

In: Garcia, Ofelia and Joshua A. Fishman eds. 1999
The Multilingual Forays in New York City
Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter

New York's multilingualism: World languages and their role in a U. S. city¹

Ofelia Garcia

"On the island of Manhate, and in its environs, there may well be four or five hundred men of different sects and nations: The Director General told me that there were men of eighteen different languages." (Father Jogues of the Society of Jesus, 1646, quoted in Federal Writers' Project 1938b: 81)

"The city of New York is composed of inhabitants from all the countries of Christendom." (James Fenimore Cooper, 1827-1828, quoted in Rosenwaike 1972)

"The city is like poetry: it compresses all life, all races and breeds, into a small island The collision and the intermingling of these millions of foreign born people representing so many races and creeds make New York a permanent exhibit of the phenomom of one world." (E. B. White, 1949. *Here is New York*. New York: Curtis Publication Company, Quoted in Klein, ed. 1955: 8).

"I do not know of a single European country ready or able to conceive of, much less deal with, the multinational mosaic I daily encounter in New York." (Gross 1990: 9)

1. Introduction

The citations above attest to the great ethnolinguistic diversity that has characterized New York City since the seventeenth century and does still today. Yet, despite this great and long-standing linguistic diversity there are no studies of the multilingualism of New York City. Scholars have paid well-deserved attention to the city's immigrants, its foreign-born population, its multiethnic character.² Other scholars have studied the city's economy and trade.³ Linguists and sociolinguists have studied English in New York.⁴ But little has been said about the city's multilingualism and the way in which Languages Other than English (LOTEs from now on) have always been used in city life.⁵

This paper documents, describes and analyzes New York's multilingualism, today and in the past, claiming for New York its rightful title as the most multilingual city in the world. Through anecdotes, census data and historical evidence, the long-standing presence of many LOTEs in

the city is made evident, demonstrating that standard English has never been, and cannot be considered today, New York's vernacular.⁶ The paper also documents the public use of LOTEs by New Yorkers in businesses and institutions today, as well as in the past, and the benefits accrued to all New Yorkers as a result. In this regard, we will see that there is a lack of fit between the official non-recognition of New York's multilingualism, the linguistic practices of its LOTE-speaking citizens, and the official multilingual policies that New York City has adopted for use in its agencies with non-English speaking clients in the last decade.

The paper starts by describing in detail New York's multilingualism as the 20th century comes to a close, drawing on anecdotal evidence, as well as census data. It then questions whether the multilingual situation of today is an historical anomaly, first by comparing it with the rest of the 20th century and then with our more remote past. The history of multilingualism in New York is provided within an interpretative language policy framework, analyzing not only the presence of LOTEs in New York, but also the government's response to them in relation to the city's socioeconomic and sociopolitical context. Finally, the paper looks at how LOTEs are being used in the city today, both by business and government, thus making apparent the city's implicit language policy.

2. *New York's multilingualism at the end of the 20th Century*

2.1. *Is New York really multilingual? Some anecdotal evidence*

Multilingualism is such a natural part of the life of New Yorkers that it takes visitors and foreigners to recognize it and validate it. A *New York Times* reporter, studying the changing immigration to New York in the 1980s, interviewed a Nigerian woman whose words summarize well New York's surprising multilingualism: "I came to New York so that I could learn English. What I got in my life is something else. I do not know where I am. Spain? China?" (Kleiman 1982). The visitor to New York City is perplexed by the vast presence of LOTEs in the city, a multilingualism that they have never read about, and one that they do not hear in the many movies portraying New York. Yet, New York's multilingualism is so extensive that some European sociolinguists (Gross 1990; Campbell 1994) have studied New York's language use in preparation for the multilingualism of the European Union. Gross (1990: 7) summarizes

New York's multilingualism by saying: "In linguistic terms it [New York] is arguably the most sophisticated area on the face of the world ... Thirty-six TV channels plus a hundred or more radio stations offer me an assortment of languages and cultures quite beyond the imagination of most Europeans."

To acknowledge New York's multilingualism, it would be important to reflect on some of the ways in which LOTEs are used by New Yorkers:

- New Yorkers can get married in any of twenty-two languages, since the city's chief marriage-maker has memorized the ceremony in all those languages and uses them frequently (Clines 1994).
- New Yorkers can hear Catholic Mass in twenty-seven different languages. Mass is said in Spanish in two hundred and four Catholic churches in the Archdiocese of New York and the Diocese of Brooklyn and Queens. Besides Spanish, Catholic Mass is said in Italian in sixty-six churches, in French in eighteen, in Polish in sixteen, in Haitian Creole in nine, and in Korean in six. There are less than five churches in the city which say Mass in these other LOTEs, given here in descending order as they appear in the Parish Service Bulletins for 1995: Chinese, Sign Language, German, Lithuanian, Czech-Slovak, Portuguese, Croatian, Filipino, Latin, Old Slavonic, Albanian, Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Hungarian, Rumanian, Russian, Slovenian, Ukrainian and Vietnamese.
- New Yorkers can follow a mayoral campaign in at least four LOTEs. For example, the 1993 race for mayor used four different LOTEs in campaign buttons: Spanish, Chinese, Russian and Haitian Creole (Purdum 1993).
- New Yorkers can receive interpretation services in as many as sixty-four languages in government agencies. A Language Bank Directory of government employees able to provide interpretation is available to all city agencies (See Section 5.2, this paper).
- New Yorkers can read twenty-nine daily newspapers in ten different LOTEs published in the city (See Table 10, this paper). This does not include the many LOTE newspapers readily available in the city that are published in other U. S. cities and even other countries.
- New Yorkers can watch television programs in as many as sixteen different languages (See Table 9, this paper).
- New Yorkers can listen to radio programs in forty-seven different languages. One station, WNWK-FM broadcasts in over twelve different languages (Howe 1992).

