they cultivate a specific ethnoreligious worldview. They feel that it is more rectitudinous and cocoons them from the vices of modernity, such as keeping their forms of expression clean from violent and abusive language.33 Seeing their Pennsylvania Dutch and bilingualism this way adds substance to and raises the orientation of language-as-resource34 to an existential plane.

The Amish deem practicing Pennsylvania Dutch and High German essential for walking in righteousness35 in the world but not of the world. Their language practices are not only a resource to self-actualize intra-ethnically but also inter-worldly, forming a protective cover

32 Kraybill, Johnson-Weiner, and Nolt, p. 122
33 John Hostetler, The Amish, p. 23
35 Hostetler, The Amish, p. 7
around their meaning narrative and corresponding lifeways that stretch back to the Bible and the Protestant Reformation. Hence, the intensity of their convictions galvanizes language maintenance, animating a bilingualism that allows these traditions to persist amidst society’s assimilationist forces. Pennsylvania Dutch and High German are instruments that allow them to care for their religious selves where these two languages nourish their spirituality in a way that, in their estimation, English does not. From the context of a broader world-picture, we can begin to see that the Amish exemplify how bilingualism and religion have historically been together.

Following this connection, let us see more deeply how the Amish see the two intimately interconnected. For Amish subjectivity, the Pennsylvania Dutch language reflects a more reverent and purer linguistic form that is more in touch with the moral exigencies of God. They see their language as creating a worldview that places front and center their living for God, with the complementarity values of humility, obedience, and collectivism fortifying this goal. These virtues spring from their commonplace expression, Geh lessa, a reformulation of the German *Gelassenheit*. *Geh lessa* has normative and ethical implications as it means to “Let be and go in this way.” In mainstream terms, we can interpret this not only as a pious “it is what it is,” but also as a command, “let it be.” Although literally translated as serenity or calmness, the expression deals more closely with having composure before and submitting to God’s plan.36 As anthropologist Johnson-Weiner suggests, this is the glue that holds everything together, which I point to as a reciprocal relation between their language use and philosophy of existence.

Pennsylvania Dutch-based traditions and religious services tap into resources in High German. In doing so, Pennsylvania Dutch becomes the latest chapter of a meaning narrative that stretches back to Anabaptist publications such as *Martyr’s Mirror*, to Martin Luther’s 1534
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translated Bible, and ultimately to Jesus Christ himself. Simultaneously imbibing High German
and practicing Pennsylvania Dutch maintains their thread of discipleship through Christianity’s
most revered figures. Not only are these publications in a pre-industrial and pre-modern German
that is in line of avoiding contemporary values but, more importantly, these behaviors inwardly
foster their commitment to their community. Augmenting their Pennsylvania Dutch with
ceremonious usage of High German sustains a Christian and, therefore, from their perspective,
existential legitimacy to their way of life.

Besides Pennsylvania Dutch, their other highly proficient language is English. Their
relation to English is not unlike their relation to their neighbors. They conflictingly describe
wanting to be on good terms and friendly with their neighbors but at the same time remain
isolated. As such, they embrace English in a utilitarian way to develop the necessary proficiency
to sustain their livelihood, interact with wider society, and be aware of high modern culture.37
The entirety of their institutionalized schooling from grades 1-8 and the medium of
communication with the outside community, and particularly business, transpires in English,
excluding some foreign-language support of German.

At the same time, the Amish have developed a certain acumen for keeping out the values
and “worldliness” of English that consequently change thought processes and test their faith.
They recognize that rubbing shoulders with English and those who speak it has the potential to
allow different language dispositions to seep their way into themselves and the community.
Learning English well, they develop a dual frame of reference that becomes their proverbial
right-hand man to finetune their desired ways of being. Amid their bilingualism, the English
language and its worldliness becomes a control group that lends itself to existential reflection.

37 ibid
They can juxtapose and contrast their German heritage with modern English language and American culture, which often provides the required vitality for the continued upkeep of their Pennsylvania Dutch.

This heightened awareness of their own protective ethnoreligious barrier happens not only individually but also communally. Non-existentialists in a philosophical sense, they do a good job as impersonators as each Amish community develops essentially its own constitution, or *Ordnung* (German for order). This unwritten code of conduct lays out the expectations of how one ought to live, effectively squaring Amish tradition and the Gospel with modernity. With these community charters, they author their own existence and externalize a moral compass intended to make life count for whom they consider the ultimate judge, Jesus Christ. Considering what they learn through and from English, they decide as a community on what forms of technology and elements of wider society they will open their ethnoreligious fences to and are compatible with their own authenticity. This *Ordnung* effectively expresses their own take on a bilingual moral conscience with its enhanced ethical commitment from three languages.

Nevertheless, the Amish’s impressive sense for their own bilingual particularity poignantly has a degree of bad faith. The same spiritually rich insulation that the *Geh lessa* maxim brings to life also shackles their thinking, concerning both facticity and transcendence. Despite their official reliance on scripture, the Amish themselves are not studious—they are not lucid regarding their historical-cultural attachments or the significance of their comportments and, less so, their language. They platitudinously preach that “using the Pennsylvania Dutch language keeps the Amish traditions going.”
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expression of their everyday engagement in the world without full awareness of this facticity that I sketched above. The ethical problem is that they lie to themselves that there is no need to have greater awareness and, therefore, they cannot be wholly responsible to themselves and others as elective bilinguals.

The Amish commitment to walking in but not of their world prevents them from taking greater control of their communal and multilingual education. In pushing out the why behind reality in favor of preserving ethnoreligious tradition, their form of self-actualization discourages their community members from higher levels of education and the meaningful and relevant concrete thinking on how their traditions have been formed, come about, and presently function. In doing so, they create a disposition that chases a mirage of religious sincerity, e.g., reading Luther’s Bible in its original High German without real competence in the language. Thus, true-hearted scripturists ought to more deeply study the historical developments of their ownmost traditions to move their quasi-trilingualism from its current lower strength status to developing more ethical forms of culture better aligned to their beliefs and trilingual identity.

**Diné and the Ethos of Hózhó**

When it comes to ethnic islands inside the United States, the Amish find themselves in the best of relative health. Their philosophy of existence, materialized through their *Ordnung* and its image creation, is their lodestar that shines bright on their economic, linguistic, and spiritual well-being. While my introduction to the Amish community signals that their geo-cultural separation is a relatively vibrant form of bilingualism, the other extreme is the case of the Diné. The Diné people, or, as outsiders generally know them, the Navajo (a term I reserve to refer to their language), find themselves in a state of existential crisis. Unlike the Amish, they have not been able to successfully forge a sustainable blueprint, which has endangered their language and
culture. Hardship strikes at the heart of English-Navajo bilingualism. Their history and present state testify to their inability to successfully cope not only with settler colonialism and American paternalism but also with the broader philosophical challenges of the modern era. Metaphorically, this bilingualism is an ulcer, the bitter fruit of a cultural evolution amidst civilizing missions, colonial violence, cultural imperialism, and underdevelopment.

The ancestors of the Diné, a name that means the People, gradually migrated through North America, making them genetically related to others that sparingly dot the West Coast of the US and more densely cover Western Canada and Alaska. Their language, Navajo or Diné Bizaad, is one of seven that comprise what linguists call the Southern branch of the Athabaskan language family, whose name geographically stems from Lake Athabasca in North Central Canada. As a distinctive ethnic group, the Diné predate, per some accounts, the Amish and their schism of 1693 by some 300 years. Drawing on archeological and anthropological work, one historian states that Diné history proper, with potential linkages to the Anasazi, begins in the fifteenth century when they separated themselves from their ancestors, establishing Dinétah, the Diné homeland, demarcated by the four sacred mountains of Blanca Peak, Colorado; Mount Taylor, New Mexico; San Francisco Peaks, Arizona; and Hesperus Peak, Colorado.
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40 I define ulcerous bilingualism as an existential take on conflictive bilingualism where the convergence of language and culture is experienced painfully.
41 While this is still a lively debate, the Diné increasingly claim lineage. See Peter Iverson, Diné: A History of the Navajos, Chapter 1.
To this day, clans are central to Diné identity and symbolize the syncretism and cultural contact in their genetic code. When a Diné with a more traditional frame of reference introduces oneself in Navajo or English, they generally express from which originating clan they are from, e.g. Many Hogan or Mexican people. More than one hundred of these clans exist. They denote not only communal bonds to a certain brand of Diné-ness but also a spatial rootedness. This clan identity encapsulates both parents’ clans but, as a matrilineal ethnic group, the father’s clan is phased out within two generations while the mother’s clan name endures. Ideally, marriage occurs between two individuals whose maternal and paternal clans do not align.\(^42\) Both the cultural and biological intercourse that the Diné had with outsiders oftentimes sprouted new clan offshoots\(^43\) and gave rise to a wide array of what it is to be Diné, much like with the Amish.
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\(^43\) Peter Iverson, *Diné: A History of the Navajos*
While the fusion of the New and Old Worlds has in current times proved ulcerous for the Diné, their horizons initially expanded favorably. Unlike later American colonialism, the first European group in the wider Southwest region, the Spaniards, inadvertently empowered them. Geographically the Diné were at the outset situated outside of the pincers of the “Gold, God, and Glory” banner-flying conquistadors. As such, the Diné avoided their direct path of destruction but reaped benefits from the Great Biological Exchange, most notably, their acquisition of sheep. Endemic to Eurasia, sheep have been at the heart of Navajo lifeways since obtained in the indigenous trading network of the 1600s. As historian Iverson poetically states, “The Navajos took the animals, wrapped them in the strands of their own stories, and made them theirs.” An entire way of life and art forms, e.g., their world-class woven rugs, have sprung from their ability to shepherd large herds of churro sheep over large expanses of land.

The colonial era is proof of the fact that exceptionally large intersubjective power differentials have loomed over Diné history. The Spaniards left an indelible mark not only on their means of production but also in their ethnolinguistic formation. In addition to helping transform the Diné culture into becoming sheep-centered, Spanish missionaries propagated the Navajo exonym starting in the 1620s. Etymologically, Navahu stems from the Tewa indigenous language where literally nava was field and hu, valley, with a figurative meaning of “large area of cultivated lands.” The Spaniards, particularly friars engaging in their colonizing agenda, borrowed and adopted this word that the Tewa applied to the Diné, describing them as the “Apache Indians of Navaju.” This name was eventually passed on to Mexican and American bands of settlers and colonizers, evolving into Navahó and eventually Navajo.
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Despite more direct run-ins with the Spanish, time would prove that the colonizing power that the Diné had to most reckon with was Anglo Americans and their ravenous language of manifest destiny. Since finding Europeans encroaching in the region, the Diné have possessed an antagonistic relationship to the foundational project of the United States and in its cultural, economic, and political imperialism toward the Pacific, comprising a stress point of Diné facticity to this day. In an era of pernicious hierarchies, the expanding frontier demanded a pacification of Native Americans, typically dispossessing land and attempting to gradually assimilate them, in what has in contemporary times been interpreted as a historical example of ethnic cleansing. In contrast to the Amish who divorced themselves from, but, after the dust settled, found their own niche inside of the modern world, the distinctive cultural-historical path of the Diné has been experienced as a clash of societies, one with extant wounds and tension still being sorted out in their language practices. Their positionality has stood at loggerheads with European and American civilization; they were not, however eccentric, acceptable owners of land as the Amish were, to be left relatively, albeit oddly, unmolested on amicable terms. From the margins, the Amish bought into the political-economic order and learned English and its commerce of communication while the Diné did not.

Contrasting the current social scientists’ celebration of bilingualism with the historical record, we see that the bilingual cognitive advantage is a particularity. When bilingualism is engendered through an ongoing ontological assault, we must also recognize it as an ulcer. Navajo language proficiency, having to reroute itself from developing familiarity with the Spanish-language conquistadores and “the truths”48 of Catholic missionaries, did not adapt quickly enough to learn the language of their new interlopers. This process foreshadowed their bilingual

48 Iverson, Diné, p. 49
difficulties to come. On a structural level, neither US nor Diné society had a vested interest in learning the other’s language and accompanying epistemology, which would have facilitated a more ethical recognition between Anglo settlers and the People. This pattern continues to this day, as outsiders rarely elect to learn Navajo. Instead, genealogically, this ethnocentric bilingualism was born in an age of the frontier, in Indian country, where dichotomies of civilization/savagery and rugged individualism/assault-on-being were engrained into both civilizations and caused psychological and physical wounds in the Diné.

While the Amish selectively integrated themselves and developed a functional bilingualism for their own advantage, on the frontier for the Diné marked by an intercultural misunderstanding and not learning the language of exploitation. The Navajo Wars, as US settlers called the low-intensity warfare between themselves and the Diné, came to a head in the Long Walk of 1864. After an invasion and accompanying scorched earth policy, the United States army used both the carrot and stick to relocate approximately 9,000 Diné to the resource-poor plains of eastern New Mexico, to an area near Fort Sumner known as Bosque Redondo. This ethic of amoral eviction backfired, creating a despondent and dependent environment for all parties. When crops failed and the river proved toxic, the US government had to ration out sustenance. Costs hit exorbitant levels for the US government in their attempt to provide the bare necessities, healthcare, and protection from invading indigenous tribes. Inside the camp itself, dissension also characterized the relation between the herders and the herded, resulting in violent deaths of US soldiers.

49 Clay Slate, “Promoting Advanced Navajo Language Scholarship,” The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice
Before long, the debacle of the Long Walk and internment camp became apparent to all sides. Opposition emerged from the Congressional Indian Peace Commission, urging to stop the humanitarian wrongs and, most importantly for them, the financial bleeding. Desperate for the Diné to become self-supporting, the US government opened a space for the Diné to negotiate a treaty on satisfactory terms. Realizing their leverage, the Diné refused to leave unless it was back home. Leader Barboncito and fellow elders appealed to their ability to be self-reliant in their ancestral lands, culminating in the Treaty of Bosque Redondo of 1868 where the U.S. officially recognized the right of the Diné to a portion of their ancestral land and gave them legal sovereign status.

The Treaty of Bosque Redondo is existentially significant in several ways. First, given the situated worldliness\(^{51}\) of Diné existence, their securing a core of their homeland was a major triumph for their survival and continuity. The reservation’s eventual extreme size of 27,000 acres, roughly that of West Virginia, means that the Diné’s presence drastically looms large in relation to nearly all other Amerindian groups. Secondly, this defining moment underscores an historical immorality of translation and bilingualism. The negotiations in consummating the treaty were mediated through a double language barrier, from Navajo to Spanish and from Spanish to English. Far more than an innocent interlingual game of telephone where the message could be distorted across languages, arbitrary boilerplate language in the negotiations was used in order to intentionally communicate in roundabout ways and get the Diné to agree to the least favorable treaty as possible.\(^{52}\) Further, this historical moment highlights the dark side of a colonizing bilingualism for ethnolinguistic minorities where the seeds of an inferiority complex
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are sown; one’s own being and values, including and especially one’s language world, are seen as an impediment for progress and self-actualization.

