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Introduction

The rise of performance studies at the end of the twentieth century encouraged many theatre scholars to take a broader view of their discipline, and to consider models other than the one long dominant in the West. Ever since Aristotle, Western writers have primarily considered theatre as closely tied to the written text, essentially the physical enactment of such a preexisting text. With tools provided by semiotics, reception theory, cultural studies, and other theoretical approaches, current research in theatre and performance has vastly extended its areas of interest, greatly enriching the field.

In the excitement and stimulation of this new orientation, however, certain more traditional areas of concern have been relatively neglected. Traditional theatre was from time to time almost forgotten in the early days of performance studies, as attention was given to a wide variety of other cultural performance and to nonliterary celebrative occasions. The long-standing theoretical privileging of the dramatic text was largely replaced by an attention to nonlinguistic and especially nonliterary phenomena. Language in the theatre, once a central theoretical concern, was generally relegated to a distinctly minor position. At the same time, changes in linguistic theory and theatre practice at the close of the century provided a challenge for a rethinking of theatrical language and of the various ways that language can function in the theatre. The purpose of this book is to suggest how the new perspectives opened by these changes can enrich our understanding of both present and past theatrical activity.

When semiotic analysis began to be applied to theatre, in one of the major theoretical developments of theatre studies in the last century, it tied modern theatre theory close to modern linguistic theory, and encouraged the use of a communication model for analysis. This model,
developed from the pioneering work of Ferdinand de Saussure early in the century, sought to develop an objective, scientific means of analyzing human discourse. Perhaps the best concise expression of this model of linguistic performance was provided by linguist Noam Chomsky, as a situation in which an “ideal speaker-listener” operates “in a completely homogeneous speech-community,” and “knows its language perfectly.”

One can recognize in this formulation the regularizing and abstracting qualities, the search for an essential core, that characterizes much modernist thought in the arts, and dominated the thinking not only of linguists, but of theorists throughout the social sciences in the early twentieth century as they sought to ground their disciplines on solid “scientific” principles.

A central manifestation of late-twentieth-century thought, however, has been to challenge these abstract and totalizing constructions, through postmodernism in the arts, poststructuralism in language and cultural studies, and the new performative emphasis in the social sciences, particularly in anthropology and ethnography. Interestingly enough, performance theorists of the late twentieth century once again found significant inspiration in linguistic theory, this time in the work of J. L. Austin and John Searle, just as theatre theorists a generation earlier had found inspiration in the linguistic theory of Saussure and his immediate followers. A new generation of linguistic theory has moved even further away from the model Chomsky describes, but is a natural development from Austin’s emphasis on the total speech situation and is closely tied to the tendency in modern performance analysis to pay attention to the individual performance event, rather than to some generic abstraction. This contemporary approach to linguistics has been called “integrational linguistics” by Roy Harris, one of its leading proponents. The term was first used in Harris’s The Language Myth in 1981 and became extensively employed to suggest this new orientation by the end of the century. This approach stresses the improvisatory and indeterminate nature of every speech act: “language is continuously created by the interaction of individuals in specific communication situations.”

Such an approach fits very well with recent developments in performance studies and performance analysis, but its possible relevance to the theatre as it has been traditionally conceived and studied has been much less explored. There still exists a widespread assumption that the vast
majority of theatre through history has operated fairly closely according to the model of orthodox linguistics. That is, the dramatist can be looked at as functioning in the role of Chomsky’s “ideal speaker-listener,” and his audience as the “completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly.” This view of theatre would not be so widespread, of course, if theatre did not possess a number of features, at least as a communication system, that offer support for such a view. Because of its close ties with the specific conditions of performance, theatre has in all times and places been strongly aware of its responsibility to relate to a particular audience. Indeed, it may be said on these grounds to be the most local of the arts. The great majority of the world’s drama has been created by dramatists who were working with a specific audience in mind, and not uncommonly dramatist and audience shared not only a common language, but often a highly specialized language unique to theatrical communication. They not only shared a common language in this standard sense of the word, but a wide variety of the other “languages of the stage” that semiotic theory has brought to our attention—particular theatrical conventions, acting styles, and the potential meanings of each aspect of production, from the theatre building itself to the smallest particular gesture. This general characteristic of theatre is intensified by its close relationship with language (indeed with spoken language), making the matters of locality and specificity clearly more central than they are in a more abstract art like dance. One can surely assume that the first dramatic productions to use language, whatever and wherever they may have been, used their audience’s common tongue or at least a tongue whose general features could be understood by all or most of that audience.