- When New Yorkers get into a taxicab, they're most likely to have an Urdu speaking driver. This was the finding of a 1992 survey by the NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission (Kandel 1992). The Commission also concluded that New York taxi drivers speak over sixty different languages and sometimes English is not one of them.
- New Yorkers involved in Court proceedings can get interpretation in forty-four different languages. Spanish is the language most requested for interpretation, but Spanish is followed by Chinese, then Russian, Korean, Arabic, Polish and then surprisingly Wolof (See Table 11, this paper).
- New York's school children can speak fifty different languages in a single school. This is the case of Intermediate School 237 in Queens (Jones 1994).
- Spanish-speaking New Yorkers are more numerous than Spanish-speakers of thirteen Latin American capitals. In 1990, 1,486,815 New Yorkers claimed to speak Spanish at home. This represents more Spanish speakers than those who live in Asunción, Guatemala, La Paz, Lima, Managua, Montevideo, Panamá, Quito, San José, San Juan, San Salvador, Santiago de Chile and Tegucigalpa.
- New Yorkers often learn a second LOTE before learning English as a second language. For example, Margolis (1994: 243-4) recounts her experience with Brazilian New Yorkers:

I was amazed at the number of Brazilians who spoke a minimal amount of English but who had no problem communicating in Spanish. When I was interviewing one Brazilian in her apartment, the doorbell rang, and the visitor turned out to be a Spanish-speaking woman handing out pamphlets for the Jehovah's Witnesses. They had a brief discussion in Spanish This woman speaks almost no English after more than two years in New York but handles Spanish with ease. Parenthetically, her Brazilian husband, who has also learned Spanish since coming to New York, prepared for and received his First Communion in Spanish at a local Hispanic church.

That LOTES are a way of life in New York City is attested by all the anecdotal evidence above. But what is the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers? What languages do they speak at home and what is their English language ability? The answers to these questions, derived from the 1990 census, are extremely important, especially for institutions of higher education which might have to adapt their English language expectations and their curriculum to fit the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers.

2.2. Are New Yorkers really multilingual? Some evidence from the 1990 census

The limitation of all census data is that it is based on self-report. Thus, the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers given in this section reveals only what New Yorkers say they do, rather than give us objective measures of their language use. Another shortcoming of this data is that the 1990 census seriously undercounted the language minority population, in particular the undocumented. Yet a third problem with this data is that the U. S. census has little historical experience with LOTE use, making trend comparisons difficult. Up to 1970, the census asked for the respondents' *mother tongue*; specifically it asked about the language spoken in the respondents' home in childhood. Since 1980, the census seeks information only about the *language used* by the respondent in the home. A final limitation is that the U. S. census has little familiarity with the linguistic diversity of Asian and African countries from which many immigrants have recently come. Thus, linguistic categories for these languages are often inaccurate.⁷ Nevertheless, as we will see, the census is a rich source to answer the following four questions that together reveal a sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers:

- a. What are the household languages in New York City?
- b. What are the different languages spoken by New Yorkers at home?
- c. What is the English language ability of New Yorkers who use LOTES at home?
- d. Are New Yorkers maintaining their LOTES or are they shifting to English? And what is the differential rate of maintenance or shift for the different LOTES?

a. What are the household languages in New York City?

As shown in Table 1, almost one-half (46%) of households in New York speak a LOTE, and the other half (54%) speak English. In understanding the English spoken by this 54% at home, it is important to bear in mind that 25% of New Yorkers in 1990 were black, and thus New York English certainly includes both African American varieties of English, as well as varieties of Caribbean English (See Winer and Jack, this volume).⁸ Standard English is definitely not the vernacular of the majority of New Yorkers.

It is also important to point out that almost a fourth of households in New York speak Spanish (24%), making Spanish a very important language for New Yorkers. In fact, English is spoken only by twice the number of households as Spanish.

Table 1
Household languages in 1990, NYC*

Language	Percentage
English Only	54%
LOTE	46%
Spanish	24%
Other Indo-Eurpn	15%
Asian or Pacific	5%
Other	2%

* Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Public Use Micro Data Sample.

b. What are the different languages spoken by New Yorkers at home?

Table 2 displays the languages spoken by New Yorkers older than five years of age. Clearly LOTEs are widely spoken by New Yorkers at home, since only 3 out of 5 New Yorkers (61.92%) claim to use English at home.

This table again confirms that Spanish is the most important LOTE in the city, with one out of five New Yorkers (20.42%) claiming to speak Spanish at home. In fact, over half of those who speak LOTEs at home (53.63%), speak Spanish.

But New York is not only a bilingual city. As shown in Table 2, there are more than 1,000 speakers of fifty-two different languages, clearly making New York the most multilingual city in the United States and in any other developed country. Almost half of those who speak LOTEs (46.4%), speak LOTEs other than Spanish. In fact, seven other LOTEs besides Spanish are spoken by more than 50,000 New Yorkers: Chinese, Italian, French, Yiddish, Russian, Korean and Greek.