One of the main vessels to impede Diné self-affirmation occurred through a forced assimilationist education in boarding schools. In addition to initially relegating them to merely fifty square miles and dispossessing them of much of their ancestral land, the Treaty of Bosque Redondo also called for the tribal nation’s youth to be schooled, “[i]n order to insure the civilization of the Indians entering into this treaty…” Dispossession moved more intentionally from land to culture and language. School, for the Navajo child, was an instrument of nation-state building, intended to rewrite Diné normativity and create a communal language shift away from Navajo under the pretense of civilization. Towards this end, boarding schools asphyxiated Diné youth from their cultural inheritance by removing them from their households, reprimanding them for using their language, and hammering into them European American epistemology and ontology. For many, this subtractive bilingual education would dislodge their ancestral language from their ability to enshrine their meaning narrative. Many did not want to have their own kids subjected to these traumatic experiences and elected to not teach them Navajo. As we see in their current low language vitality, this threatens to upend Diné ontology and rewrite their history as one of insurmountable painful journeys that eventually led to the linguistic death of Navajo.

Due to these and other injustices committed against tribal nations, Americans, in a wide sense of the word, do not need to turn to Europe to find a milieu that birthed a natural expression of existentialism. Rather, philosophy finds a recognizable strand under the name, “self-determination.” Like with more traditionally identified European existentialist thought, similar
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themes of a heightened sense of temporality,\textsuperscript{55} an ongoing project of value creation and identity formation, a conscious possession-taking of oneself, and ethical relations and discussion of rights also spring forward in indigenous thought in response to the indignities suffered and lack of free growth to self-form. Granted, the individuality is expressed through more communal forms. However, in their wanting to live according to their own lights with self-governance, cultural renewal, and education, this movement is an indigenous take on an existential bilingualism.

This movement is a counterreaction. Their twentieth century language shift has become more pronounced in each subsequent generation to gradually erode Navajo from Diné households and not have any clear domains of use such as in religious ceremony. Jarringly less than 5\% of Diné youth are fluent in Navajo today and by 2040 forecasts show that fluency will dwindle to only 4\% of the entire population; for the sake of comparison, Amish knowledge of Pennsylvania Dutch is universal. Policies in place since the 1980s to strengthen the language with bilingual education programs and degree plans in Navajo in their own institution of higher learning, Diné College, have only been implemented halfheartedly. Further, the fact that political leaders since 2015 are no longer legally obliged to know their language highlights this shift.

Nonetheless, a new subjective layer of linguistic awareness and cultural individuality is coming into view for many Diné. Their language shift has not only painfully produced self-criticism and a pining for better times ahead,\textsuperscript{56,57} but also modified their disposition towards Navajo, comprising a moment for a new dawn.\textsuperscript{58} There is a call to subjectively take charge of who they are and extend their self-determination to the linguistic sphere. A new sense of urgency

\textsuperscript{55} Existentialism: A Very Short Introduction
\textsuperscript{56} Deborah House, Language Shift Among the Navajos, p. 98
\textsuperscript{57} Nez’s 2018 dissertation concludes that including Diné epistemology in education could jumpstart “a transformative awakening that could lead to new understanding of responsibility and purpose in the lives of Diné youth.”
\textsuperscript{58} https://www.npr.org/2020/03/28/823071300/what-hopi-and-navajo-teachings-tell-us-about-pandemics
and mobilization to reclaim their language and transfigure their indigeneity is their 21st century ethnic Great Awakening. Now more than ever before, many pin their philosophy of existence—diné be’iiná—on how they educate themselves bilingually in and outside the classroom. The centrality of education and the importance of every person in their community is increasingly seen as the solution to renovate their past and prevent a soon-to-be-monolingual community. Navajo-English bilingualism is developing a more ethical self-presence.

This existential turning point in self-understanding can be seen in their own brand of Bildung. Literally meaning both education and culture in German, the term Bildung has a heavily philosophized past in Europe, connoting anything from being well-rounded, philosophically autodidactic, and possessing good taste, to having societal application like with the notion of human development or level of cultivation. It is also both a process and a result. Ethically, Bildung implies not only the art of self-cultivation but also that of a communal cultivation where we educate ourselves to become more responsible to each other. This edifying nature led Emerson to translate it as upbuilding and underpins much of Dewey’s philosophy.

On Navajo Nation, the ideal of an indigenous Bildung is evolving to include a eudemonic Navajo-English bilingualism. Like the German tradition, an indigenous Bildung also has a wider conception than mere formal education in a Western normative sense. Namely, their conception is far more intergenerational, communitarian, and ethical. Each generation is expected to be responsible for the preceding and subsequent three generations, as well as their own, thus being responsible for seven generations—an ethic in all its complexity that would be emasculated if removed from the Navajo language. In addition, more explicit programs are being implemented.
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to prevent language death, where the remaining fluent older generations are taking on a bigger role in the community. Not only are they immersing their toddlers in language nests, but they also devote more resources to higher quality bilingual dual language programs.

I contend that this commitment to a bilingual Bildung aligns with Diné epistemology and is a means to interpret a further projection of it. In Navajo, the sacred notion of Hózhó, shorthand for Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hózhóón, represents their own take on human flourishing, translated as “past old age, the one that walks there in ultimate balance and harmony or the balanced path.”

Like eudaimonia, this indigenous philosophy of well-being holds reflection, independent thinking, action, and self-actualization in high esteem. But unlike its Western counterpart, Hózhó demands a metaphysical balance with oneself and his relation both to himself, those around him, and nature. As an obliged bilingualized culture, the Diné must rationally carve their initials into their bilingualism in a more balanced form to not only reengage the past but also innovate on present circumstances to make Navajo a living language once again. This entails not just being functionally bilingual; rather, it provides a nuance of eudemonic bilingualism in so creating the disposition of Hózhó in their speakers.

How to do this becomes the central question for the Diné. Following their ideal of balance, they could strive to learn both equally well in pursuit of balanced bilingualism. Alternatively, and more practically, as the Amish do, they could distribute Navajo and English to different domains, reserving in-group communication at home, religious life, and work for Navajo and formal schooling and communication with outsiders in English. While this decision is decided by the community of elective bilinguals, I suggest that they build on their undeniable
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strength of environmental ethics. Given that a life is made significant and enhanced through building on ideals, their Navajo language and overall bilingualism can gain succor through further developing their relationship to Earth, already strong through the interwovenness of their oral tradition, place-based history, and sacredness of Mother Earth. Combining the best of indigenous and broader philosophical traditions, the Diné can revitalize their language through the means of environmental stewardship and sustainability.

From this angle, the moral dimension of bilingualism is in full display. Navajo provides access to ontological tools such as the seven-generation concept and Hózhó while seeding a deeper concern for the environment. This ability to reimagine their existence through Navajo provides an opportunity for a cultural renaissance. True, the Diné are still struggling to find an ideal of self-projection after what has happened to them. But, taking a step beyond Sartrean existentialism, they have realized that their bilingualism, from a happenstance to an elective variety, renders an enhanced and higher-powered for-itself, negating their ulcer. As the youth gradually develop a disposition of wisdom and see the need to project a more balanced relation to both languages in a eudemonic fashion, their meaning narrative embraces a self-actualizing bilingualism through which they commit to their themselves and their community.

**Gullah Geechee and the Ethos of Kumbaya**

Unlike the cautionary tale of the Diné for whom historical trauma has become a psychological fact, we encounter the Gullah/Geechee people of the Sea Islands who resiliently prefer to focus on the vibrancy of their past, present, and future. They have overcome their history of transatlantic bondage to possess a different collective disposition. An ethos of survival
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The story of the Gullah begins with rice. Plantation owners in the low-lying coastal regions of the Southeast of the colonial United States especially wanted slaves from the “Rice Coast” of West Africa, or the coastal lip of Senegal down to Liberia, since these slaves brought knowledge of rice cultivation with them. As the Amish arrived to Philadelphia seeking freedom from ethnoreligious persecution, Gullah African slaves were auctioned off to the highest bidders in the high-volume slave ports of Charles Town and Savannah. These prized slaves fetched a premium market price, making them, in many instances, irreplaceable for their owners. Consequently, they outlived the average short lifespan of a slave in the New World. The owners account for their relative well-being. They went on to live much longer, which allowed the germination of a new culture and language.

The philosophic theme of isolation and the resulting micro-politics also weigh in the story of the Gullah. Like with the Amish and the Diné, the terms of isolation between wider society and their ethnic community partly frame the ethical character of their existence, comprising the structural backdrop. In the case of the Amish, their isolation is like the ascetic monk, self-imposed. Being economically empowered, the Amish can exert their own free will on the terms of interaction with the other. The inverse has been the case for the Diné. Their isolation has been much more punishing and paternalistic. Settler colonialism and nation-state building resulted in ethnic cleansing and the creation of a fourth-world reservation. However, the Gullah
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do not follow either. After the worst of starts, healing and maturation has occurred, allowing them to sustain a relatively healthy internal and external relation for much of their history.

The climate of the Sea Islands isolated the Gullah. As it turns out, a sort of Montezuma’s Revenge hit the white plantation owners. In importing slaves, the human traffickers also inadvertently brought malaria and yellow fever pathogens to the New World. The same conditions that gave rise to thriving rice cultivation also allowed tropical diseases to thrive, rendering the coastal areas along the Carolinas and Georgia effectively uninhabitable for the whites for half of the year. At the same time, the African slaves had some degree of immunity to the diseases and could endure the summer and fall months of heightened transmission.\(^\text{70}\)

Thus, a different plantation system developed on these barrier and tidal islands of the antebellum South. The white plantation owners ran their business from afar, establishing an accountability system with only a few white managers and trusted African slaves to oversee the servitude. As such, these absentee white slave owners made it so that African slaves had little exposure to North American colonial culture. An environment spatially distanced from Westerners gave rise to the phenomenon of creolization where these enslaved Africans from diverse tribal speech communities largely communicated amongst themselves. Numerous West and Central African languages and English fused into to a new language known as Sea Island Creole or Gullah Geechee. The slaves’ relatively autonomous recreation of what they knew from Africa on the shores of the Carolinas and Georgia\(^\text{71}\) indigenized Africa on American soil.

Without minimizing the African influence in the general African American community, the Gullah clearly accentuate the African in African American. Following liberation from their white owners, the land that the Gullah worked was rightfully given to them during

\(^{70}\) Wilbur Cross, *Gullah Culture in America*  
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Reconstruction. Many African American communities had to eventually return their land to white owners, but the remoteness of the Gullah corridor cocooned them from the government’s reneging in the Jim Crow South. Comparably with the Diné, the demand for Gullah land was low. In this context, many Sea Islands would go on to “resemble a West African homeland.”

Sea Island creole and other visible elements of their African heritage flourished such as their ancestral songs, grass basket weaving, rice and seafood diet, and presence of medicine men.

As postbellum landowners, the Gullah began forging a positive ethos of survival in a geographical safe space. The Gullah homeland was not handpicked for its fertility like with the Amish nor ancestral like with the Diné. But coincidentally being in possession of this land had enormous benefits. It entitled them to a degree of physical separation where they could localize their African lifeways, secure control of the means of production, and establish relatively favorable interaction with outsiders. This reversal of fortune in the resulting micro-politics allowed this former slave community the chance for the first time to pursue life, liberty, and happiness. These conditions helped the community heal from the trauma of slavery.

After the Union troops liberated them in the Civil War, the Gullah people on St. Helena Island in South Carolina would experience a defining dayclean in their ethical composition. Traumatically, Sea Island Creole was born in the early 1700s from chattel slavery. However, the start of a more ethical and stable bilingualism originated when abolitionist Laura Towne, trained in medicine and education, left her native Philadelphia for South Carolina in 1862 to administer humanitarian aid to former slaves in this area. Unsurprisingly, her abolitionist fervor was not
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primarily couched in a modern-day human rights discourse, but rather in Biblical scripture and teachings of transcendentalist preacher William Henry Furness, who sermonized that slavery was anti-religion, suppressed spirituality, and that his congregation ought to help the cause.\footnote{William Henry Furness, \textit{The Blessings of Abolition}, https://iiif.lib.harvard.edu/manifests/view/drs:46311368$24i}

Answering this call, Towne arrival marked a desire to uplift and extend liberty to all of God’s children, providing a stark contrast to the Diné’s Christian harassment.

The Gullah lacked basic academic skills. Realizing this, Towne expanded her concern from their physical health to their intellectual health as well. In so doing, she invaluably steeped the youth of St. Helena Island in a distinct tradition, vital for developing a bilingual moral conscience. With Sea Island Creole not yet having linguistic recognition, she was unable to identify it as a distinct language, perceiving that the community had trouble producing a more traditional variety of English. She wrote, “their mode of speaking is not very intelligible,”\footnote{Laura M. Towne, \textit{Letters and Diary of Laura M. Towne}, p. 6} with most of her pupils only being monolingual in what we now call Sea Island Creole. Along with her friend Ellen Murray, the two women started Penn School, in honor of William Penn, where students described it, using what linguists call a phraseological calque, as a place to “catch the learning” in reading, writing, arithmetic, history, geography, music and the Bible through the English language.\footnote{Wilbur Cross, \textit{Gullah Culture in America}} Within a year, the abolitionists grew their teaching force, established permanent facilities and added the teaching of vocational skills to their curriculum. The Penn School was much more than a mere neighborhood school becoming a node of ethical formation in the Gullah community, training the youth academically and professionally and performing community outreach in education, politics, and public health to surrounding Gullah areas.

Considering this evidence, some scholars interpret this history as an assimilationist
ideology to Anglicize the Gullah. With no knowledge of their culture, Towne and Murray, as they stand accused, chauvinistically reproduced their New England Bildung and worldview in the Gullah nation. This seems one-sided. As an educator myself who values bilingual education, I see her humanitarian work, while suboptimal as it only academically promoted one language, as a fountainhead towards healthy and supportive dual language practices. That is, this humanitarian work laid the foundation for a bilingual moral conscience. The Penn Center brought a new line of cultural development side-by-side with their creole, providing access to conventional literacy, the power of English, its moral code, and the requisite amount of L2 intake to bring their bilingual formation into existence. If the motive behind a phenomenon significantly determines its ethical character, the Gullah bilingual experience as via the Penn School has undeniable moral legitimacy to it.