This feature is reinforced by the fact that, although a society may possess considerable cultural diversity, the audiences that have attended particular theatres have generally been distinctly less heterogeneous than the society that surrounds them. Moreover the theatre has often, consciously or less consciously, been seen and employed as an instrument of cultural and linguistic solidification. As a public art devoted to cultural self-reflexivity, theatre has not only reflected but often helped to reinforce and to crystallize norms of social action. Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller saw the theatre very much in these terms, and during the ensuing romantic period, an almost invariable component of the rise of
nationalism in Europe was the establishment of a national theatre, contributing to the formation of a unified and univocal people by presenting the history and myths of that people in their own language. Alongside the building of these modern nations developed the modern colonial empires, and if theatre was perhaps not so central to these, the importance of the great national dramatists, Shakespeare in England, Racine, Corneille, and Molière in France, indisputably played a major role in the construction of the subaltern’s worldview in the colonies of these nations.

One of the strongest statements concerning the proclivity of theatre toward this totalized and monolithic communication model was developed by Mikhail Bakhtin, who argued that the drama, in contrast to the novel, was an essentially monologic form. In his discussion of dialogue in Dostoyevsky he specifically took issue with Leonid Grossman, an earlier commentator, who had called Dostoevsky’s dialogues “dramatic.” Bakhtin insisted, on the contrary, that “the rejoinders in a dramatic dialogue do not rip apart the represented world, do not make it multi-lev-eled; on the contrary, if they are to be authentically dramatic, these rejoinders necessitate the utmost monolithic quality of that world.” Although the characters may come together “dialogically,” they do so within “the unified field of vision of author, director, and audience, against the clearly defined background of a single-tiered world.” This view of drama bears, I would note, a striking similarity to the orthodox view of language, the “unified field of vision of author, director and audience” and the “single-tiered world” they share corresponding closely to the “completely homogeneous speech-community” of classic linguistic theory.

Elsewhere I have taken issue with Bakhtin’s view of the operations of the drama, with examples drawn from such major classic authors as Calderón, Shakespeare, Ibsen, and Shaw, but more recent developments both in dramatic practice and in cultural theory have raised significant new questions about Bakhtin’s attempt to deny heteroglossia to the theatre. A useful intertext for indicating the way that Bakhtin’s original concept has been productively appropriated and expanded in more recent cultural analysis is James Clifford’s influential 1988 study of the interrelationships of contemporary ethnography, literature, and art, *The Predicament of Culture*. The opening chapter of Clifford’s book.
“On Ethnographic Authority,” makes extensive use of Bakhtin’s idea of heteroglossia, but also remarks that in Bakhtin the idea of polyphonic discourse is “too narrowly identified with the novel.”7

The major concern of Clifford’s opening chapter is to trace “the formation and breakup of ethnographic authority in twentieth-century social anthropology.” In the wake of the breakup of colonial power, the development of the radical cultural theories of the 1960s and 1970s, and the increasing exposure of varied cultures to one another in the late twentieth century, the monologic Western “voice” of ethnographic authority has given way, in more recent cultural theory, to a consciousness of the varied “voices” that this monologist view silenced or suppressed. Clifford invokes Bakhtin to express this new concern: “With expanded communication and intercultural influence, people interpret others, and themselves, in a bewildering diversity of idioms—a global condition of what Mikhail Bakhtin called “heteroglossia.” In citing this usage, Clifford quotes Bakhtin’s comment that heteroglossia assumes that “languages do not exclude each other, but rather intersect with each other in many different ways,” adding that “what is said of languages applies equally to ‘cultures’ and ‘subcultures.’”8

Clifford, like Bakhtin, speaks very little about theatre and drama specifically, but many of his observations about the cultural complexity and the workings of heteroglossia in the plastic arts and in literature have clear relevance to the world of theatre, especially postcolonial theatre, as in his discussion of the work of Aimé Césaire. Césaire’s writing Clifford sees as emblematic of the “hybrid and heteroglot” intersection of language that characterizes some of the most interesting and powerful postcolonial expression. Later in this book I will consider some of the operations and implications of heteroglossia in the linguistic intersections and negotiations that are central to an understanding of postcolonial artistic expression.