But how bilingual are New Yorkers who speak LOTEs at home? And does LOTE use at home respond to a communicative need? A surprising finding shown in Table 2, last column, is that New Yorkers who speak LOTEs at home do so by choice, rather than out of necessity, since over 50% of the speakers of all LOTEs also claim to have good English-speaking ability. In fact, even in the case of the ethnolinguistic group with the least English ability, the Cambodians, more than half of the group claim to speak English very well or well.

The different ethnolinguistic groups can be broken down into three categories according to their degree of bilingualism, given here in order of decreasing bilingualism:

- Those that are highly bilingual: 100% to 90% proficient in English
- Speakers of Dutch, Finnish, Danish, Sindhi, Sinhalese (all 100% bilingual)

Table 2
Languages at home in NYC, 1990*

LANGUAGE	Total Spks ^a	% Total Pop Spks this Lang.	% LOTE-Spks Spks this LOTE	Total Spks this LOTE NOT Eng-Spk ^b	% Spks this LOTE NOT Eng-Spk
English	4,507,520	61.92%			
LOTE (All)	2,772,586	38.08%			
	7,280,106	100.00%			
<i>Specific LOTEs</i>					
Spanish	1,486,815	20.42%	53.63%	397,380	26.7%
Chinese ^c	211,447	2.91%	7.81%	92,123	43.6%
Italian	202,538	2.78%	7.31%	31,486	15.6%
French	105,756	1.45%	3.81%	11,925	11.3%
Yiddish	93,529	1.28%	3.37%	8,532	9.1%
Russian	65,895	.91%	2.38%	24,406	37.0%
Korean	62,671	.86%	2.26%	26,259	41.9%
Greek	55,461	.76%	2.00%	9,793	17.7%
German	49,271	.68%	1.78%	2,033	4.1%
Polish	47,575	.65%	1.72%	12,230	25.7%
FrenchCreole	43,660	.60%	1.57%	8,222	18.8%
Hebrew	40,044	.56%	1.44%	1,964	4.9%
Hindi-Urdu	37,123	.51%	1.34%	5,017	13.5%
Filipino-Tagalog	35,094	.48%	1.27%	1,554	4.4%
Arabic	31,460	.43%	1.13%	4,028	12.8%
Portuguese	14,649	.20%	.53%	3,286	22.5%
Hungarian	14,464	.20%	.52%	2,217	15.3%
Japanese	13,277	.18%	.48%	2,889	21.8%
SerboCroatian	11,967	.16%	.43%	2,495	20.9%
Kru-Ibo-Yoruba	10,508	.14%	.38%	174	1.7%
Rumanian	10,424	.14%	.38%	1,967	18.9%
Bengali	10,405	.14%	.38%	1,248	12.0%
PersianFarsiDari	9,187	.13%	.33%	1,803	19.6%
Ukranian	7,489	.10%	.27%	875	11.7%
Gujarati	7,331	.10%	.26%	1,176	16.1%
Malayalam	7,200	.10%	.26%	803	11.2%
Vietnamese	5,948	.08%	.21%	2,098	35.3%
Albanian	5,791	.08%	.21%	1,137	19.6%
Turkish	5,544	.08%	.20%	767	13.8%
Armenian	5,223	.07%	.19%	757	14.5%
ThaiLaotn	4,608	.06%	.17%	894	19.4%
JamaicanCreole	4,490	.06%	.16%	248	5.5%
Croatian	4,207	.06%	.15%	592	14.1%
Patois	3,902	.05%	.14%	203	5.2%
IrishGaelic	3,715	.05%	.13%	130	3.5%
Punjabi	3,709	.05%	.13%	668	18.0%
Dutch	3,288	.05%	.12%	0	0.0%

(Continued next page)

Table 2 (Continued)
Languages at home in NYC, 1990*

LANGUAGE	Total Spk ^a	% Total Pop Spks this Lang.	% LOTE-Spks Spks this LOTE	Total Spks this LOTE NOT Eng-Spk ^b	% Spks this LOTE NOT Eng-Spk
Czech	3,069	.04%	.11%	270	8.8%
Slovak	2,500	.03%	.09%	279	11.2%
Norwegian	2,361	.03%	.09%	62	2.6%
Swedish	2,010	.03%	.07%	47	2.3%
Tamil	1,773	.02%	.06%	75	4.2%
Telugu	1,769	.02%	.06%	126	7.1%
Mon-Khmer-Cambd	1,693	.02%	.06%	826	48.8%
AfricanNtSpc	1,625	.02%	.06%	0	0.0%
Lithuanian	1,483	.02%	.05%	78	5.3%
PashtoAfghan	1,171	.02%	.04%	330	28.2%
AmrcnIndian	1,043	.01%	.04%	163	15.6%
Indonesian	1,035	.01%	.04%	86	8.3%
Amharic	1,022	.01%	.04%	17	1.7%
Finnish	964	.01%	.03%	0	0.0%
Fulani	945	.01%	.03%	253	26.8%
Swahili	904	.01%	.03%	11	1.2%
Bulgarian	817	.01%	.03%	118	14.4%
Estonian	765	.01%	.03%	65	8.5%
Lettish (Latvian)	744	.01%	.03%	20	2.7%
Danish	725	.01%	.03%	0	0.0%
Malay	724	.01%	.03%	162	22.4%
BurmeseTonkin	711	.01%	.03%	246	34.6%
Serbian	642	.01%	.02%	185	28.8%
Ladino	590	.01%	.02%	182	30.9%
Marathi	543	.01%	.02%	59	16.1%
Sindhi	543	.01%	.02%	0	0.0%
Sinhalese	428	.01%	.02%	0	0.0%
Mande	411	.01%	.01%	106	25.8%
BantuXhosZulu	394	.01%	.01%	19	4.8%
Nepali	368	.01%	.01%	107	29.1%
OtherLOTEs ^d	3,149	.07%	.11%	131	4.2%
TOTAL	2,772,586	38.08%	100.00%	667,402	

* Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Public Use Micro Data Sample.