Despite their bilingualism brewing in public education, the Gullah still marched into the twentieth century by cultivating their particularity largely amongst themselves and distant from the outside world. Like Pennsylvania Dutch and Navajo, Sea Island Creole was solely oral, forged when the slave was forbidden to learn the written word. Gullah’s lifeways and the resulting social relations sustained their language, be it through the fervor of their kumbaya (“come by here,” creolized) prayer inside one-room communal Praise Houses or their subsistence agriculture and commercial specialization.

Bilingual outcomes varied in the 12,000 square mile Gullah corridor. Some Gullah testimonials discuss the lack of self-presence in realizing their own bilingualism, experiencing it, as Haugen aptly put it, as mundane as the air they breathed. One example is Emory Campbell (1941-present), former director of the Penn Center for 22 years, who recollected, “I was nearly
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half a century old when I comprehended that the culture in which I was born, Gullah, contains uniquely rich folklore and a fascinating, distinguished idiom.”

Perhaps in a similar fashion to how many may experience their bilingualism, it simply was without much reflection.

Nonetheless, the community also deeply felt the US melting pot ideology making many Gullahs ashamed of their cultural-historical background. Hence, the spectrum of Gullah bilingualism contains an ethnocentric variety like that felt by native speaker Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas (1948-present). He and others grew up experiencing bilingualism as a stigma, remarking, “What little remains of Geechee life is now celebrated by scholars of black folklore, but when I was a boy, ‘Geechee’ was a derogatory term for Georgians who had profoundly Negroid features and spoke with a foreign-sounding accent similar to the dialects heard on certain Caribbean islands.”

For non-Gullah, his language revealed a static and “outmoded” culture. This projected back on to those like Thomas to be internalized as a scar to be shunned. Lacking knowledge of his roots, he was embarrassed by them, and, thus, had no defense on hand. The community’s choice to maintain a strictly oral language tradition, in absence of traditional literacy, would arguably handcuff them from self-actualizing more presently and being more prepared to counteract society’s push to decreolize. Legitimate questions can be raised if Thomas’ embrace of conservative politics overcompensates for or could be a consequence of not developing a bilingual moral conscience in his youth.

These situations compounded with an encroaching modernity gave rise to an ongoing language shift starting in the second half of the twentieth century. Perceiving that society favored English, much of Gullah youth, like Justice Thomas, matured in a subtractive bilingual
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environment, adopting English at the expense of their home language. Far too often, Sea Island Creole became a language to socialize in intra-ethnically and hidden from the mainstream. In addition to the shaming, bridges began to be erected from the mainland into the Sea Islands which, like many bridges into isolated communities the world over, would disrupt landownership and spatially-bound language practices in the name of development and infrastructure. Developers bought out Gullah land from underneath many of them, displacing communities and forcing them into select pockets. At the present, Gullah is still living and engaged in the world, but it is increasingly shrinking, down to approximately 5,000 speakers.

Nevertheless, possibility prevails. In a similar fashion that the Diné have had an ethnic revival, the Gullah are not far behind in the process of formalizing their bilingualism. Going beyond what Thomas signaled above, bilingualism and cultural particularity are not just increasingly protected and celebrated in institutional settings but also in their concrete relations in communities. With their bilingualism now under the microscope, biliteracy has followed. A 2005 translation of the Bible, De Nyew Testament, has helped legitimize Gullah. In addition, fully praying in their primary language represents an internal push for an independent cultivation of Sea Island Creole to better balance out their English dominance. In brief, the normative significance of their ancestral bilingualism has experienced rapid evolution over the past century where, inside a bilingual moral conscience, lives a self-acceptance of their past and a high-powered for-itself projects a brighter bilingual future.

**Commonalities**

All three of our historical case studies corroborate the notion that there has been a definitive increase in the value of bilingualism from society at large. Whether it be the self-
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actualizing variety of the Amish, the eudemonic variety of the Diné, or the ancestral variety of the Gullah, bilingualism has become an ideal and an object for morality as communities are existentially taking possession of themselves, moving from happenstance to intentional language planning. As I see it, this pattern constitutes a world historical principle. The ethos of bilingualism found in each case study, to different degrees and directions, has moved from a circumstantial oral based language to cultivating a bilingual formation through design that is morally desirable. The variation across contexts gives each bilingual combination its own moral twist and normative significance based on its cultural-historical tradition.

In this sense, they are not only ethnic islands but also islands of positive deviation in bringing together bilingualism and ethics. Their home language is not a world language and does not live outside of their community. Consequently, they are not under any pretense of knowing their language for utilitarian purposes or globalized culture, motivations of many other bilingual speakers. As linguistic minorities, their context has given them the wisdom to see a deeper value in bilingualism. Whether reacting against language loss or religious abandonment, each case study shows the importance of getting its members to commit to the larger community through such a bilingual formation. Their unique sense of right and wrong comes through it.

A second essential variable is the role of Christianity. Christianity has worked against and for bilingualism, as a meaning narrative powerful enough to create or destroy it depending on the actors. As a protagonist, the spirit of the Christian Bildung for the Gullah was a stabilizing force that anchored the community in two languages. The motives were genuine and upbuilt the Gullah. The same cannot be said for the Diné. Christianity is an antagonist that has been a justification to displace their existence. At the same time, the Amish see Christianity worthy enough to devote their whole lives to it, their language practices included. Their very identity is
so caught up in their bilingualism that it can be said to demonstrate a mutuality of cause and effect.
Chapter 2: Defining Individual Bilingualism

My case studies about forms of communal bilingualism and how they existentially vary help us understand that the significance of bilingualism differs for each ethnic group based on their historical frame of reference. Further, each community is coming to more fully embrace their two languages to recognize how each tradition morally shapes their sense of right. This sense of right from two traditions allows the creation of a bilingual moral conscience and elective bilingualism. Far from being isolated theoretical constructs, chapter one’s historical examples show us what ideals look like in other cultural contexts, and, thus, by implication, in our own.

As much as these ideals stand as a novel contribution to philosophy, simply exalting them in a moral discourse or pointing them out in select language communities is insufficient. We cannot celebrate these ideals based on ethics alone because their realization is contingent on it taking place on a scientific level. Thus, if we aim to bring to life an ethical form of bilingualism in our populations, we ought to move away from historical ethical perspectives that anecdotally draw on a negative naturalism\textsuperscript{84} to scientific details on what it takes to galvanize the psychological phenomenon. It is, after all, the business of philosophy to know the science behind what it examines. Striking at the scientific structure of bilingualism, my research question asks, then, how do we determine where someone is in their bilingual development and when it existentially entails a bilingual relation with facticity.

Consequently, in this second chapter I incorporate scientific findings into my philosophy. I extend our understanding of the phenomenon of bilinguality\textsuperscript{85} and bilingualism by exploiting

\textsuperscript{84} See Appiah’s *Experiments in Ethics* (2008) where he emphasizes an interdisciplinary cosmopolitanism where philosophy integrates social sciences’ findings to ground and enrich its arguments, a point that I agree with.  
\textsuperscript{85} Hamers & Blanc (2000) use bilinguality to refer to the psychological state of bilingualism at an individual level.
“the bilingual turn,” or its boom in recent social science research. Grappling with the general science of psychology, related fields, and the bilingualism paradigm, I anchor my project in philosophy of science. Far from cheerleading scientism, I take a hard look at the current state of the field, the caveats that we must have in drawing on the research from the bilingual turn, and the pitfalls that prevent a greater conceptualization of individual and societal bilingualism and, by extension, elective bilingual morality.

First, I describe the Great Method Debate in relation to the scientific study of bilingualism. I adduce evidence from in and outside of the field to argue that reigning epistemic ambiguity is a symptom of the root cause, an ill-defined and unclear methodology. Secondly, I key in on and assess the prevailing working definitions of bilinguality. Third, I describe the evidence for my proposal of a developmental psycholinguistic definition, one that is suppler than what the field currently offers. Finally, I conclude that the aesthetic and ethical reasoning from the last chapter helps pave the way to a scientific theory that reveals the background conditions. The beauty of its psycholinguistics corroborates its truthfulness.

**Diagnosing the Epistemic Ambiguity**

Methodism, or the search for and evaluation of a method, has been a centerpiece in philosophy, science, and their intersection. History shows how epistemic despair, be it from uncertainty or empirical anomalies, ushers in paradigm shifts, new theories of knowledge, and innovative methodologies. While method’s connotation has increasingly contracted in scientific circles as technological, experimental, and statistical techniques, epistemology and philosophy of science are concerned with the how and why behind facts, reminding us that method implies
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epistemic premises, reasoning skills, and a greater self-presence in coming to know. Hence, methodology is a scientific face of epistemology, given that it encompasses the nature of knowing and the process of using certain doctrines for research goals,\textsuperscript{89} i.e., the explanatory principles that guide the hermeneutics of the researcher. As such, Vygotsky, the epitome of a methodist, states, “Methodology then is the linchpin through which philosophy guides science,”\textsuperscript{90} since “fact and philosophy are directly interrelated.”\textsuperscript{91}

While this section draws on relevant disciplines, the primary focus is psychology. The phenomenon of bilingualism is inexplicably tied to mental processes and behavior, which is the main epistemic responsibility that psychological science purports to oversee. Further, the existing theoretical core and protective belt of bilingualism studies are largely psychological in nature.\textsuperscript{92} On the other hand, it is also a linguistic phenomenon to the degree that bilingualism requires two or more languages to be acquired and internalized, comprehended and produced. A scientist must therefore control not only for both domains of knowledge, but, since it is both a linguistic and psychological phenomenon, one must also perceive their interrelation.\textsuperscript{93} Moving forward, how one deals with this issue of interrelation represents a key hermeneutic gift that philosophy can give to the scientific study of bilingualism, which will result in a clearer statement on the centrality of language in cognition as a causal principle.

Let us first clearly acknowledge that the scientific study of bilingualism is riddled with epistemic difficulty. The complexity\textsuperscript{94} and related variability\textsuperscript{95} in the bilingual experience
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impede any straightforward and more rational interpretation of it. Since bilinguality does not transpire outside of broader language use and cognitive development, a specialized study of it not only presupposes a general understanding of linguistics and psychology but also the consideration of a host of relevant factors such as the age and psycholinguistic structure at the time of acquisition, the degree of developmental symmetry of the two languages, the mental relations between them, the role of volition, motivation, and affect (e.g., Clarence Thomas’s subtractive bilingualism), the extent of education in each respective language, and sociolinguistic factors such as prestige, use, and function.\textsuperscript{96} Needless to say, controlling for a range of variables as wide and deep as these presents enormous theoretical difficulty for researchers in their attempt to make sense of an unusually noisy phenomenon.

As if this were not enough noise to clearly see a pattern, we must know not only where to look and what to overlook but also how to interpret. One can easily fall into a rabbit hole due to the theoretical complications outlined above, the interdisciplinarity of the bilingualism paradigm, the depth of the methodological crisis that is found within it, and the need for a method that finds a unit of analysis conserving the larger symmetric whole.\textsuperscript{97} It is much easier to trick oneself into thinking that one is scientifically plumbing the depths of bilingual memory if, with reckless abandon, the relations to the rest of the developmental process and cognition are set aside. The one-track mind does not realize its own inaccuracy. In the context of the bilingualism paradigm, the epistemic watchword is impoverishment, not anarchy. Against Feyerabend, a clear philosophy of psychology helps disambiguate by providing principles on which to base interpretations of the studied facts. Psychology must reform its methodology, allowing philosophy and science to enter an epistemic partnership.

\textsuperscript{96} Vygotsky, \textit{The History and Development of Higher Mental Functions, Vol. 4}
\textsuperscript{97} ibid
Given this intricate situation, one must master the field at large and develop breadth of range, as opposed to hyper-specialization. That is, a consistent philosophical framework informed by scientific results must be developed and applied to bilingualism, one that develops both its scope and depth attentively listening to the inferences and empirical evidence of current science while simultaneously subjecting its findings to the answers that dissenting voices and the scientific past can provide. Yet, in our current research environment, many scientists follow the opposite advice. They grapple with bilingualism’s complexities without being able to turn to a general science of psychology and a clear methodology. Left high and dry, the investigators have nothing but their own expertise and interpretive abilities to develop explanatory principles out of relations and processes that attempt to solve bilinguality and its broader cognitive underpinnings. In this pursuit of universals from a standpoint of particularity, one senior researcher remarks, one must “find a way of accounting for these myriad special circumstances and find at the core what is general and true,” evoking a sense of Mission Impossible.

By many accounts, evidence so far amassed supports only a low level of theoretical credibility in the scientific study of bilingualism. Although this may strike the reader as controversial, the demand from its leading researchers for greater rigor shows that the second-guessing and calling into question emanates from scientists’ own bilingual cognition laboratories. In fact, psychologists and linguists have admitted for decades that there is a need to wrestle with the reigning theoretical ambiguity; “bilingualism as a concept,” they confess, “has open-ended semantics.” These persistent dark clouds of uncertainty also envelope current
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research programs, as one senior scientist lamented, “I don’t have good answers to many questions...because] the areas are not well studied, not well defined.”

Further, a recent meta-study of the field also noted that a significant hurdle to increasing scientific credibility is that “many studies define and measure bilingualism differently, making cross-study comparisons difficult.” The fact that researchers themselves have become frustrated and perplexed by the vague and indeterminate character of their research suggests that the Great Method Debate is not only not settled for psychology and its bilingualism paradigm but also represents a red flag about the truth behind much of the science that they are producing.

Towards ameliorative ends, we commend these self-critiquing researchers for realizing that they fall short of meaningfully describing bilingualism. But however important self-critical insider reviews are, we must recognize that déformation professionnelle is also at play, as their reading of the situation is skewed from their thin specialization. To put it in perspective, their diagnoses are akin to identifying a false peak on the path to our summit. Through their narrow hermeneutic circle, they frame the problem as a method that can be corrected through even more narrowness and precision in the confines of bilingualism studies.