More broadly, however, I would like to extend Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia somewhat in the way Clifford has done, to explore certain theatre and performance manifestations rather than more general cultural and ethnographic ones. I propose to examine some of the many ways that languages, in Clifford’s phrase, have intersected with each other in a wide variety of different theatrical contexts, and some of the implications of these intersections in terms of reception, mimesis, and
the social, political, and cultural investments of theatrical presentation. I hope to demonstrate that “playing with language” in the theatre is not simply a postcolonial or postmodern strategy (although linguistic play has become of major or even central importance in both postcolonial and postmodern theatre) but an activity found very widely in theatrical cultures past and present, around the world, and that such “playing,” as is the case with much “play” in theatre, has often involved very serious social and artistic concerns.

Before laying out the general plan of this study, however, it is important that I offer some introduction to the very vexed question of what is meant by language. Like many general terms (such as performance) that a generation ago seemed more or less clear and unambiguous, language is now a term that conjures up a wide and in some cases quite contradictory range of meaning. This situation has been largely the result of two developments. On the one hand, semiotic theory worked to extend the term to cover any sort of communication system that could be described in codified terms, so that, for example, one of the first books on theatre semiotics published in English was entitled Languages of the Stage,9 and semioticians often spoke of the “language” of gesture, costume, makeup, scenery, or architecture. On the other hand, the integrational linguists dismissed the very concept of “language” as a misleading myth, and argued for the replacement of the language study, so central to traditional linguistics, with a study of contextualized communication situations.10

David Crystal’s Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, the standard guide to terms in the field, provides a useful starting point. Its entry on language begins with the caution that even “everyday use of this term involves several different senses, which linguistics is careful to distinguish.” One of these senses, although of major importance to the theatre, will be little considered in this book. Crystal describes it as the sense of a “particular variety, or level, of speech/writing” such as “scientific language” or “bad language.” Since the theatre reflects the linguistic world around it as it does the cultural world in general, the varieties of language can naturally be found there as well, but the theatre also offers many examples of its own sort of “scientific language,” of what might be called “stage language.” This is not a particularly familiar expression in English, although the Germans use the term Bühnenspräche. Since the
rise of realism, the use of “stage language” has become much less obvi-
ous, but it was an important feature of theatre in most historical periods,
when characters on stage spoke a “language” generally understandable
its audience but distinctly different from what they actually spoke. Per-
haps the most familiar and striking example is the highly codified
rhymed couplet, composed of two alexandrine lines, that was the invari-
able basis of the “language” of French neoclassic tragedy and indeed was
copied by dramatists in writing in other national languages who wished
to place their work in this tradition. English, of course, had the familiar
Shakespearian “blank verse,” the rather less familiar “heroic couplet” of
the Restoration period; the classic Noh drama’s language is notoriously
remote from anything actually spoken; and so on, through all the his-
toric and geographic variations of poetic and patterned speech. Since
stage speech can operate in different registers (the blank verse of Shake-
speare interspersed with a variety of other material— the prose of the
clowns, the embedded sonnets of Romeo and Juliet, the songs and end
couplets) one can even speak of at least some stage speech as heteroglos-
sic and therefore closely connected to a major theme of this book. Nev-
evertheless, I will not address this aspect of theatrical language in any
detail because its operations, especially in such important cultural exam-
pies as the Noh drama, the work of Shakespeare, or the French neoclas-
sic tradition, have been extensively examined in work devoted to those

Among the other senses of the term language that Crystal cites, the
most familiar is surely “the abstract system underlying the collective
totality of the speech-writing behaviour of a community” as in “the En-
glish language” or “the French language.”11 Since it is this sense of “lan-
guage” that I will be primarily using, it is important to note that, popu-
lar and familiar as this usage is, it hides a large number of contradictions
and assumptions that integrational linguistics has dedicated itself, in
part, to revealing. Among these is the ambiguous relationship between
language and dialect. Crystal provides a clear and balanced statement of
this relationship that raises a series of significant concerns. I would like
to quote in full the first two paragraphs of his definition of dialect:

A regionally or socially distinctive variety of language, identified by a
particular set of words and grammatical structures. Spoken dialects
are usually also associated with a distinctive pronunciation, or accent. Any language with a reasonably large number of speakers will develop dialects, especially if there are geographical barriers separating groups of people from each other, or if there are divisions of social class. One dialect may predominate as the official or standard form of the language, and this is the variety which may come to be written down.