^a Only those 5 years old and above are included.

^b Represents those who answered Not Well or Not at All in English language ability.

^c For this table we have summed up results that the Census breaks up into three categories: Chinese (Cantonese, Yueh, Min) with 206,515 claimants and 90,220 non-English proficient; Formosan (Nan, Min) with 3,351 claimants and 1,194 non-English proficient; and Mandarin (Hanan, Hopei, Pei) with 1,581 claimants and 709 non-English proficient.

^d This category includes all LOTE's that received less than .01%.

Speakers of Swahili, Amharic, Kru-Ibo-Yoruba, Swedish, Norwegian, Lettish (Latvian), Irish, German, Tamil, Filipino, Bantu languages, Hebrew, Patois, Lithuanian, Jamaican Creole, Telugu, Indonesian, Estonian, Czech, Yiddish

• *Those that are very bilingual: 90% to 70% proficient in English*

Speakers of Slovak, Malayalam, French, Ukrainian, Bengali, Arabic, Hindi-Urdu, Turkish, Croatian, Bulgarian, Armenian, Hungarian, Italian, Gujarati, Marathi, Greek, Punjabi, French Creole, Rumanian, Thai, Albanian, Persian, Serbo-Croatian, Japanese, Malay, Portuguese, Polish, Mande, Spanish, Fulani, Pashto, Serbian, Nepali, Ladino

• *Those that are least bilingual: 71% to 50% proficient in English*

Speakers of Burmese, Vietnamese, Russian, Korean, Chinese, Mon-Khmer.

As we saw before, Spanish is the language of the home for many New Yorkers. But it is instructive to realize that Spanish-speaking New Yorkers are *not* the least English proficient group, with approximately three-fourths in their group claiming to speak English well. In absolute numbers, however, it is Spanish speakers who make up the bulk of non-English speaking New Yorkers, with 397,380 claiming to have limited English speaking ability. That is, 59% of the non-English speaking population speaks Spanish. The Spanish-speaking limited-English-proficient group is followed by Chinese speakers (92,123) who make up 14% of the limited-English-proficient population, and then Italian speakers (31,486) making up 5% of those who do not speak English well. Determining which ethnolinguistic group has limited proficiency in English might be an important consideration for agencies and institutions that need to provide services to these groups. It seems then, that in absolute numbers, the ten languages most needed in interpretation and translation are, in order of need: Spanish, then Chinese and then Italian, followed by Korean (26,259 speakers with little English speaking ability), Russian (24,406 speakers), Polish (12,230 speakers), French (11,925 speakers), Greek (9,793 speakers), Yiddish (8,532 speakers) and then French Creole⁹ (8,222 speakers). It is instructive to realize that the need for French Creole may be greater than that revealed by census data, since many Haitians claim French as the language of the home, when Haitian Creole is truly the language spoken (see Joseph, this volume).

c. *What is the English language ability of New Yorkers who use LOTE's at home?*

Table 3 displays the overall results for the question on English speaking ability asked of those who claimed to use LOTE's at home. Three-fourths

Table 3
Ability to speak English of LOTE claimants in NYC*

English ability	No. of claimants	%
Very well	1,422,936	51%
Well	682,248	25%
Not Well	483,559	17%
Not at All	183,843	7%
TOTAL	2,772,586	100%

* Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Public Use Micro Data Sample.

(76%) of New Yorkers who speak LOTE at home are bilingual, claiming to speak English either very well (51%) or well (25%). This is an important finding since it confirms that most New Yorkers who speak LOTE at home choose to do so, even when English is an option, given their language proficiency. In fact, only 7% of those who speak LOTE at home are LOTE monolinguals, indicating that LOTE-speaking New Yorkers are, for the most part, bilingual.

d. Are New Yorkers maintaining their LOTE or are they shifting to English? And what is the differential rate of maintenance or shift for the different LOTEs?

The multilingualism of New Yorkers is obvious from the above census data. Yet, it is important to consider whether New Yorkers' multilingualism is a transitional phenomenon, as it is in other places in the United States, or whether New Yorkers' multilingualism is more stable. Table 4 attempts to answer this very important question by trying to determine the percentage of native born New Yorkers who still speak their LOTE at home, since intergenerational transmission depends upon LOTE use at home especially by the mother (Fishman 1966).

As shown in Table 4, the most important ancestry group of New Yorkers is the Latino one, with Puerto Ricans constituting 50% of the Latino ancestry. Latinos are followed by those of Italian ancestry, and then Irish, German, West Indian (not shown in Table), Russian-Ukrainian, Polish, Chinese, Asian Indian, Greek, Hungarian and Korean. Some groups are heavily foreign born, especially the Koreans (82% foreign born), followed by the Chinese (73% foreign born), Latinos (61% foreign born), Asian Indians (45% foreign born) and the Greeks (38% foreign born). Some groups are heavily native born, with the Irish having only 6% foreign born, followed by the Germans (only 9% foreign born), the Italians (12% foreign born), and the Hungarians (19% foreign born).