A prime example is supplied by François Grosjean, a pioneer in the psycholinguistics of bilingualism who is as close to a founding father as the field has. He insightfully notes that bilingual speakers are not equivalent to two monolinguals in one and therefore a scientific understanding must account for this divergence. In the main, researchers have yet to leave behind at least six monolingual biases, he affirms, in their methods for studying bilingualism, as
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bilingual fluency and skill are often unfairly held to monolingual standards; bilingual cognition, despite majority status in the world, is othered; crosslinguistic influence is seen as abnormal; bilingualism studies often focus on just one or the other language; and bilingual proficiency is irrationally allusive. Further showing his sensibility, he makes the case for rebooting the paradigm based on a bilingual view of the unique configuration of bilinguality, one that accounts for the distributive nature of the actual uneven development of bilingualism across domains for each individual.

Despite Grosjean’s wisdom, he sends mixed signals on the relation of bilingualism to monolingualism. In one moment, he chauvinistically advocates, “It is only when we start studying bilingualism in itself and for itself that we will make additional headway in this field.” At first glance, it might make sense that he would call for an intensification of expertise. After all, the runaway success of hard sciences demands narrowmindedness on strict empirical evidence and experimentation has given these fields a special epistemic status. However, at other times Grosjean hedges, offering such remarks as, “Now I am not opposed to sometimes comparing bilinguals to monolinguals… but one must be very careful.” His not being clear-eyed on how monolinguality and bilinguality are and are not similar and how these forms of cognition mutually inform each other creates additional ambiguity for researchers. In the negative, we must tell Grosjean that studying bilinguality in and of itself is not adequate.

Another line of research that sheds light on bilingualism’s epistemic ambiguity is a promising field known as metascience, a sister of philosophy of science. As a complementary voice to my dissatisfaction with psychology’s qualitative framework, metascience prides itself on
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finding problems in the practice of science. These methodists of the scientific method itself have caught on to the fact that psychological studies are unusually fallible. They are the leading voices of the devastating metanalysis that has been popularized as a replication crisis in psychology, grouping it with similarly rickety research in medicine and nutrition. They cogently impugn the discipline for “credibility deficits” insofar that its findings routinely possess entrenched confirmation and allegiance biases, among others, that contribute to a general inability to reproduce its methods, discoveries, and inferences. As such, they insinuate that psychology’s conflating scientific method with strict statistical significance and p-values is a “sterile intellectual rake” that struggles to yield a significant quantity of progressive problemshifts.

The strength of metascience is that it opens the door of possibility to language scientists of a “methodological education” that transpires at their own level and on their own terms. In looking at a systematic synthesis of common errors and biases across all scientific fields, psychological science can better fulfill its self-correcting capacity and be more effective, as its senior and junior scientists become more aware of the complexity behind their tools to access what they study. As they see that there are no quantitative shortcuts to good science, they might streamline their “statistical hypothesis inference testing” method to reduce false positives derived from correlations. This conversation starter may otherwise be off limits in many instances if we start from more a historico-philosophical perspective or conceptual analysis. For philosophy, metascience serves to takes language scientists to epistemic therapy where they feel comfortable enough to eventually broach the deeper epidemic at hand.
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With the big picture in mind, we can conclude that researchers have not been able to develop a methodological ideal. However effectively metascience reflects on a troubling statistical dependency or Grosjean on monolingual biases, these are not a silver bullet for knowing the epistemic ins and outs of bilingualism. The gravity of the problem for bilingualism stems, in part, from language scientists prematurely replicating the behavior from the hard sciences without the sorely needed intermediary theory,118 or the requisite philosophical groundwork from its own Galileo. Recent literature touches on this one-sidedness, describing it as wanting to do the math and experimentation with underwhelming “conceptual focus.”119 Accordingly, we cannot simply accept what experts of bilingualism state. Rather, we must exploit the raw data from these insider critiques and their larger frameworks while recognizing that their own in-house scientific limitations impair their judgment and distort their rendering of bilingual cognition. Further, this prevailing epistemic ambiguity has a historical context that must be analyzed to reconcile more adequate theoretical foundations. Otherwise, we address the symptom and not the root of the matter. Considering this methodological education that I have here synthesized, we can now turn to its history for definitions about what bilingualism is.

**Reviewing Historical Definitions of Individual Bilingualism**

The development of rose-colored glasses that scientists currently use to examine bilinguality passed through historical currents from differing schools of thought and paradigms. Employing a Hegelian approach to understanding the perspectival nature of science, this intellectual-historical process has created a field that has identified bilingualism’s distinguishing marks120 in a plurality of ways, thus helping us to perceive the phenomenon from multiple

120 See “Reason” in G.W.F. Hegel’s *The Phenomenology of Spirit*
perspectives. While each of these proposals has some degree of merit to them in themselves and enriches our understanding of bilingualism’s subtleties, they are burdened either by incompleteness, behaviorist tropes, or partial truths, which create cut-and-dry definitions or try to do away with one altogether. Hence, in this section, I show that the way of undertaking the science of bilinguality and bilingualism that has been employed so far in the social science literature is inadequate.

One reason for the prevailing epistemic ambiguity and false positives is the field’s rightful desire to overcome the dabbling in pseudo-science. While statistics, experimental design, and even correlation have developed through psychology dating back to 1860,121 behavioral and language scientists’ current overreliance on statistics can be interpreted, in part, as a heavy-handed weeding out that purged biases of last century’s prevailing schools of psychometrics, behaviorism, and psychoanalysis. These antecedents of our bilingualism paradigm have their roots in the mental testing and measures of intelligence at the turn of the twentieth century and which thus substantiate the notion that the immaturity of psychology frequently renders it a null field with minimal true discoveries.122,123

Overall, the intelligence testing era for bilingualism accomplished little beyond highlighting the importance of misguided ideologies and external history to psychology’s epistemology. The hermeneutics of the researchers were all over the place, interpreting bilingual’s effect on intelligence favorably, unfavorably, and to no effect.124 Effectively, our current ambiguity has been baked into the research findings for more than a century. In all these
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cases, an explicit definition is beyond the grasp of researchers, who happily went about testing the paradigm or validating their biases through their measurements. Scientists revealed findings of deficiencies in verbal intelligence, e.g., vocabulary size, and non-verbal intelligence, interpreting them as “language handicaps” or “mental confusion” for children who were reared as bilingual from birth, but did so without controlling for socioeconomic background or the degree of language proficiency. Social Darwinism, genetic superiority, and accompanying melting pot ideologies that tormented Navajo-English bilingualism also ran rampant in the scientific literature at this time.

Moving past pre-definitional literature, structural linguist Leonard Bloomfield is remembered for an unrealistic first definition. Specifically, he set the bar sky high to qualify as bilingual, as “native-like control of two languages.” This has been superficially cited, as even well-documented textbooks start and end there, lamenting how it is extreme, maximalist, and vague on what a native point of reference or control would entail. Positively, we must recognize that Bloomfield’s high expectations on natural forms of expression in language production and for minimizing cross-linguistic influence lend a degree of idealism to bilingual learning, given that an elective bilingual presupposes knowing the cultural-linguistic norms encoded in speech communities and appropriating those he deems well-motivated. However, we must also add that not only is it not entirely possible for many sequential bilinguals to achieve this state but that native-like comportment can be overrated. Formed by a different developmental process, the inherent divergent thinking possesses a unique set of connections that leads to the type of semantic and phonetic accents that are aesthetic in themselves provided that
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communicative proficiency is present.\textsuperscript{128} Finally, I must add that Bloomfield’s ambiguity is greater than what mainstream accounts recognize. He continues, “of course one cannot define a degree of perfection at which a good foreign speaker becomes a bilingual: the distinction is relative.”\textsuperscript{129} The skeptic in him, perhaps due to his behaviorist mind-set, thinks that the qualitative jump of when bilinguality first exists eludes science, which interestingly foreshadows later thinkers.

We continue with Uriel Weinrich and his 1953 one-hit wonder \textit{Languages in Contact}. Responding to Bloomfield’s overly strong model, he definitionally reshapes the conversation, conceptualizing bilingualism as “The practice of alternately using two languages.”\textsuperscript{130} This is a more encompassing definition but, in terms of scientific merit, is too liberal and one-sidedly focuses on external behavior. Many people may use a second language routinely, being only sparingly competent in one domain or another. Under these circumstances, Weinrich wants to study \textit{interference}, or the deviation of linguistic norms from a context of societal bilingualism where two languages inhabit the same geo-cultural space, which would not say much of anything other than claiming that communication relies on the mother tongue. This includes the ‘indirect method’ for learners, a \textit{subordinative bilingualism}, where a foreign speaker mediates the new language through the preconceived notions and meaning of their first language. We contradictorily call someone bilingual who systematically relies on this method of thought, e.g., knowing \textit{Bildung} not through every day and/or academic experience but by neutering it through its translation equivalent.

\textsuperscript{128} For example, the speech practices of an elective bilingual teacher of mine that I greatly respect reveal a semantic accent. She masterfully and routinely employs the phrase “by all means” in a way that is entirely appropriate but would not necessarily be used in a such way by a native speaker.
\textsuperscript{129} Bloomfield, p. 56
\textsuperscript{130} Weinrich, \textit{Languages in Contact}, p. 1
Subordinative bilingualism must be understood as part of a larger discussion of the relation of language to thought. Weinrich affirms, “merging vs unmerged coexistence is a problem par excellence in speech-language relations. In studying it, psychological reasoning therefore cannot be excluded.”

Delving into the meaning-making of the bilingual, he also includes compound bilingualism aka merged psycholinguistic systems and coordinate bilingualism, or two distinct systems. Despite being an important early theoretical contribution, subsequent lines of psycholinguistic research cast doubt on Weinrich’s simplified reduction to a duality, where a preponderance of evidence exists for both a distinct and connected system or overlap and specificity of each language in a bilingual mental lexicon.

1953 was a productive year for bilingualism studies. Einar Haugen used his enriched perspective from his Norwegian-English bilingual experience to pioneer sociolinguistics. He admits “[i]t is no simple task to define the limits of what we call ‘bilingualism.’” Perhaps teaching Bloomfield how to differentiate, he discerns both a pre-bilingual stage, where limited knowledge of a second language exists, and a definition of bilingualism, “the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language.”

His definition includes those who occasionally pass as a native but also a person who understands and makes themselves understood in a highly proficient manner. The novel insights and subtleties about life to which bilingualism gives birth, he says, does not require nativity, but regularly functional meaning making.
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Years later, Haugen further spells out his vision for bilingualism. With the field historically having coalesced around two definitions, one wide and one narrow, he shuns the former that, as Weinrich advocates, is merely receptive, dialect-oriented, and vertical (one language offers more power than the other). He rejects this more inclusionary notion that embraces nearly everyone who merely understands more than one variety of the same language. Instead, he affirms that the most fruitful path for the science of bilingualism is a narrower definition where a cut-off point to determine bilinguality is productive, language-oriented, horizontal, and bicultural. Despite the freshness of this perspective, we cannot accept it as conclusive by any stretch of the imagination. It is absent of causality, a chief characteristic of science, be it through theoretical models, observations, or measurements. To describe bilingualism in merely “functional” and “behavioral” terms without causal explanations or the background conditions of bilinguality does not give us any resolution because we cannot verify the description provided and how it came to be. To hint at what is to come, my proposal fills this void, demonstrating its truth combining empirical and aesthetic evidence, the first to explicitly do so.

Despite its conceptual problems, the Weinrich-Haugen era contributes a promising method. We find the deeper value of their work in their rendition of scientific method to know bilinguality. They believe, on firm ground, that studying the mark that one language makes on its counterpart, as evidenced in external linguistic behavior is not a mere phantom but rather is residue that lends genuine insight into the phenomenon of its internal psycholinguistic processes. Their contribution of “finding a common denominator to which… [bilingualism] might be reduced” grants us an indirect yet stringent examination of bilinguality.
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This question was also taken up by Grosjean, the critic of monolingual-centrism that I mentioned previously. He recognizes that too many researchers get lost in the weeds, neglecting bilingualism’s foundational aspects. Towards a more complete science, he defines bilingualism, seemingly taking a cue from Weinrich, as, “the regular use of two or more languages (or dialects) and bilinguals are those people who use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday lives.” While he adds that proficiency tacitly comes part of the package given that it will be organically developed during routine use, he also touts that this definition more realistically accounts for non-balanced speakers of more than one language since those who are not fluent in all areas of life are included, as counterintuitive as that may seem. Included in his theoretical cohort is also the nuance of stable bilingualism, where we differentiate between bilinguality under construction, a process where language structuring (initial acquisition of language) and restructuring (L₁ and L₂ bidirectionally impacting each other) take place. Stability is equated with the second language learning attaining a certain level, no longer growing by leaps and bounds when it begins to be learned and take root in its universality and particular domain.

Like with Grosjean’s other points, one must exfoliate them to bring the truthful elements to the surface. As anyone knows who has experienced bilingualization firsthand or witnessed it in others, we must affirm the idea of stability as development slows in between inflection points. His stable bilingualism broadly aligns with a commonsense fluency, implying that two language systems co-exist behind the eyes. Furthermore, this differentiation between an inclusive bilingual, with minimal competency, and a stable bilingual speaker gets at the crux of the matter of being able to determine this elusive bilingual relation with facticity. His language structuring
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provides a contribution towards but also indication of why we need a stronger intermediary theory to describe the process of making the qualitative jump from mono- to bi-linguality. However, what is striking about this psycholinguistic framework, in a post-cognitive revolution, is its lack of attention to the details of the cognitive mechanism that he attempts to describe. His language structuring is simplistic, with minimal details on its content and none on how its form changes over the lifespan for bilinguality developed at different ages.

Fast forwarding to the present, a noteworthy research program is from Canadian cognitive psychologist Ellen Bialystok. Reaching mainstream notoriety for work on bilingual cognitive advantages, she also spearheads an attempt to overturn bilinguality’s definitional everydayness that Grosjean peddled at the turn of the twenty-first century. She has despaired over a yes/no answer to bilingualism as a “categorical variable,” or a single characteristic that can be answered in a dichotomous question such as “Is someone bilingual or not?” Forget about stable bilingualism—identification of when someone factually becomes bilingual is “fuzzy at best.”\(^\text{140}\) She goes as far as to say, “classification of participants as ‘monolingual’ or ‘bilingual’ is ultimately a matter of judgment.”\(^\text{141}\) For her, a determinative cut-off point for bilinguality is beyond reach.

Instead, Bialystok promotes bilingualism as a matter of degree. She and her research progeny advocate “defining bilingualism more operationally” as a “multidimensional construct” encompassing “specific correlates of bilingual experiences.”\(^\text{142}\) For her and her generation, bilingualism conceptually exists on “a continuum of different variables,”\(^\text{143}\) such as self-reported
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language proficiency, usage, length of time that the individual has been bilingual measured as the 

*onset age of active bilingualism*, and home language. Her point is that these “experienced-based factors”\(^{144}\) are not the sources that feed an overall bilingual proficiency, perhaps in the form of a coefficient, but they themselves on their own comprise a multifactorial bilingual definition.