The distinction between “dialect” and “language” seems obvious: dialects are subdivisions of languages. What linguistics (and especially sociolinguistics) has done is to point to the complexity of the relationship between these notions. It is usually said the people speak different languages when they do not understand each other. But many of the so-called dialects of Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, Pekinese) are mutually unintelligible in their spoken form. (They do, however, share the same written language, which is the main reason why one speaks of them as “dialects of Chinese.”) And the opposite situation occurs: Swedes, Norwegians and Danes are generally able to understand each Other, but their separate histories, cultures, literatures and political structures warrant their being referred to as different languages.¹²

Although, as the final three sentences make clear, the distinction between dialect and language is by no means as obvious as it may at first appear, I will on the whole follow standard usage, which correlates closely with the way these terms in fact operate in the theatre. In the case of a bilingual or multilanguage play, however, we cannot simply rely on what is “usually said”— that people who speak different languages do not understand each other. A play produced in a bilingual community, like contemporary Quebec, may well utilize two clearly different languages, English and French, and yet be entirely composed of characters who understand both languages, and each other, perfectly well, an ability shared by a bilingual audience. Since at least as many people in the world today are bi- or multilingual as those that are not,¹³ it is becoming increasingly common to find audiences that are entirely or partly able to understand more than one language used in a play, and indeed one often finds characters in contemporary drama who understand, and may speak, a number of languages (like the Afghan guide in Tony Kushner’s
Nevertheless, both characters and audiences are aware that several languages are involved in such works. Certainly the question of understanding is a major one, and cannot be avoided when one is speaking of multilanguage theatre, but on a pragmatic level it does not provide a clear and unambiguous way of distinguishing polylinguistic from monolinguistic theatre.

A more workable approach is to recognize that each language, like the concept of language itself, is a social construction, and that languages on the stage as elsewhere are recognized and coded as languages by their employment of features culturally related to that construction rather than by comprehension or noncomprehension. This same process of social construction continues to apply in the separation of languages from dialects. For the most part what is popularly spoken of as a “language” is one of many competing dialects that for a variety of reasons—commercial, political, and cultural—emerged as the “standard” language of a geographical area. The most familiar Western examples are the languages that worked in tandem with the development of the modern nation-states, and contributed significantly to consolidating and establishing the authority of those states. So effective was this process that a major project in contemporary sociolinguistics has been explaining that existing languages are not superior in any objective way to their various alternative dialects past and present, but have gained their prominence by a concrete historical process. The fact that, as Crystal notes, separation of dialects is encouraged both by “geographical barriers” and “divisions of social class” has naturally meant that in addition to dialects being generally somewhat looked down upon by speakers of the “official” language, dialect speakers have often suffered the additional stigma of being marked by their speech as coming from a subordinate or inferior geographical area or social class. I recall several years ago being somewhat surprised by the gales of laughter from a Berlin audience at almost every speech of Polonius in a production of Hamlet, including lines that seemed to me to have no comic content whatever. Finally I asked a German friend what was so funny and he patiently explained that the actor was used a Swabian accent, a source of much amusement to the sophisticated Berliners.

Naturally all of these linguistic social dynamics are reflected in theatrical presentations, which inevitably reflect the social operations of
their culture. From classic times onward language differences have been utilized not only to place characters within multilanguage or multidialect cultures, but almost always also to reflect the power relationships embedded in language usage.\textsuperscript{15} Although there is no tradition of comparative linguistics in classical Greek writing, there is certainly an awareness of different languages and different dialects in such authors as Herodotus, although no very clear distinction between the two.\textsuperscript{16} Homer characterizes the Carians, a people of Asia Minor who spoke a language quite distinct from Greek, as \textit{barbarophonos}, “of barbaric speech,”\textsuperscript{17} a coinage that stimulated extensive discussion among subsequent authors. The geographer Strabo summarizes this discussion and adds comments of his own that are quite relevant both to the Greek theatrical use of alien language as well as to such usage in later theatrical cultures. Strabo suggested that the term \textit{barbarophonos} was first used onomatopoetically, “in reference to people who enunciated words only with difficulty and talked harshly and raucously,” as in the sound of the Greek word for stutter, \textit{battarizein}. Strabo notes that this descriptive term gradually took on social and cultural significance. Non-Greek speakers were called barbarians