Table 4
Rate of language maintenance of ethnolinguistic groups in NYC*

Ancestry	TotalPop	FB	NB	%FB	LOTEUse	NBLOTE Use ^a	LOTE ^b %NB ^b
Latino ^c	1,724,812	1,055,271 ^d	669,541	61%	1,486,815	431,544	64%
Italian	838,780	101,651	737,129	12%	202,538	100,887	14%
Irish	535,846	30,541	505,305	6%	3,715	-26,826	-
German	395,230	33,947	361,283	9%	49,271	-15,324	-
RussUkr ^e	330,797	80,333	250,462	24%	73,384	-6,949	-
Polish	296,809	61,634	235,175	21%	47,575	-14,059	-
Chinese	238,919	173,512	65,407	73%	211,447	37,935	58%
A. Indian	94,590	42,764	51,826	45%	69,447	26,683	51%
Greek	82,690	31,792	50,898	38%	55,461	23,669	47%
Hungarian	75,721	14,051	61,670	19%	14,464	413	1%
Korean	69,718	57,488	12,230	82%	62,671	5,183	42%

* Source: Selected Social Characteristics, 1980 and 1990 Summary Tape Files 3 and 4. 1990 Census of Population and Housing. Public Use Micro Data Sample. From Department of City Planning 1993. *Socioeconomic Profiles. A Portrait of New York City's community Districts from the 1980 and 1990 Censuses of Population Housing.*

^a NB LOTE Use has been calculated by subtracting the total foreign born population from the total LOTE Use. An assumption has been made that the foreign born population speaks LOTE at home.

^b LOTE Maintenance has been calculated by dividing the number of the NB LOTE Use by the number of native born population.

^c Latinos include the following categories, given here in order of frequency: Puerto Ricans 851,291; Dominicans 328,634; Colombians 85,975; Ecuadorians 76,144; Cubans 58,381; Mexicans 57,298; Salvadorans 25,030; Peruvians 23,798; Panamanians, 21,929; Spaniards 20,210; Hondurans 20,154; Guatemalans 15,765; Argentines 13,934; Nicaraguans 9,660; Costa Ricans 6,920; Chileans 6,721; Venezuelans 4,172; Bolivians 3,465; Uruguayans 3,233; Paraguayans 1,380; other South Americans 912; other Central Americans 452; others 89,354.

^d This figure includes Puerto Ricans born in the island.

^e The fifth ancestry group in New York is West Indian. It is not included here because language maintenance of English Creole cannot be arrived at through census figures.

That foreign born New Yorkers, even if bilingual, should speak LOTE at home is not surprising. But what are native born New Yorkers doing? Given the linguistic heterogeneity in the city, are native born New Yorkers of different ancestries using LOTE at home or are they using English? The answer to this question is important in understanding New Yorkers' multilingualism, for it allows us to examine whether New York is different from other places in the United States where shift to English among immigrant populations is completed by the third generation (Fish-

man 1966, 1972). Paulston (1994: 9) has said that "[E]thnic groups within a modern nation-state, given opportunity and incentive, typically shift to the language of the dominant group." Do ethnic New Yorkers fit within this generalization? And do all ethnolinguistic groups behave similarly?

Table 4 shows that all groups are experiencing shift to English, but at differing rates. The rate of shift to English is proceeding at extremely rapid rates among Poles, Russians and Germans. Even first generation immigrants of these three groups are using English at home (as shown by the minus signs in the last column), revealing a faster rate of shift to English than what has been historically expected, since second generation Polish, Russian and German New Yorkers can then be expected to be English monolinguals. The historical pattern of English language shift by the third generation is also very evident in the case of Hungarians and Italians. Only 1% of native born Hungarians and 14% of native born Italians speak their LOTE at home, guaranteeing the shift to English of the entire group by the third generation.

Koreans and Greeks have a somewhat slower rate of English language shift than do Hungarians and Italians, with 42% of the native born Korean population and 47% of the US born Greeks claiming to speak their LOTE at home. Because less than half of native born Koreans and Greeks are able to transmit their LOTE to their children, it is likely that English language shift will occur by the third generation, although it is also possible that some will remain bilingual.

A slower rate of English language shift than that which has been historically expected is being experienced especially by Latinos, Chinese and Asian Indians. Over half of the native born second generation Latinos, Chinese and Asian Indians use their LOTE at home, making it more likely that their bilingualism will persist longer.

A word of caution is necessary so the reader does not interpret this to mean that the bilingualism of Latinos, Chinese and Asian Indians in New York is stable and not transitory (see chapters by Zentella, Pan and Sridhar, this volume). What these results imply is that despite the use of English at home of almost half the population of native born Latinos, Chinese and Asian Indians, the use of the LOTES by the majority of the native born in these groups will guarantee a longer period of bilingualism spanning the second and third generation.

A number of social factors seem to support the slower shift to English of these three groups. On the one hand, these three groups are among the four with a larger foreign born population, allowing for the use of

LOTEs to communicate intraethnically with those who have recently arrived and who may not be English proficient. These three groups are also among the four that are racially distinct and thus may suffer social segregation and economic exploitation in the city. It is instructive to understand why the fourth group which shares with these three groups the social characteristics of having a large foreign born population and being racially distinct, the Koreans, does not fit the same pattern of language maintenance. Korean New Yorkers, many of middle-class socioeconomic status, have been able to form ethnic enclaves which support their economic activity (Kim 1981), enabling them to escape the social stigmatization to which Latinos and Chinese have been subjected.