Despite the merit of much of Bialystok’s research program, her science is not above criticism. Her definition of bilingualism is a misapplication of statistics terminology, not because she does not necessarily understand statistics but because, thinking it fits the subject matter, clearly does not understand her own specialization. One pleads for rationalism; bilingualism is in fact a categorical variable that can be achieved with the right scientific conceptual tools. Her use of subjective opinion and only external, rather than internal, references, stems from her not having the prerequisite intermediary theory that serves as a reliable guide to access, measure, and diagnose bilinguality as a psycholinguistic system, of first importance for a philosophy of wisdom to nurture the bilingual moral conscience. With disdain for range, she lacks the theoretical resources in her hermeneutic circle to scientifically describe the internal essence of bilinguality and its evolving psycholinguistic context.

I conclude my definitional history with Annick De Houwer. She laments that the field has generally failed to take a “development-oriented view of bilingualism”\(^{145}\) and its psycholinguistics. As “each stage [of human development] represents a different kind of general life experience,” researchers err if they attempt a static definition of bilingualism across life stages, thereby comparing apples to oranges. To epistemology’s delight, not only does she bring in elements of positive psychology, but she also marries her psycholinguistic research on

\(^{144}\) DeLuca et. al., “Redefining bilingualism as a spectrum of experiences that differentially affects brain structure and function,” v116 of *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of USA*

bilingualism to developmental science, making bilingual development the theoretical bedrock over which the rest of the science ought to flow. With an eye for linguistic milestones and becoming bilingual from birth, she gives the name bilingual first language acquisition for the circumstances in which newborns receive inputs from two languages. Towards seeing bilinguality from the standpoint of development, she writes, “We dynamically define a bilingual individual as one who understands at least two languages at age-appropriate levels.”

The strength of De Houwer’s research program is her conceptualizing bilinguality in movement. Her methodology puts ontology first, as opposed to a strict epistemological approach whose fiat have contributed to the bilingualism paradigm running amok. She has caught on to the fact that bilingual development ought to be defined and elaborated as a process. “If you know how something came about,” she epistemically remarks, “this tells you a lot about what that something is.” Taking her claim one step further, researchers in fact put their findings on firmer ground proving how a phenomenon came to be and fits together with what precedes and succeeds it at each phase. Thus, the particularity of each period has the potential to be affirmed through her “age-appropriate levels,” where both quantitative and qualitative growth occur. Her perspective reveals how both the form and content of bilinguality and its mechanism of language structuring change.

Despite her dynamism being on the right track, De Houwer settles for passive bilinguality. I would accept her definition if her age-appropriate definition were not just understood but produced at the appropriate maturity level. As most teachers and parents would attest to, linguistic competency is not sufficient if it only entails receptivity. Bilinguality is not
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adequately reached if it is only passive when it is capable of being spoken. For a mature speaker, to describe bilinguality as passive is in epistemic bad faith, which must be corrected by Haugen’s pre-bilingual term where a second language has not been sufficiently internalized for all but pre-verbal young children. Further, the milestones that she documents in her research must not just be for language but also for cognition, an element sorely missing from her science.

To conclude, the bilingualism paradigm, taken as a whole, is based on a logical fallacy, ambiguity. As I have demonstrated in this section, its language scientists comprise a case-in-point of a failure to provide a clear and true definition of the in-itself of the subject matter that they study. In aggregate, not only does the field not know what it means when it says bilingual, but it is also devoid of the sort of causality and background conditions of bilingualism and its relation to cognition, which I rectify in the next section. While all senior scientists contribute, they ultimately fall short in overcoming bilinguality’s theoretical difficulty, evidenced in loose theoretical constructs that simplistically correspond to the complex phenomenon they describe.

Such an ambiguous atmosphere has consequences, namely that it begets more ambiguity and deficits of credibility. Many researchers, steeped in one specific theoretical facet, combine to posit an endless range of different forms of individual and societal varieties. Discreet manifestations of bilinguality and bilingualism are understood through dozens upon dozens of typologies, each a unique configuration that is oftentimes theoretically severed from a more adequately systematized and epistemically responsible view. Researchers that have not attempted to define, typify. This ad-hoc coping-mechanism exacerbates the ambiguity, waterlogging, further complicating, and even polluting the field,\(^\text{150}\) with researchers using many terms for similar phenomena and using classifications that might prove illusory or mere wishful thinking if
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greater scientific literacy were present. Surveying this literature is akin to consuming a reheated alphabet stew of bilingualism in the midst of an epistemological shantytown.\textsuperscript{151} Due to this science’s immaturity, we are not looking for a Feyerabendian law-and-order science, but neither should we expect a partial structural collapse upon the arrival of stronger theory.

**Proposal for Developmentally Defining Bilinguality**

In this section, I suggest a paradigm shift in defining bilinguality. We will not jump to some sort of alternative world of philosophy that scientists criticize, but rather synthesize and bring out the truth straight from the history of the field. We saw that a blanket definition that uses the same traits and descriptors to inflexibly define certain behaviors or mental processes fails because, in part, bilingualism is incommensurable across the first decades of life. Cognition’s age-graded influences\textsuperscript{152} and discontinuous processes deeply shape how bilinguality is received and its nature upon acquisition. Accordingly, I see bilinguality as a moving maturational target whose defining characteristics and subsequent cut-off point change over the lifespan. While some scholars recognize these naturally shifting goalposts,\textsuperscript{153} they either despair over this variability, cling to linguistic markers, or sustain a low bar. We must embrace this dynamism, moving beyond De Houwer to the standpoint of cognition, to introduce periodicity or insert stage theory\textsuperscript{154} into bilingualism’s science in terms of thinking.

I propose, then, a developmental approach that circumscribes the possible boundaries of bilinguality based on both the individual’s overall cognitive maturity and the relational maturity of the second language. Perhaps paradoxically, establishing a universal definition entails particularity; we must determine if the psycholinguistic structure and the thinking that takes

\textsuperscript{151} see Figure 4 below for a small sample of the overgrowth of typologies inside the bilingualism paradigm.
\textsuperscript{152} Laura E. Berk, *Development Through the Lifespan* (6\textsuperscript{th} Edition)
\textsuperscript{153} see Costa’s *The Bilingual Brain* (2019) for one example of similar observations that concludes in despair
place through it are age appropriate or sufficiently cognitively mature. A psychological system that is qualitatively different with the same mental processes of each period having different relations and happening on their own terms make it that the linguistic and psychological expectations of bilingualism that we might have for a two-year-old are not suitable for a fourteen-year-old. Cognitively speaking, bilinguality acts its age and so must its definition.

Part of the problem is recognizing that bilingualism is more integral to broader intellectual development than social scientists realize. Developmental psychologists tend to holistically look at human development, integrating physical, cognitive, emotional, and social lines of development. In so doing, they garble the facts and lose sight of periods of cognition and its transitions. To no surprise, neither do bilingualism scholars have down their periods, who take their cues from the developmental psychologists. They correctly point out that speech gradually becomes “more adult-like” phonetically and semantically but cannot provide details on cognition’s maturational processes and the changing inner structure of bilingualism that make it incommensurable across the lifespan.

In contrast, my four-stage proposal embraces thinking as an activity as such with its own dynamics that need attending to. Synthesizing Vygotsky’s view on normative monolingual development and the bilingualism paradigm, renewed emphasis on the periods of thinking and the centrality of language is in order, a philosophic matter unheard of in contemporary research programs. I also contribute to clarifying the relationship between monolinguality and bilinguality, processes that, if started from birth, are surprisingly similar. Our methodological concern, then, encompasses the standards of each cognitive period that constitute steady
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development, the qualitative transitions between distinct psychological systems, and the type of empirical evidence for an emergent neoformation\(^{158}\) to developmentally hit the tipping point of bilinguality. We would expect this to have undergone a pre-bilingual process of structuring where new connections, relations, and generalizations burst onto the scene to settle into a more stable bilinguality, as Grosjean correctly point out, in its corresponding domains of usage.

From a standpoint of bilingualism, the first period of cognition is initially dedicated to hearing. This pre-verbal phase, lasting until the protowords at one years old, establishes the cognitive basis to communicate through language. Amidst a growing “instinctive mental life,”\(^{159}\) an infant’s first six “speechless” months develop the ability to recognize and respond to the speech in his or her environment. As one eminent bilingualism scholar has called it, the appearance of a *sound inventory*\(^{160}\) implies an ability to recognize the phonological properties of the parent language such as prosody. The second half of this period, starting at approximately six months, lifts the sound inventory to the higher form where the infant now instinctively imitates these ambient sounds. This pre-intellectual affective babbling is evidence of the beginnings of language structuring. To talk of a crib bilingual, infancy bilingualism, or bilingual infant acquisition\(^{161}\) means that a baby develops his ear to be able to specifically attend to two or more languages and/or babble derived from such languages. Hitting a bilingual tipping point implies the necessary input of two languages to develop a passive bilinguality in year one of life.

Infants reach a cognitive milestone of enormous scientific importance at around twelve months. As opposed to a babbling devoid of semantics, meaning is now attached to the sounds
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that infants make, as parents intuitively perceive that their son or daughter is now speaking their own baby language.\textsuperscript{162} That is, development now begins to transpire through the prism of semantics, in the most nascent of senses. What we see from an external linguistic standpoint as the emergence of fragments and protowords is psychologically the baby’s own autonomous language.\textsuperscript{163} What seem like real words are, on one hand, a holdover from babbling but, on the other hand, now have a situational intentionality to refer to specific objects in their environment based on the baby’s affective-volitional desires. This transition to autonomous language constitutes one essential step in forming the qualitative jump of a psychological system that is sorting out what it first means to use language.

As the baby sloughs off his autonomous language, they cognitively leap from infancy to early childhood. Amid this relatively stable second year, they learn how to speak, gradually increasing word combination from one upwards to seven where total vocabulary can hit hundreds of words by the second birthday.\textsuperscript{164} While the child graduates to real words, holophrases occur where a single word stands behind more-encompassing ideas. For example, De Houwer documents the inconstant contextual meaning behind the word ‘das’ of a German-English bilingual baby, who holophrastically uses this one word, with different intonations, to either ask a question, agree, express a desire, reiterate a desire, or convey happiness.\textsuperscript{165} A definitionally bilingual baby at this point not only utters small combinations of words in both languages but also may have floating utterances that are not easily distinguishable from either

\textsuperscript{162} Jon Bardouche, personal communication, an empirical observation of his children that he shared with me.
\textsuperscript{164} De Houwer, \textit{Bilingual First Language Acquisition}
\textsuperscript{165} De Houwer, \textit{Bilingual First Language Acquisition}, p. 215
Towards the end of this period, a bilingual child may have several hundred vocabulary words in each language.

The second essential step towards thinking through language normatively occurs at two years old. Initially, our speech is pre-intellectual, and our thinking is pre-verbal, but they become intertwined and first correspond in cognition, creating a phenomenon known as verbal thinking. The entire thought that in the previous stage was carried in one word—the holophrase—starts to co-occur with the word that corresponds to it. From the opposite side, the infant’s words no longer represent affect alone—_das_ as happiness—and these real words internalized by the child from their environment begin to create a meaningful thinking structure. That is, thought and language, as two separate lines of development, first fuse; thinking becomes characteristically linguistic when internalized language in the fusion of thought and language becomes the basis on which thinking occurs. This is the moment when a speech act can be typically identified as an act of thought and vice versa.\(^{168}\)

In fact, generations of philosophers posit this phenomenon. What Herder expresses, “If it is true that we cannot think without thoughts, and learn to think through words, then language sets limits and [serves as an] outline for the whole of human cognition.” We can hear echoes of Sartre here, in his phrase, “language refers us to thought and thought to language.”\(^{170}\) While these statements point towards verbal thinking, they lack the nuances and details that we would need to describe the structure of thinking more accurately. As opposed to this anti-geneticism or
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much of current philosophy’s sterile conceptual analysis, my proposal explains its development and ties it to the phenomenon of bilingualism in a concrete fashion.

A preponderance of empirical evidence supports this thought-word fusion. For the child at age two, scholars empirically focus on what they call a vocabulary burst or spurt. Cognitively, the child realizes that everything has a name. Linguistically, he strings together four or more words, advancing to complex sentences in year three. But the self-called specialists provide no answer of the cognitive background conditions to explain this.

Towards giving the science of bilingualism the causality that it deserves, we must understand that the chief characteristic of verbal thinking is its ability to generalize. Through the inner word-meaning of the speaker, each psychological system determines how generalization unfolds with variations based on the extent of generalization of this or that word and its relations to other words. “The word does not relate to a single object,” states Vygotsky, “but to an entire group or class of objects. Therefore, every word is a concealed generalization.” Additionally, the nature and functionality of generalization that occurs through the prism of the word undergoes qualitative changes in each subsequent temporal period of cognitive development. Every psychological system has different mental operations in its structure of generalization.

With verbal thinking and its generalization established, let us now explore each of these four stages to illustrate the age-appropriate distinguishing mark of bilingual thinking. The first is largely based on subjective associations that converge in and across words, known as a synthetic heap. The system then matures to thinking in complexes based on more concrete
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objective relations of generality. The concrete associations, collections, and chains restructure themselves to preconcepts, initially generalizing around specific elements of reality but still kid-like. Finally, the child can move beyond concreteness and immaturity to thinking in concepts where more powerful generalizations are now connected to each other as part of a logical hierarchical system marked by volition. The psychological system for the first time can extrapolate outside of the given with conscious awareness in the way that an adult could. Thus, it can be said that our measure for both overall cognitive maturity and bilinguality is whether each language is age appropriate based on the weakness or strength of the flow of thinking that happens through it.

Amidst the initial intertwining of thinking and speech, the fabric of thought is the synthetic heap and its generalized perceptions. As the child rapidly imbibes language, his thinking is stitched together through his direct impressions and the spontaneous associations between them. The modus operandi of this psychological system is its “unconnected connectedness.” Lacking an awareness of objective relations of the real world, perception dominates the thinking process to cause subjective associations, which is the justification for the many accumulated objects that are signified through a given word and its preceding words. Generalization tends to grossly overextend the semantics of accepted usage that we see in adult-like thinking. Corresponding to the typology of consecutive early bilinguality, the development of the bilingual subject at this point has both languages directing his or her thinking where enough lived experiences tied to both languages form synthetic heaps that are collectively bilingual developing in the domains of family and community.