in the special sense of the term at first derisively, meaning that they pronounced words thickly or harshly; and then we misused the word as a general ethnic term, thus making a logical distinction between the Greeks and the others. The fact is, however, that through our long acquaintance and intercourse with the barbarians this effect was at last seen to be the result, not of a thick pronunciation or any natural defect in the vocal organs, but of the peculiarities of their dialects. . . . So, therefore, we must interpret the terms “speaking barbarously” and “barbarously-speaking” as applying to those who speak Greek badly.\textsuperscript{18}

When we turn in the following chapter to the specific depictions of “barbarian” speakers in the Greek drama, we will find that on the whole the speaker of the foreign language or dialect is marked as a figure of ridicule, or at least condescension, a feature that will characterize much subsequent theatrical use of foreign speakers, especially in the comic theatre.
Within the Greek theatre itself, some “barbarian” speakers did not in fact utilize words or phrases from any specific foreign language, or even from any specific dialect, but rather were depicted with an accent, suggesting such languages or dialects to an audience who had likely only a limited acquaintance with these alternative voices. In linguistic terms an accent is distinct from a dialect in that accent refers only to pronunciation, while dialect also involves grammar and vocabulary, but in more general usage the boundaries between accents and dialects, like those between dialects and languages, are extremely fluid. General usage also associates accents as departures from some generally accepted “normal” speech, speech “without an accent,” although anyone with an ear trained to notice verbal distinctions is aware of what linguistic theory stresses, that no one speaks without an accent, even if that accent (as is almost never the case) is perfectly attuned to the standard speech of the surrounding culture.

In this light, one can readily see that the much-admired “standard stage English” of the early-twentieth-century English Shakespearian actors was also an accent, although traditionally the term stage accent or stage dialect has referred to a particular pattern of intonation and pronunciation designed to give the impression of a character coming from an alien linguistic background. The stage dialect is best understood as a particular form of stage language. Although it is meant to suggest actual dialects and languages in the world outside the theatre and therefore borrows certain of their features, these features are exaggerated or simplified for theatrical purposes. As Jerry Blunt explains in the introduction to his Stage Dialects, “A stage dialect is a normal dialect altered as needed to fit the requirements of theatrical clarity and dramatic interpretation.”

Obviously the primary function of the stage accent is related to that of scenery and costume in the standard Western theatre. It is one of the codes employed to provide audience members with a sense of the physical and temporal location of the imaginary world being constructed on stage. In what is, to the best of my knowledge, the only study to pursue the cultural and social implications of stage dialects, Angela Pao has stressed that the tradition of the stage dialect, developed on a basis of technical skill without significant engagement with the culture behind the dialect, “carries the potential for ethnic stereotyping as much as per-
forming in blackface or yellowface perpetuates racial stereotyping.” So far the visual and behavioral aspects of performing race, such as blackface performance, have attracted far more attention than the vocal aspects, such as dialect, of performing ethnicity, but the same tendency toward stereotyping, and the embedded cultural bases connected with stereotyping, exists. Pao’s essay is a major first step toward engaging these vocal aspects, with telling examples from the major textbooks for stage dialect learning of the past half-century.

The history and importance of the stage accent, but also its linguistic ambiguity, suggest a number of tensions fundamental to the theatrical experience, in particular the tension between self and other and that between reality and convention. Although one can argue that with modern international touring, international festivals, international audiences, and international companies, a significant heteroglossic theatrical tradition is developing, but it is nevertheless true that in most locations and in most historical periods theatre has been a predominantly local phenomenon. In the case of most traditional theatre audiences, essentially drawn from the surrounding community, there was normally a very close relationship between the cultural practices and assumptions of theatre and the audience for which it is created. Throughout most of theatre history, a dramatist and the audience for which that dramatist created almost invariably spoke essentially the same language, both literally and figuratively, even if that language was colored, in the theatre, by such agreed-upon artistic conventions as alexandrines or iambic pentameters. Bakhtin’s example of Racine is a particularly clear case of a dramatist and audience not only essentially homogeneous in terms of cultural assumptions but also in the way that these assumptions were expressed theatrically.