Despite the more stable presence of Spanish and Chinese in New York, these LOTEs have received little recognition as mainstream resources, as we will see in the last section of this paper. For example, only in the ethnic markets of New York's segregated neighborhoods are Spanish and Chinese valuable economic resources of the ethnic community (García - Otheguy 1994). Spanish and Chinese remain important instruments of communication only in the ethnic community, with little value assigned to it in mainstream institutions, except to communicate with those who do not speak English.

In sum, the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers confirms their pervasive bilingualism, with LOTEs competing with English in the home. But all ethnolinguistic groups are experiencing shift to English by the third generation, with Latinos, Chinese and Asian Indians showing a more moderate rate of shift.

3. *New York's multilingualism throughout the 20th century*

3.1. *Is the multilingualism of today different from that of the rest of the century?*

An important question for language planners in New York City is to determine whether the multilingual situation of today is different from that of the rest of the 20th century. Should we be alarmed by New York's multilingualism today? How different is the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers today from that of the recent past?

Again we turn to census data to help us answer this question. Table 5 compares the results of the 1980 census for LOTE use at home with those of the 1990 census given previously as Table 2. As we said before, the 1980 census was the first to ask for LOTE use rather than Mother

Table 5
 LOTES at home in NYC, 1990 and 1980*

LANGUAGE	1990	1990	1980	1980
	Total SpksLOTE	% Pop SpksLOTE	Total SpksLOTE	% Pop SpksLOTE
English	4,507,520	61.92%	4,667,960	65.8%
LOTE (All)	2,772,586	38.08%	2,424,240	34.2%
	7,280,106	100.00%	7,092,200	100.00%
<i>Specific LOTES</i>				
Spanish	1,486,815	20.4%	1,260,040	17.8%
Chinese ^a	211,447	2.9%	112,800	1.6%
Italian	202,538	2.8%	289,660	4.1%
French	105,756	1.5%	101,660	1.4%
Yiddish	93,529	1.3%	133,820	1.9%
Russian	65,895	.9%	40,800	.6%
Korean	62,671	.9%	21,340	.3%
Greek	55,461	.8%	70,980	1.0%
German	49,271	.7%	73,500	1.0%
Polish	47,575	.7%	43,860	.6%
French Creole	43,660	.6%	6,160	.1%
Hebrew	40,044	.6%	30,980	.4%
Hindi-Urdu	37,123	.5%	15,500 ^b	.2%
Filipino-Tagalog	35,094	.5%	18,860	.3%
Arabic	31,460	.4%	17,580	.2%
Portuguese	14,649	.2%	9,320	.1%
Hungarian	14,464	.2%	22,640	.3%
Japanese	13,277	.2%	11,300	.2%
SerboCroatian	11,967	.2%	15,900	.2%
Kru-Ibo-Yoruba	10,508	.1%	3,880	.1%
Rumanian	10,424	.1%	6,760	.1%
Bengali	10,405	.1%		
PersianFarsiDari	9,187	.1%	5,280	.1%
Ukranian	7,489	.1%	9,960	.1%
Gujarati	7,331	.1%		
Malayalam	7,200	.1%		
Vietnamese	5,948	.1%	1,800	.1%
Albanian	5,791	.1%	3,580	.1%
Turkish	5,544	.1%	4,980	.1%
Armenian	5,223	.1%	6,940	.1%
ThaiLaotn	4,608	.1%	3,080	.0%
Jamaican Creole	4,490	.1%	1,080	.0%
Croatian	4,207	.1%	3,440	.0%
Patois	3,902	.1%	660	.0%
IrishGaelic	3,715	.1%	2,920	.0%
Punjabi	3,709	.1%		
Czech	3,069	.04%	6,100	.1%
Norwegian	2,361	.03%	5,580	.1%

(For notes, see p. 17)

Tongue, and thus results prior to 1980 are not comparable. But even in a decade, we can discern some differences in the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers.

From 1980 to 1990 both our multilingualism and our linguistic heterogeneity have increased, although not remarkably. The number of New Yorkers who speak English at home today remains similar to that in 1980. What seems to be different is the origin and racial composition of those who are LOTE speakers today, and also the way in which language minorities view themselves. For example, whereas in 1980 all Hindi Related languages accounted for only .2%, in 1990 Hindi/Urdu alone accounted for .5%, with four more East Indian languages accounting for .1% each: Bengali, Gujarati, Malayalam and Punjabi. Because of greater linguistic consciousness, in 1990 claimants of Jamaican Creole and Patois grew by more than four times.

With the exception of Russian, Polish, Rumanian, Albanian and Irish, the languages of Europe (Italian, Yiddish, Greek, German, Hungarian, and Serbo-Croatian) show a decline in 1990. In 1980 Italian was the second most used LOTE at home, but in 1990 Italian moved to third place, with Chinese becoming the second most used LOTE. Although Spanish, French and Portuguese have experienced increases, the speakers of these languages have been, for the most part, Latin Americans, coming from South and Central America and the islands of the Caribbean, or Africans.

French Creole has experienced great growth, but this is a result of greater linguistic consciousness among Haitians, claiming now Haitian Creole rather than French, instead of an actual increase. Beyond Haitian Creole, the greatest increase has been experienced by Korean, Kru-Ibo-Yoruba and Vietnamese, tripling in use, followed by Hindi-Urdu, Chinese, Filipino, Arabic, Persian, all doubling in use.