175 Vygotsky, Problems of General Psychology, p. 136
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From age three to seven, preschooler’s cognition hits the milestone of thinking in complexes where thought initially discovers actual relationships of generality that more reflect the external world. Cognition’s synthetic heaps and its collections of perceptions qualitatively restructure into the form of concrete-empirical thinking. Hence, thinking in complexes borrows the same forms from last period with the associations and collections but these are no longer incongruently subjective. Instead, maturation raises them to a higher plane based on isolated yet objective elements.

Vygotsky compares complexes to the family name. Unlike the hierarchical and systematic ordering of a family tree, the movement from idea to idea inside the child’s head is based on a single objectively shared characteristic such as the Elericks, without regard for the hierarchical intragenerational family ties. Towards this period’s upper-end, associative-complexes and collective-complexes begin to include higher forms like chained complexes. The word and its interconnection with related thoughts are glued together by “dynamic, temporal unification of isolated elements in a unified chain, and a transfer of meaning through the elements of that chain.”178 While this structure of generalization and its relations of generality among words represents a significant advance, the immaturity puts the general and the particular on equal footing that, in a way, is not fully logical and is overtly bound to the concrete.

Thus, bilinguality at age three to seven is also naturally marked by the complex. A preschool child qualifying as bilingual exhibits a flow of thought that has attained the complex’s lower forms with relative independence in two different languages. Preschoolers new to bilinguality—consecutive early bilinguality—do not require balanced bilingualism but rather enough conceptual fluency in each language to have sufficient knowledge of how to generalize

178 Vygotsky, Problems of General Psychology, p. 139, emphasis in original
across words in age-appropriate complexes. We nod to Grosjean to acknowledge that the
separate-but-together psychological nature of bilingualism normalizes a certain degree of cross-
linguistic influence. Building on the semantic structure already present from the first language, preschoolers hit the tipping point when the developing general representations and relations between these generalizations in the other language reaches enough maturity to flow relatively autonomously in complexive thinking, through objective associations, collections, and chains.

Moving ahead, the preschooler’s complexive thinking grows more sophisticated. This next chapter in the coming-of-age story of thinking, and thus of bilingual thinking, is the school-age period and its preconcepts, or higher forms of complexes. From age seven to twelve, the child’s chain-like, undefined, and indistinct generalizations can reach the ceiling of abstract associations around a specific element of reality. His thinking grows more powerful and approximates adult-like thinking to abstract from the given. However, in contrast to adult-like concepts, the school-age child’s generalizations are preconcepts. The difference lies in that preconcepts are not necessarily clear logically or consistently worked out on a conscious plane. Therefore, the mental operations that underpin outward appearances of adult-like thinking transpire through a different path with a distinct fabric of thought.

Hitting puberty at around age thirteen, the window for childhood bilingualism closes. This transition out of childhood causes changes not only to the body but also cognition, whether monolingual or bilingual. The cognitive difference between the middle schooler and the high schooler is that the latter has a greater facility to master his own thought. Making a qualitative jump from lower to higher psychological processes, his memory becomes more logical, his attention turns more voluntary, and his perception grows more categorical. The adolescent can
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now engage in introspection to intentionally examine his own thinking and the ideas that comprise it. Adolescence furnishes this ability to think, as Vygotsky maintains, marked by conscious awareness and volition. In this sense, thinking possesses a certain self-control that it did not have previously.

Thus, with this level of cognitive maturity, the adolescent for the first time in his life can truly think in adult-like concepts. The ideas that he has practically picked up through his lived experiences, what Vygotsky calls *everyday concepts*, can be coherently systematized and thought about in a logical hierarchy of meaning. Through instruction, the child can learn academic constructs about the universal that incorporates these details from what he has experienced. These new concepts that are learned with conscious awareness and volition are known as *academic or scientific concepts*. Their interplay raises lived experiences to a theoretical level and lowers theory to a practical level.

These maturational processes of adolescence mark a transitional age to adulthood. Despite verbal thinking’s capacity to hit the cognitive ceiling of logical hierarchical thinking, the greater part of its generalizations is still not fully formed as it just begins to learn more serious academic constructs to make greater sense of the world. Underdeveloped complexes from the previous stages linger, which applies to all periods. Just because thought has the potential for great things does not mean that it will routinely achieve them without the appropriate education. The teenager frequently moves from idea to idea merging complexive and conceptual thinking.

Finally, I come to my claim that the rite of passage to adolescence bilinguality is conceptual thinking. With bilinguality as a new formation, the restructuring of ideas occurs in a two-fold fashion. Indeed, non-academic and academic concepts mutually inform each other but also ideas from each language cross-linguistically influence each other. A newly formed
bilinguality feels the second language’s influence on the first. Further, equipped with conscious awareness and volition, the adolescent should be able to think about the inherent differences found within both of his culturally patterned languages and its norms.

A final point of consideration is that bilinguality acts its age in terms of knowledge. The knowledge base through, in, and about\textsuperscript{181} two languages needed to become bilingual expands exponentially in the first decades of life. That is, the floor for knowledge of two languages to be considered bilingual is raised every year. From generalized perceptions to complexes to concepts, it is clearly easier to gradually invest early on in bilinguality than start later in life. By the time of adolescent bilinguality, the measure of generalization is relatively strong and presupposes an ample repertoire of life experience and knowledge.

**Conclusion**

I have synthesized diverse traditions to provide a richer intermediary theory to overcome the current contradiction of a science with acute credibility deficits. Further, I have sustained both a philosophic and scientific line of reasoning throughout this chapter to put these disciplines into epistemic partnership. In so doing, I hope to have convinced the reader that the field should accept my argument that it needs to ameliorate the ambiguity that taints the study of its bilingualism. Given the dereliction of duty from contemporary cognitive and development psychologists that offer scant scientific explanation for the distinguishing mark of cognition, my proposal of defining bilinguality based on the level of development of word meaning is as foreign to the paradigm as financial literacy is to the average American. Moreover, I utilize this current era of typologies in the field to give us the leading candidates to describe the particular
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aspects of bilinguality as it develops. My proposal expects that the keystone of thinking will be at the center of its next paradigm.

To make this a more rounded argument, I offer one final thought. Philosophy has always told us that there are three domains about which we should concern ourselves if we wish to live authentic, flourishing lives with each other: Truth, goodness, and beauty. I have already talked about the science and I gave the argument of the bilingual moral conscience. Here are a few words about bilingualism’s beauty inside the head.

There is something about the above scientific picture that is aesthetically attractive. If we conceptualize the psycholinguistic structure on an abstract aesthetic plane, we find two developing structures capable of powerful generalizations once they are sufficiently mature. And while these interrelated mature structures do not need perfect balance, we find bilateral symmetry in these dual structures guiding bilingual thought. The elegance of this aesthetic points to a truthfulness in and of itself.

A well-known aesthetic already exists in the dual iceberg metaphor.\textsuperscript{182} According to this analogy, there is an underlying cognitive interconnectedness at the base of bilinguality. Each language, as a subsystem of the overall system, is only a “linguistic surface feature” that appears above the icy ocean water. Plunging into the psychology of bilingualism, these linguistic tips are internally connected, which my model would corroborate. The ethics of the dual iceberg entails not only that the development of one language impacts the other, but that academy proficiency in the primary language is vital to advance the overall system, thus giving a more equitable education to immigrants and other ethnic groups that deviate from language majority students. It supports an ideology of social justice and bilingualism.

This analogy epitomizes the good fight within colleges of education but, like many of their well-intentioned initiatives, the contributions are shallow. Comparing Cummin’s underlying proficiency of the iceberg with the science of this chapter, we see that the ontology of bilinguality in this commonly accepted metaphor stays at the surface. Considering my philosophy of bilingualism, written in an age of runaway climate change, this choice of metaphor has not aged well, and the explanatory power has increasingly shrunk. The iceberg misses the qualitative differences in the changing fabric of bilingual thought. If there is any saving it, it works insofar it points to an unhealthy bilingualism on the verge of disappearing. There is no multilayered theory of axiology, or what is valuable and good beyond biliteracy and native language development. Put simply, this aesthetic is a superficial ethics from a superficial science.

We need an image worthy of the magnificence of the wisdom of a self-actualizing bilingualism. The cognitive architecture of such would be more like a Hagia Sofia that has two
chambers leading to the central pulpit. This bicultural place of worship has seen competing influences from both East and the West where one tradition builds on top of the other and is that much more beautiful for it. In my version of it, the natural light that enters from the skylights and stained glass of one chamber contributes to illuminating the entire edifice. As wisdom as its goal, this cultural historical project is under constant luminous innovation. If the real Hagia Sofia did have a dual chamber, it might resolve current religious conflicts. In sum, I leverage bilingualism’s science to Thomas Paine’s claim, “My own mind is my own church.”\textsuperscript{183} We now see more clearly the truth of the ethical promise of bilingualism and why a bilingual moral conscience is so powerful.

\textsuperscript{183} Thomas Paine, \textit{Age of Reason: The Definitive Edition}, 2014, p. 20
Chapter 3: Spanish-English Bilingualism

I conclude by presenting a bilingual horizon for the U.S. The complexities of Spanish-English language contact that occur in that society amidst a polemical Whiteshift\textsuperscript{184} entail serious consideration. This challenging philosophical issue of our time, set in a globalized context, implies more than language. As one scholar writes, cultural globalization tests our ability to develop responsible dispositions toward each other, affecting the normative significance of our selfhood.\textsuperscript{185} I address this ethical position about determining normative significance in some detail below but briefly note that bilingualism is not only directly interconnected with selfhood and politics but an ethical version of it can also improve our own sense of them. As such, we can consciously tap into the possibilities of bilingualism to help evaluate the commitments in place to each other and ourselves, two important layers of ethicality. This has obvious normative consequences for the English-Spanish phenomenon.

As background, a century-old debate between US and Latin American thinkers exists on the stress and opportunity of this encounter.\textsuperscript{186} This inter-American discussion examines differences in cultural values and their implications. While each author gives insight, I assert that unexamined biases lead to a shared misreading of what is at the crux of the issue: scorn or sheer ignorance of bilingualism as a universal. As a member of the next generation of thinkers that feels the burden to set things right, I am compelled to rectify this oversight. The old guard thinkers are bearish on bilingualism because they do not have, as Appiah implores in his moral


\textsuperscript{186} Gregory Fernando Pappas, “The American Challenge: The Tension between the Values of the Anglo and the Hispanic World,” \textit{APA Newsletter, Spring 2006, Volume 05, Number 2}
experiments, the interdisciplinary evidence that sustains my project. The ethics and epistemology of my philosophy of bilingualism, in contrast, allow me to be bullish.

Towards practical application, we must take small steps to achieve a big idea. For US society, I promote an aspirational project of what I call Great Society Bilingualism where we can potentially become better, more moral versions of ourselves amidst practicing both languages every day. I argue that if stakeholders have a disposition towards wisdom — which I define as a two-step orientation towards being open to experiencing the wonders of cultural differences and taking these findings to heart for future choices — they are more likely to learn from each other, an interpersonal aspect of elective bilingualism that I am emphasizing in this last chapter.

Undeniably, this goal is a big if, given the recent general decay of cultivating the humanities and philosophy in recent American history, but it can be done with a respect for and understanding of each ethnolinguistic tradition’s eudemonic ability. Like a teacher who rises to the distinguished category on a rubric due to knowing what is pedagogically exemplary, my project provides a philosophical framework that visualizes the inherit opportunity in the current moment.

First, I discuss a philosophy of bilingualism for the United States in dialogue with leading thinkers. Second and finally, I show the importance of the Great Society of the 1960s to the present as I reflect on the importance of a Bildung of elective bilingualism.

**A Philosophy of Spanish-English Bilingualism**

To return to an initial comment, I describe the field of bilingualism studies as a moral wilderness. Scholars on different aspects of bilingualism have yet to identify ideal outcomes and often peddle suboptimal ideas that muddy the ethics.\(^{187}\) In this section I want to both deepen and
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\(^{187}\) One instance of such wild thought is Guadalupe Valdes’ suggestion that bilingual education may strip language minority students of certain advantages and thus should be restricted to them.
extend my claim that that the boundaries of the wilderness do not stop in academia — they extend to public opinion and daily life in US society.

Specifically, the ethos surrounding English-Spanish bilingualism is bewilderingly inconsistent. This inconsistency primarily comes through a cultural-linguistic landscape that possesses various ideological camps. I start with the two monolingual factions, having varying motives to not learn about or accept the other. These camps create an environment where many Spanish speakers and English speakers do not want to understand the other or only do so brokenly and/or begrudgingly. In addressing this unwillingness to learn, we might identify three distinct yet overlapping bands: ethnocentric loyalty, resentment from uneven power dynamics, and the undereducated.

Let us first look at undue ethnocentric loyalty. While not all who fall in this conservative camp are extremists nor exist just in English, a spokesperson is political scientist Huntington. He argues that record immigration from Latin America, primarily Mexico, dilutes the U.S.’s virtues and causes a polarizing divide between those who speak Spanish and identify with Hispanic culture and those that speak English and personify the American Creed. The US has been exceptional, as he sees it, due to its credal commitment to “liberty, equality, democracy, civil rights, nondiscrimination, [and] rule of law.” These values are fundamentally acquired through assimilation into American English, which many Mexicans and their descendants, often poorly educated, fail to adopt since they increasingly see Mexico’s culture and its derivatives as superior. He claims that such immigrants want American prosperity but through Spanish culture. Hence, for him, Hispanization brings a “creeping bilingualism.” Spanish-English bilingualism
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may seem harmless; however, if we wake up and smell the coffee, we will understand that a detrimental shift in what it means to be an American has occurred.

Despite his skill at describing the lack of ethnolinguistic solidarity, Huntington is far from a moral authority. Given that everyone has areas of growth, alarmism and fault-finding represent low-hanging fruit. Far more difficult and noble of an enterprise is developing a serious action plan to mediate this tension. Supposedly showcasing American virtues, he ironically forgets a can-do attitude and thinking big. My thesis responds to this bias of “the more bilingual we are, the less ethical we are” to enlighten him and others who wrong their neighbor this way.

It is important to grasp the underlying disposition of such a normative statement given its prevalence in public opinion. Huntington’s tone conveys that he feels slighted by the disrespect that Hispanics display toward what he believes has made the US attractive in the first place. Put simply, he one-sidedly sees Spanish as a foreign tongue that trespasses on and defaces our property. As such, his reaction is to demand exclusivity and loyalty toward being American, fallaciously believing that membership in such an exceptional group is all-or-nothing.