Important as this centripetal dynamic has been, it is also true that a culture’s concept of itself, like a concept of individual identity, inevitably involves on some level a recognition of what lies outside that concept, of the other who provides a defining contrast to the self. As an art form centrally concerned with cultural self-reflection, then, the theatre could hardly escape bringing into its considerations the other that supported and provided a necessary counterpart to the concept of self. A great variety of strategies have been employed over the centuries to mark the
other in theatre, but surely one of the most striking has been the actual employment of the other’s language.

The problem of just how this language is to be represented theatrically has elicited a very wide range of responses, the variation in which is closely related to the ever-present struggle in theatre between reality and artifice. Many of the arts are involved to a greater or lesser degree with the imitation of life, but none is so extensively involved as theatre with using the raw material of life, bodies, objects, sounds, even on occasion smells, as the specific means of this imitation. In semiotic terms, theatre is the most iconic of all arts, often extending iconicity beyond mere perceptual resemblance to what I have elsewhere described as “iconic identity,” in which an object on stage actually is what it represents. In somewhat different terms, Bert States remarked that theatre was dedicated to the constant “colonization” of reality, to consuming “the real in its most real forms.” At the same time the theatre, like all arts, operates by conventions that qualify and modify the material it utilizes according to the codes developed within each culture according to which art is both created and received. There is thus a continuing tension in theatre between this art form’s ongoing commitment to the utilization of extratheatrical material and the often artificial codes and operations of the form itself that facilitate reception.

A character speaking an alien language is a particularly clear example of this ongoing struggle in theatre between verisimilitude, the actual or apparent utilization of the real, and artistic convention, which adjusts and qualifies reality in the interests of consensual strategies of reception. The force of verisimilitude encourages the use of actual foreign languages on stage, while the necessity of adopting the raw material of life to the theatrical and social conventions of a particular public, here including the language they speak, has resulted in a variety of substitutions for or supplements to actual foreign speech. The major substitution has been various forms of stage dialects, an artificial “stage speech” that one may consider a kind of artificial dialect; the major supplement, in modern times, has been the superstitied translation, about which more will be said in my concluding section.

The chapters that follow will consider various aspects of heteroglossia in the theatre, how and why it has been used in different theatrical con-
texts, and what it reveals about some of the social and cultural dynamics of this highly reflexive artistic form. The first chapter takes up what might be considered the “purest” form of theatrical heteroglossia, the appearance in a play of speeches or even whole scenes in an actual language different from that of the main action of the play. Although this might seem a rather odd phenomenon, it has in fact been utilized throughout the history of the theatre and around the world. Often verisimilitude is the major structural motivation for such linguistic mixing, but no cultural activity, and certainly not language, is devoid of associations and values, and so beyond the rather simple and straightforward concern of verisimilitude, theatrical heteroglossia almost always involves a wide variety of social and cultural issues.

The second chapter turns from a consideration of language to that of dialect. As I have already noted, I will be primarily using dialect in the common meaning of a subdivision of language. This meaning involves two widely held but not in fact accurate assumptions that will be engaged within the chapter. The first and more important is that there is a superior “regular” language that provides the norm, with various dialects as variations from it. Although this assumption accurately describes a cultural fact, it is important to realize that from a linguistic point of view, the dominant language is simply one dialect among many, which by social and historical forces has achieved a position of centrality. One of the major concerns of this chapter will be tracing how these forces operate in theatrical terms. The second assumption is less central, but necessary to note because it also has specific theatrical implications. This is the assumption that speakers of different dialects can understand each other (in common usage indeed this is what distinguishes a dialect from an independent language).

The idea that dialects can presumably be understood by speakers of other dialects would seem to suggest that they would be much more commonly utilized in the theatre than alternate languages, which present greater problems of communication. At first glance this seems to be the case, since dialect speech is far more widely encountered in the theatre than the sort of mixed language production discussed in chapter 1. The situation is more complicated than that, however. To begin with, the great majority of characters presented on stage as dialect speakers are not in fact speaking a “natural” dialect, but a “stage” dialect, a very