The differences in the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers reflect the heterogeneity of the origin of the LOTE speaking population, increasingly from Asia and the Caribbean. Whereas in 1970, Asian and Pacific

* Source: 1990 and 1980 Census of Population and Housing. Public Use Micro Data Sample. Only LOTES that account for over .1% in 1990 or 1980 are here included.

^a For this table we have summed up results that the Census breaks up into three different categories: In 1990 Chinese (Cantonese, Yueh, Min) had 206,515 claimants, Formosan (Min Nan) 3,351 claimants, and Mandarin (Honan, Hopei, Pei) 1,581 claimants. In 1980 Chinese (Cantonese, Yue, Yueh, Min) had 111,980 claimants; Formosan (Ch'ao Shan, Min Nan, Taiwanese) 740 claimants, and Mandarin (Honan, Hopei, Pei) 80 claimants.

^b Includes the category "Hindi Related Languages".

Origin New Yorkers accounted for only 1.0% of the population, in 1980 they represented 3.4%. By 1990 the Asian and Pacific population in New York represented 6.7% of the population. The Hispanic Origin population has also grown, representing 15% in 1970, 19% in 1980, and 24% in 1990.

Throughout the 20th century, bilingualism has been an important part of the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers. Although trend comparisons in LOTE Home use are impossible to make, an analysis of the foreign born population of New York throughout the 20th century, given here as Table 6, confirms New Yorkers' bilingualism.

Table 6
Foreign-born persons as percent of the total population of New York City, 1910-1990*

Year	Total pop	Foreignborn	% Foreignborn
1910	4,767,000	1,944,400	40.8%
1920	5,620,000	2,028,200	36.1%
1930	6,930,000	2,358,700	34.0%
1940	7,455,000	2,138,700	28.7%
1950	7,892,000	1,861,000	23.6%
1960	7,782,000	1,559,000	20.0%
1970	7,895,000	1,437,000	18.2%
1980	7,092,000	1,675,000	23.6%
1990	7,322,564	2,082,931	28.4%

* Source: A composite of information taken from Bogen (1987) Table 3.1, Youssef (1992) Table 2.1.

Although 28% of New Yorkers in 1990 were foreign born, this in itself is nothing new. Indeed, the proportion of foreign born New Yorkers in 1990 is less than that of the first four decades of the 20th century. Except for the 1970 census, foreign born New Yorkers have always represented more than one fifth of the population.

Puerto Ricans born in the island are not counted as foreign born since they're U. S. citizens. One can then argue that the proportion of non-native New Yorkers in 1950, 1960 and 1970 would have been higher if the Puerto Rican migration, prevalent during those three decades, would have been counted. There is thus nothing unusual about New Yorkers at the end of the 20th century. New York has always been, and continues to be, a city mostly populated by newly arrived immigrants and migrants, eager to benefit from the greater economic incentives of a huge metropolis.

Nevertheless, it is important to realize that New Yorkers who are in positions of influence today may remember a New York with less public linguistic heterogeneity than that of today. But these mature native New Yorkers must understand that the ethnolinguistic composition of the New York they remember in the 1960s and 1970s was highly unusual, and was not a reflection of the rest of the century.

3.2. *What is the real difference between today and yesterday? And given the difference, are there any policy implications for institutions of higher education?*

The big difference between today and the past is not the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers, but the socio-educational changes that have been brought about by a highly technological society. As recently as 1970, adult immigrants had few educational and social opportunities. For example, it was only the children of immigrants who were welcomed in the city's public colleges. But the social change brought about through the greater economic prosperity and the greater social and racial tolerance of the 1960s opened the doors of institutions of higher education to immigrants themselves.

Increased access to colleges and work places meant that the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers who were now included in institutions and businesses changed. Yet, institutions of higher education were unable to make the changes in curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment that would have been necessary. Students who failed to meet the sociolinguistic expectation of native English language proficiency were relegated to the remedial track that was created.

If New Yorkers were serious about educating immigrants, they would need to teach them in much the same way they educate foreigners in overseas programs, with native English language proficiency being one more by-product, and not a pre-requisite, of a college education. Challenging academic courses would be opened to all, with instructors willing to contextualize language and to scaffold their instruction to accommodate for different English language skills. New York institutions of higher education might have to model their curriculum, practices, and assessment in what is done in most countries in the world, where higher education, especially in the scientific and technological fields, is in English, a second language for students. Given New York's sociolinguistic profile, there is no other appropriate educational choice for institutions of higher education if all New Yorkers are to be educated.

4. *New York's multilingualism throughout history.*

Is the sociolinguistic profile of New Yorkers different today from that of the past?

New York's multilingualism today is a result of the legacy of the Dutch of New Amsterdam whose interest in trade and their tradition of religious tolerance encouraged people from all over Europe to settle in what today is New York City. And so, even today, it is precisely the economic competitiveness of New York, together with the greater tolerance toward linguistic, cultural and racial differences that New Yorkers exhibit, which attracts citizens from all over the globe to become New Yorkers.