With stronger knowledge of human geography and ethics, Huntington would know that assimilation and acculturation are not the same. The latter aligns to a philosophy of wisdom where select traits and speech can be learned from the host society while retaining the good from one’s hometown. He would also know that we can speak of eudemonia in either language with different referents, a point that he carelessly omits. Inversely, we can also speak of character flaws that run through either language group, that we cannot, in good faith, endorse for anyone else, e.g., the US’s mental health epidemic. Like wall builders, he fails to recognize any redeeming qualities that Hispanization offers to the US, e.g., economics, healthy birth-rate,
warmth, humor, economic contributions. If truth were a concern, he would have taken the time to acquaint himself not only with Latin Americans’ weaknesses but also their strengths.

This observation allows us to infer that Huntington never had the epistemic privilege of having access to insider judgments from another culture. If he did, he would realize that these contrasting viewpoints—even if they were to somehow be consistently backward—invaluably facilitate asking tough questions about who we are, not to mention the resulting novel insights that make the good that much more attainable. In such a scenario, he would inevitably lay some of the blame at his own door. Instead, deprived of a control group and a complementary structure of generalization from a second language, his ethical determinations are slavishly monolingual. His conscientious ability to determine particularity is restrained in a logical straitjacket. The rational takeaway is that he is not lucid about our own problems or dogmatically chooses to overlook them. Pertaining to ethics, he less understands how Hispanization brings in a second language that can yield a bilingual moral conscience for those who are educated and willing to reach out to the other for reciprocal benefit.

This ignorant “speak American” ideology is not the only challenge to our becoming bilingual. When Dewey speaks of Mexico being the land of contradictions, he recognizes resentment that stems from political and cultural hegemony of the US in Latin America. Whether we look at a segment of Puerto Rico rejecting English as co-equal on the grounds of it being an imposition or whether we look at countless Mexicans who have felt the brunt of a disapproving and/or racist gaze, this demographic prefers to maintain a healthy distance away from those who speak the language of Colossus of the North and Trumpism. Even those who may not have had
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190 Who can say with a straight face that the American winner-takes-all principle is better than a proportional representation principle which is used in Europe?
much direct contact with Anglo America may feel the effect of the unbalanced border\textsuperscript{192} where one culture, with airs of superiority, wields disproportionate influence on the other’s affairs. This disposition of exclusivity leads to an anti-Americanism that can be ameliorated by fulfilling our promise of a Good Neighbor ethic, which, in an era of Whiteshift, now starts at home with a Great Bilingual Society, an idea addressed below.

The last strand of monolingualism that I want to discuss is the undereducated. This monolingual demographic, present on both sides of the language divide, lacks either the self-efficacy or interest to learn about the other. If we look at the Latin American immigrant with minimal schooling in their native language, learning English may feel nearly impossible. Since this humble blue-collar Spanish locally sources our bilingualism, it needs a self-actualizing attitude towards language as much anyone else. The result of this group consistently having lower levels of education and achieving unequal outcomes in society creates stigma and its accompanying vertical bilingualism where Spanish seems inferior.

On the other hand, the hard truth, from my view, is that we in the US—the Diné, Gullah, and Amish included—need to hold ourselves to higher standards. To modify a line from Huntington for self-critique, many Anglo Americans want American prosperity but through a simple-minded keeping up with the Jones. Whether we stroll down Main Street in small-town America, Greater Appalachia, or the Bible Belt, the art of self-cultivation is seldom found in the average American. Their problems prevent contemplation of bigger ideas and self-actualization, much less prioritizing another language. Amidst dysfunctional relationships and their conformity with modern distractions, the “delights of thinking”\textsuperscript{193} are lost on this group.


\textsuperscript{193} John Dewey, \textit{Individualism Old and New}, Prometheus Books, 1930, p. 78
To make matters worse, this ignorance sometimes breeds xenophobia. A recent account describes it as, “We do not like outsiders or people who are different from us, whether the difference lies in how they look, how they act, or, most important, how they talk.” Curiously, analyses like Huntington’s omits this unwelcoming disposition towards the outsider. It is no wonder we find the immigrant archetype who prefers to remain apart and not commit to the greater good.

I make one final note about the undereducated. Many individuals from both speech communities may be highly educated in one area or another but undereducated in language. While failing to qualify as bilingual, they may have some degree of competency in the other language and cultural worldview. I call this pre-bilingual sub-strand simpáticos. They have positive dispositions to the other, putting them a cut above the rest, but still fall short in fully committing and, thus, may not wholly make the most of the cultural, ethical, and psychological benefits.

Among the bilingual population, these monolingual ideologies compete. Much said above I could repeat with a bilingual accent as the ordinariness of many bilingual experiences allows these ideologies to pass unexamined. I could conclude my analysis here, noting a nation creating two societies, “One Spanish, One English, separate and unequal.” The moral wilderness and the accompanying dismal levels of human development cause our divides and create a vertical bilingualism. By dismal, I mean accepting monolinguality as a fact and norm. Towards overturning this, my final pages are interested in enlarging that dot on our horizon towards which
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196 I have adopted this famous line from the Kerner Commission on white and black inequality for the color line in America that is increasingly outstripping others.
we drive, a normative position on bilingualism, none other than *the more bilingual society is a more ethical society.*

Two philosophies associated with the frontier fittingly provide their own perspective on how English-Spanish bilingualism is not solely a matter of fluency. As these mid-twentieth century philosophies underscore, border areas put us in close contact with the other to energize bilingualism but often with unequal ethical outcomes. The ideas of these two thinkers overlap but diverge insofar how each defines themselves to the other: the first despairingly turns to a third space\(^\text{197}\) while the second aspires to emulate virtues. The inherent views of bilingualism and their normative significances reflect their respective processes of inward formation, which in both cases implicates a deeply sensitive layer of ethicality at the core of selfhood.

Our first theorist in navigating these issues is Gloria Anzaldúa, representative of the enormous hurdles to developing horizontal bilingualism within the US. As a Chicana feminist, she staunchly rejects cosmopolitanism, proudly defying both dominant cultures’ oppressive nature as it converges on the US-Mexico border. Due to the dual systems of racism, sexism, poverty, and educational inequity in place along the border, she evokes the image of her home being “a thin edge of barbwire,”\(^\text{198}\) which also describes the truth of her bilingualism. At times writing in English, Spanish, and other times Spanglish, she laments her mental nepantlism, or being torn between ways. The consequence of receiving mixed signals from these two ethnolinguistic traditions and its unique blend is that they adversely strain her to such a degree that she feels “an inner war.”\(^\text{199}\) She does not feel at ease or accepted by any dominant
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\(^{197}\) Third Space refers to the distinctiveness of each person as an intersectional and cultural hybrid.

\(^{198}\) Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*, Aunt Lute p. 25

\(^{199}\) ibid, p. 100
community and thus largely prefers to do both languages on her hybrid terms, rejecting a rotten core of prevailing ideologies that come from both Spanish and English.

Arguably, Anzaldúa’s philosophy of education would look much different had she grown up in a supportive dual-language environment. Rather, the taproot of her mestiza consciousness is, as she correctly perceives, the burden of an undereducated and tyrannical circumstantial bilingualism. Not having access to bilingual education, she sees the grammatical ins and outs of Spanish as a “bag of reglas de academia” that muzzle her expression instead of RAE’s slogan of “purifying, fixing, and dignifying” Spanish as appropriate. With even stronger critiques of her English language upbringing in school, she is the inverse of shaping oneself through wisdom and possibilities encountered—she anguishes over the oppression and non-possibilities encountered.

Based on her circumstances, Anzaldúa’s description of bilingualism is justified. Her project amounts to an outcry, speaking for the downtrodden and embodying societal wrongs of oppressive ethnolinguistic obedience in a setting of low human development. This critical perspective, like the one I provided about the history of the Diné, contributes to setting policy on bilingualism in the U.S. To be effective, bilingualism must entail free growth in a web of support to prevent the abuses that create her conflictive bilingualism, or, as she puts it, a “forked tongue.” This negatively positions her bilingualism closer to chronic pain than self-actualization.

Therefore, I read between the lines to claim that Anzaldúa would fully endorse my normative position on elective bilingualism. She validates that we must wean ourselves off monolinguality and anachronistically educating through such frameworks, whichever one they may be. She confronted the existential inadequacy of her situation by herself, indignantly transforming her circumstantial variety to elective. She angrily puts it as, “What I want is an
accounting with all three cultures—white, Mexican, Indian.” In so doing, she demonstrates that my categorical imperative of elective bilingualism has direct applicability for a Spanish-English community and corroborates its universality for simultaneous and sequential bilinguals alike.

Much like our dear Cummings or Mignolo, I qualify my positive judgment on Anzaldúa. Outcries instruct on warning signs, risk indicators, and prevention education—they are not designed for normative theory. To use an outcry for normative purposes would undergird our bilingualism with a disposition of despair. Thus, for my agenda, her perspective is not an endpoint. Her mestiza consciousness, though having a hint of a bilingual moral conscience, does not give the complete picture on how to ethically educate ourselves because it is an overly strong condemnation of both dominant cultures and fails to dignify the positive.

Our task is to explore the ideological landscape to ultimately find and endorse a more universal viewpoint, a key element of what it means to be educated. Hence, an essential difference in her accounting and mine is my transcendence of specific cultural and ethical circumstances to suggest an existential project for all bilinguals to undertake, surpassing dichotomies of conflict/harmony and simultaneity/sequentiality. She powerfully describes her own corner of the world but does not philosophically convey a coherent normative position and overarching orientation for any bilingual speaker or community.

On the other hand, my ethics is a multilingual bilingualism. That is, I interpret bilingualism drawing on a multilingual epistemology. Thus, in bringing together bilingual voices from diverse ethnic, scientific, and ideological communities, I move from select cases and offer the reader a globalized view on the phenomenon, applicable to the borders of India and
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Bangladesh or wherever else. The evidence fully supports my insistence that the individual rationally educate himself to seek bilingual wisdom and that the education of the family, community, and school nurtures such a worldview just like teaching a kid to say “please,” to look both ways before crossing the street, or to memorize his multiplication tables. This would address complaints from myself or others throughout my thesis, be it dichotomous thinking, inauthentic homogeneities, North American self-centeredness, logical straitjackets, or cultural tyranny. Even Jean-Paul Sartre would accept it.

As we think again about wisdom, my last exploratory voice for a philosophy of bilingualism is Cuban Jorge Mañach. He depicts cultural frontiers in a more balanced fashion, a perspective that can rein in the wild nature of modern times. Corroborating Anzaldúa, he fully acknowledges that the average Latin American and Anglo American each have serious cultural deficiencies to resolve and that such hang-ups contribute to cross-cultural bitterness, but as only one standpoint of several in his philosophy of place for each civilization. Due to unique historical and geographical modes of existence, each tends to emphasize distinct yet complementary virtues. These lend themselves to an advantageous partnership. Hence, he instructs individuals to transcend cultural frontiers to esteem the other and learn their virtues, thereby becoming ethical self-formers as they work with and emulate each other.

Mañach evaluates eudemonic ability for prescriptive ends. For him, the British colonial conditions of “ideological and moral autonomy” created rugged frontier individualism and self-reliance, which historically supplies the optimism and can-do attitude that we still at times find. He sees the virtuous emphasis of Anglo America being a practical form of rationality that prizes action and doing. Advances in science and technology naturally follow from such a disposition.
Further, when this expresses itself at its height, the Anglo exhibits a healthy self-critical attitude and respect for the abilities of others. He deems this “an ethical-practical synthesis.”

By contrast, the strength of a Latin American mode of knowing is heightened sensibility. Starting with the Reconquista that merged the religious with the political, the conquistador-missionary assault combined strict hierarchy with violent control that led to an unequal environment from the beginning. In contrast to the land of opportunity north of the border that valued democracy and egalitarianism for the average white settler, this closed, conservative, and slow-moving society drove people to focus on their social support structure and the relationships therein. The miscegenation formed a distinct penchant for aesthetics, deep feeling, and intuition. Absent material abundance, the Latin American tends to favor quality over quantity and, due to genetic mixing, is more successful at racial coexistence. What the average Anglo expects in his golden years of retirement only after attaining a nest egg, the Latin American experiences on a weekly basis: quality time with loved ones and focusing on the little things in life. Therefore, the virtuous emphasis is a kind of being as fulfilled desire, exemplified in the word *gana* and the many expressions that spring from this disposition. This ethos promotes general happiness.

Whether ethical-practical synthesis or fulfilled desire of being, each of these is double-sided. Mañach laments that the US is prone to overemphasizing money and utility at the expense of developing its culture and outlook in other areas. With eyes firmly set on economics, the common Anglo American overlooks the bigger picture, immersed in anti-intellectualism and consumerism. On the other hand, the Latin American suffers from political corruption and low levels of human development. While no one doubts the genius of a Botero, García Marquez,

---

Neruda, or Dudamel, he avers that this civilization has contributed little to science and technology, harshly and perhaps unfairly evoking the image of a parasite.

Fortunately for the welfare of the Americas, these emphases are inverted in the other half. In this sense, Mañach laudably puts on a clinic in a philosophy of wisdom as he visualizes each civilization cross-pollinating each other based on their historically effected virtues. In a climate dominated by Huntington-like attacks and Anzaldúa-like disillusionment of the status quo, his pragmatism in this regard instructs us on the disposition to rise to the occasion and make this ethical.

Before moving on from Mañach, I point out another stance on language use. Discussing Puerto Rico as a geographical bridge between two civilizations, he remarks, “It is true that the common speech suffers at every turn from the inevitable spatterings of bilingualism, and I believe that this is going to require a whole campaign of purification.”

To this apparent bias of Spanglish as a corruption, I would respond that Mañach’s position leaves too much to an unguided imagination, which is uninformed by my concern for the ‘elective’ dimension in elective bilingualism. The average circumstantial speaker of Spanglish does not generally philosophically reflect on the virtues of both languages and then oscillate between them through each language. Rather, most speakers of Spanglish, from a standpoint of contingency, probably need to do more homework in one or the other language. Anzaldúa’s elective Spanglish illuminates this possibility of affirming what is wise in such bilingual spatterings, and it follows that Mañach would support such language use.

In sum, Mañach’s approach has enormous ethical implications both for inhabitants and stewards of cultural frontiers. For this reason, he can enlighten philosophy departments, Colleges
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of Education, classrooms, and households. His approach is worthy of consideration for normative ethics, one that I implore followers of both Huntington and Anzaldúa to read for their respective edification because he gets us rethinking about what is possible and how to embrace each other in an ethically novel way. Here is my own version of this.

**A Great Bilingual Society**

To finish, my thesis culminates in the normative significance of our budding bilingualism. As I address its normative significance, I acknowledge that many who exercise caution about bilingualism are bilingual themselves and are not against bilingualism per se but rather how it plays out experientially. Rightly so. The bilingualism that we have had in many places, especially the United States, has not consistently considered the breadth of perspectives involved. This injustice comes to the crest with someone like Anzaldúa who resorts to poetic ranting. A people like the Diné do not even get to rant; they get crushed. Nevertheless, these critics also long for the sort of ethic that can resist this historical injustice and give stewardship to cultural globalization. In fulfilling my watchword of “the more bilingual, the more ethical,” I offer a horizon of a Great Bilingual Society.

This premise stems from a historical period of the US that is inspiring both for its lofty idealism and democratizing laws. The ethical aspirations and policymaking of 36th President Lyndon B. Johnson form the Great Society (1963-1969). In the words of the architect himself, the Great Society “demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time.”204 This effervescence for meeting the moment sought to do more for economic and social issues “than the last hundred sessions [of Congress] combined.”205 Towards
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204 Lyndon B. Johnson, University of Michigan, 1964
205 Lyndon B. Johnson, State of the Union, January 1964, minute 3:10, accessed at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fv9aimlQJzM.
this end, he ratified landmark legislation, securing civil rights protections, anti-poverty measures, and health care access.

LBJ also dismantled discriminatory immigration policy. In the larger spirit of opening America to every color, Great Society idealism birthed the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, a federal law that abolished the quota system and the use of race as a criterion for admission. Instead, family unification, as one of seven categories, became a selection principle for visas. This strengthened the phenomenon of chain migration where relatives and children of U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents receive priority status to migrate. As Europe stabilized post-World War II and Anglo Americans began to have a stagnating birthrate, the United States increasingly grew its population from immigrants and their families from the nearest regions outside of the economic core. The upshot is that a high percentage of Americans of Latin American extraction call the US their home and more Americans now enjoy the cultural and economic power of Spanish. This is a prime cause of the current demographic changes and surge of bilingualism that we see ever-present in the US today.

Another way the Great Society influences my project is its concern for education. The crown jewel is the Head Start program. Initially a summer school program, it has expanded to year-round preschool services that build literacy, numeracy, and social and emotional skills for children one to five years old and specifically targets low-income families. This investment in school readiness for all children attempts to democratize society, developing the talents of demographics traditionally neglected.
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207 The previous administration attempted to overturn this.
208 Quoted from official Head Start website, accessed at https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ohs/about/head-start.
We must meet the current moment by establishing a norm on the present conditions that the Great Society created. Much of the world is narrowly stuck on the value of teaching language either for the “perpetuation of its own customs,” securing a piece of the economic and political pie, or career advancement. While these are important elements, they are not adequate ethical aims for educators. Clearly, ethics must include instrumental aims. But our ideals and aspirations go beyond language maintenance and academic achievement.

Thus, improving the moral wilderness, referred to earlier, rests on developing a systematic ethics that complements a broad societal bilingualism. This is even more the case since the current experts of the field are not up for this challenge. They neglect the history of philosophy. Besides the occasional drive-by reference to a select few thinkers, e.g., Foucault, social scientists and educators in the bilingualism paradigm tend to ignore ethics altogether. Truth be told, they could use the help. By contrast, in remarking that the universal good of self-actualizing bilingualism must be the educational aim, I step into the unknown and synthesize the bilingualism paradigm, bilingual education, and philosophy. As I hope the reader has realized, bilingualism experts can be that much more effective as they bring more voices into the conversation. We need diverse stakeholders to take part in creating an electively bilingual society, not just one demographic or the other participating amongst themselves. Drawing on the likes of Roger Williams, the science of bilingualism, and Jorge Mañach, I strengthen bilingual education and policymaking with a philosophy of wisdom.

Creating this ethos, let us listen to voices like Dewey in our bilingual society. We need to make good on his aspiration to rid American society of its problems and backwardness by improving it through education. In my view, his lofty ideal of intergenerationally transmitting
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virtues while simultaneously casting away proverbial “deadwood and the positively perverse”\(^{210}\) is more realistic and attainable when we educate ourselves to have a bilingual frame of reference and moral conscience. My science from chapter two supports this—the second language gives its speaker an additional system of psychological concepts that, with the right philosophically cultivated disposition towards bilingualism, can help identify aspects of our existence that otherwise seem benign or even virtuous for a monolingual conscience like Huntington’s. We do not passively transmit but rather get elective bilingual students to discern the problematic aspects of life and choose between tangible bilingual alternatives. Surpassing our problems, then, is not an abstract ethical ideal but a concrete and compelling option. We take Dewey a step further by strengthening the average conscience specifically from bilingualism, a new layer of ethicality here in the US.

Therefore, the normative significance of our bilingualism is a means to flourish. We should see it is as \textit{an opportunity to self-form and improve eudemonic ability}. An ethical form of societal bilingualism in the US equally values both languages and fuses horizons for mutual benefit. In seeing the perspectives of others, this ethically informed existential take on bilingualism paves the way to learning about bias blind spots and gives a greater self-presence, which undeniably leads to self-expansion. In an increasingly multilingual world, we have a responsibility to elevate our conception of morality in this way.

To make this idea concrete for our context, the fusion of Anglo and Latin American horizons can lead to a healthier form of selfhood and community, or what Dewey calls integrated individuality.\(^{211}\) Dewey could not have foreseen how the conditions for this ideal would emerge in a post-Great Society and how ‘a new education’ of bilingualism can rejuvenate selfhood to

\(^{210}\) Dewey, \textit{Democracy and Education}, p. 19
\(^{211}\) Dewey, \textit{Individualism Old and New}
achieve his ‘new individualism.’ As Anzaldúa correctly notes, individuality is frequently lost in Latin American culture, which partly explains her exasperation. She remarks, “The welfare of the family, the community, and the tribe is more important than the welfare of the individual.”

Communal forms of being are one-sidedly prioritized over developing the individuality of each member to bring out unique talents and abilities, ultimately for the greater good. Clearly, we need individuals who invest in themselves, develop their knowledge base, and professionally thrive. Mañach laments this aspect of Latin American Bildung, clearly prescribing a dose of Anglo self-reliance for his people. This pitfall of the Latin American to overly focus on community lends itself well to the Anglo American. In fact, it is a great example of the cosmopolitanism and self-actualization through bilingualism to affirm both the individual and the community.

Essential to this picture is promoting sensitive dialogues of constructive criticism. Now more than ever, we tend to listen to one perspective or another and disregard sincere grievances that we have of one another. Dewey astutely points out that we should learn the complaints of our neighbor in order to uniquely recommit to ourselves and grow. This is the deeper contribution of Anzaldúa to a philosophy of bilingualism. Her outcry is the raw material that forges a bilingual moral conscience. She is a testament to the added sincerity when it is done from the standpoint of genuine insider judgments on each culture’s own terms in each respective language. I also add that my own background corroborates this transformation—I have seen firsthand how educators trained in elective bilingualism can simultaneously lend credence and play devil’s advocate to the criticisms that each speech community perceives and airs to the
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other. Bilingualism reflects life. It is not always positive but the first-hand experience of living conflict and listening to others are essential pieces in building a bilingual moral conscience.

Since it takes ages to form a distinct bilingual self-awareness, we would be ahead of the game if my theory of elective bilingualism were swiftly adopted. Jeopardy has already acknowledged the importance of electively knowing Spanish to be a well-educated American, regardless of background. The gameboard of January 2, 2020 (see Figure 3) asked contestants to name the original Elton John song that was presented to them in a Spanish translation. As Jeopardy as my final piece of evidence, the normative significance of our bilingualism is to educate ourselves and ethically shape who we are through a bilingual tongue. *Concientícémonos a través de una formación ética bilingüe.*

![Figure 3: Jeopardy board](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>The moment when two languages begin to be used daily</td>
<td>Luk &amp; Bialystok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>A second language is added to the person’s repertoire and the two languages are maintained.</td>
<td>Garcia, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>State of bilinguality reached after childhood but before adulthood</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>State of bilinguality reached after adolescence</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendant</td>
<td>When a second language is developing</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>equally skilled in both languages</td>
<td>Peal &amp; Lambert, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>Identifying with the culture of two different language groups. To be bilingual is not necessarily the same as being bicultural.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood</td>
<td>State of bilinguality reached before 10-12 years</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
<td>Groups of individuals who must become bilingual to operate in the majority language society that surrounds them.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>A state of bilinguality in which two sets of linguistic signs have come to be associated with the same set of meanings; this type of bilinguality is usually linked to a common context of acquisition.</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicitive</td>
<td>A negative experience and/or interpersonal problems experienced in the context of societal bilingualism</td>
<td>De Houwer, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive</td>
<td>Infancy bilinguality in which the child develops two mother tongues (L_A, L_B) from the onset of language</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive early</td>
<td>Childhood bilinguality in which the second language (L_2) is acquired before 4-5 years but after the acquisition of basic skills in the mother tongue (L_1, then L_2)</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate</td>
<td>The state of bilinguality in which translation equivalents in two languages each correspond to a distinct set of semantic representations; this type of bilinguality is usually linked to different contexts of acquisition.</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeping</td>
<td>A seemingly innocuous bilingualism that debases the society.</td>
<td>Huntington, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diglossic</td>
<td>Societal bilingualism where two languages cooccur, each with a distinct range of social functions.</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>A state of bilinguality in which competence in one language is superior to competence in the other; note that dominance is not equally distributed for all domains and functions of language.</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Focuses on the ways bilinguals draw on the range of features associated with socially constructed languages within their linguistic repertoire in complex and dynamic ways as they communicate with others and engage in collaborative tasks</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>Typically refers to bilingualism by choice in two (or more) elite or prestigious national and/or international languages, among the highly privileged members of a dominant society.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>Early stages of bilingual development</td>
<td>García, Ibarra Johnson, &amp; Seltzer, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>Those who can use two or more languages with relative ease, although their performances vary according to task, modality, and language.</td>
<td>García, Ibarra Johnson, &amp; Seltzer, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>See entry for conflictive</td>
<td>De Houwer, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>See entry for balanced</td>
<td>Romaine, Bilingualism (2nd Ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>The ability to use bilingual skills to accomplish basic functions.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine</td>
<td>Exhibits mastery of both languages</td>
<td>Peal &amp; Lambert, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonious</td>
<td>The experience of well-being in a language contact situation involving young children and their families, absent of interpersonal problems due to their bilingualism.</td>
<td>De Houwer, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal</td>
<td>Languages are of roughly equal status</td>
<td>Haugen, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>See entry for balanced</td>
<td>Romaine, Bilingualism (2nd Ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Bilingual capabilities resulting from immigration</td>
<td>Haugen, 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incipient</td>
<td>The early states of bilingualism where one language is not strongly developed. Beginning to acquire a second language.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>A psychological state of the individual who has access to more than one linguistic code</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infancy</td>
<td>State of bilinguality reached during early childhood</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Psycholinguistic development covers select domains in each language</td>
<td>Romaine, <em>Bilingualism</em> (<em>2nd</em> Ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Understanding two languages but capable of only producing one</td>
<td>De Houwer, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>See entry for <em>individual</em></td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestigious</td>
<td>Typically refers to bilingualism by choice in two (or more) elite or prestigious national and/or international languages, among the highly privileged members of a dominant society.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>Speaking and writing in the first and second language (as well as listening and reading).</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo</td>
<td>Knows one language much better than the other</td>
<td>Peal &amp; Lambert, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>Understanding and reading a second language without speaking or writing in that language</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recessive</td>
<td>When proficiency in one of a bilingual’s languages is decreasing due to lack of use or development.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recursive</td>
<td>Bits and pieces of an ancestral language are reconstituted for new functions</td>
<td>García, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>The average bilingual that has specific language knowledge and distributed language use.</td>
<td>Grosjean, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualizing</td>
<td>Existential take on harmonious bilingualism where eudaimonia is predicated on a self-project of cosmopolitanism and language learning.</td>
<td>Rethorn, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>Bilingualism achieved via learning a second language later than the first language, typically after age three.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
<td>Infancy bilinguality in which the child develops two mother tongues (L_A, L_B) from the onset of language</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal</td>
<td>A broad term used to refer to the use of two (or more) languages within a given society.</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Wainwright, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Bilinguals who use both languages across many more shared domains and shared purposes such as translators and interpreters</td>
<td>Grosjean, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>plateau effect where development in both languages is satisfactory</td>
<td>Grosjean, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtractive</strong></td>
<td>A situation in which the bilingual child’s cognitive development is delayed in comparison with his monolingual counterpart; this usually occurs when the mother tongue is devalued in the environment.</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Territorial</strong></td>
<td>Cooccurrence of two or more languages which have official status within a geographical area; or coexistence of two or more UNILINGUAL areas within a single political structure (e.g., UNILINGUAL regions in a MULTILINGUAL state)</td>
<td>Hamers &amp; Blanc, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>True</strong></td>
<td>Masters both languages at an early age and has facility with both as a means of communication</td>
<td>Peal &amp; Lambert, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ulcerous</strong></td>
<td>Existential take on conflictive bilingualism where the convergence of language and culture is experienced painfully</td>
<td>Rethorn, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical</strong></td>
<td>one language is hierarchically above another in power and prestige.</td>
<td>Haugen, 1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4: Bilingualism and Bilinguality Tracker*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Period</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Ability to Generalize</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Corresponding Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infancy’s preverbality</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Nonexistent</td>
<td>Basic instincts determine behavior</td>
<td>Crib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood’s synthetic heap</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>The dominance of perception from which subjective generalizations emerge</td>
<td>Unconnected connectedness</td>
<td>Bilingual First Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool’s thinking in complexes</td>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>Objective, concrete, empirical connections, drawing on lived experiences that are chained together.</td>
<td>“Establishment of the connections and relationships that constitute its basis”</td>
<td>Consecutive early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-age’s preconcepts</td>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>Abstractly privileges a certain characteristic but without logical clarity or conscious awareness</td>
<td>Potential concepts are associated abstractions that destroys concrete situation and the concrete connections</td>
<td>The end of childhood bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescence’s thinking in concepts</td>
<td>13-onward</td>
<td>Systematic analysis, logical hierarchy</td>
<td>Abstract, scientific</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consecutive/Sequential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5: Vygotsky’s Periodization*
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