This section traces New York's multilingualism from its earliest history through quotes and anecdotal evidence contained in historical sources, and census data when available. The historical evidence of New York's multilingualism is here organized into four different historical periods, each representing a distinct government response to the presence of LOTEs, motivated mostly by socioeconomic and sociopolitical concerns. Organizing the historical evidence in this way leads us to identify four different language policies held in the city:

- I. A Policy of Promotion of LOTEs 17C-1880
- II. A Policy of Tolerance of LOTEs 1880-1920
- III. A Policy of Restriction of LOTEs 1920-1950
- IV. A Policy of Tolerance of LOTEs 1960-1990s

4.1. *A policy of LOTE Promotion: 17C - 1880. Encouragement of trade and of religious differences*

What evidence do we have of linguistic heterogeneity in New Amsterdam? As early as 1628, the Reverend Jonas Jansen Michielse had found Walloons and Frenchmen among the fifty communicants in the Dutch Reformed Church (Rosenwaike 1972: 4). And, as seen in the first quote which precedes this paper, by 1646 eighteen different languages had been identified in the island of Manhattan by Father Jogues. Describing these early New Yorkers, Charles M. Andrews writes in 1664: "Racially these people were of great variety, Dutch, Walloons, French, English, Portuguese, and after 1655, Swedes and Finns. There were a few Jews, and many Negroes from Brazil and elsewhere" (Federal Writers' Project, 1938b: 88).

Does multilingualism disappear with English rule in 1664? There's evidence that after 1664, the heterogeneity in language, ethnicity and reli-

gion actually increased. In 1692 Charles Lodwich complained of this heterogeneity: "Our chiefest unhappyness here is too great a mixture of Nations, and English ye least part" (Still 1956: 21).

The 18th century saw the decline of Dutch influence. By 1703 less than 50% of heads of family were Dutch (Hansen 1931: 364, quoted in Rosenwaike 1972: 10). A French visitor in 1765 described the Dutch language decline: "There are still two Churches in which religious worship is performed in the Dutch language but the number that talk it Diminishes Daily" (Still 1956: 22). Besides these two Dutch churches, there were three churches that had services in English: an Anglican Church, a Presbyterian and a Quaker one, two with services in German (a German Lutheran and a German Reformed Faith), one in French (a French Huguenot Church), and a Jewish Synagogue (Still 1956: 23). By 1790 only 1/6 of the white population of New York was Dutch, another 1/6 was Irish, and 1/6 was German.

How was multilingualism affected by the commercial expansion of New York during the late 18th and especially the early 19th century? New York was built as a major commercial center by powerful and wealthy people of different ethnicity and language backgrounds. For example, the charter members of the New York Chamber of Commerce in 1786 included a French Huguenot, a Scot, two Irishmen, an Englishman, as well as two native born New Yorkers of Dutch origin and four of English origin (Federal Writers' Project 1938b: 81). New York established itself as the center of international trade especially after the construction of the Erie Canal in 1825.

During this time, English gained mostly in economic power. Commenting on the great diversity of the people of New York, a visitor in 1794 said: "[S]ince the wealthier elements are English, the whole feeling and behavior of the town seems to be English" (Rosenwaike 1972: 19). Although the New Englanders and the Knickerbockers, New Yorkers whose ancestors had settled in the city in the colonial period, formed the governing classes in the early 19th century, there were more people of Irish and German than of English parentage in New York during this entire period (Rosenwaike 1972: 35).

Dwight, who prepared a list of New Yorkers on the eve of the War of 1812, could not describe a "typical" New Yorker: "Among so many sorts of persons, you will easily believe it must be difficult, if not impossible, to find a common character; since the various immigrants themselves, and to some extent their children, will retain the features derived from their origin and their education" (Quoted in Rosenwaike 1972: 23). Lev-

asseur, secretary to General Lafayette during his travels in the United States declared in 1824: "Of all the cities in the United States, New York is certainly the one in which society has lost most of the national character. The great number of foreigners which incessantly flow into it, is a continually operating cause" (Levasseur 1829: 125. Quoted in Rosenwaike 1972: 35).

In a work of nonfiction, James Fenimore Cooper (1827-1828) describes New York's heterogeneity:

The city of New York is composed of inhabitants from all the countries of Christendom. ... It is computed that one in three are natives of New England, or are descendants of those who have emigrated from that portion of the country. To these must be added the successors of the Dutch, the English, the French, the Scotch and the Irish, and not a few who came in their proper persons from the countries occupied by these several nations. In the midst of such a melange of customs and people, it is exceedingly difficult to extract anything like a definite general character (In *Notions of the Americans*, p. 135, quoted in Rosenwaike 1972: 34).

The 1830 census counted 108,000 foreign-born persons in the United States. New York City, with 17,773, had four times more foreign-born residents than Philadelphia (4,184 in the city and county) and five times more than Boston (3,468) (Rosenwaike 1972: 35). Francis Lieber in 1835 refers to: "English, German, French and Spanish, which, with the addition of Italian, you may hear almost any day, in Broadway at the hours when it is most frequented" (Ernst 1949: 23).

The foreign born were not only poor immigrants, but included many of the intellectual and political elite of other countries. For example, as early as 1830 three Spanish-language journals were published in New York for the benefit of Latin American revolutionaries and merchants who lived in the city: *El Redactor*, *El Mercurio de Nueva York* and *Mensajero Semanal* (Ernst 1949: 157). It was also intellectual elite who in 1827 started the French language paper now called *France Amérique* (Leeds 1991: 10).

Italian revolutionary leaders also came to New York City after the unsuccessful Italian uprisings of 1820, 1821, 1830 and 1848 against Austrian rule. Among these was Giuseppe Garibaldi, leader of Italy's revolutionary forces. Italian cultural activity in New York had started in 1806 with the arrival of Lorenzo Da Ponte, famous as librettist of Mozart's operas and first professor of Italian at Columbia University (Federal Writers' Project 1938a: 94). The leader of the 1848 Magyar revolution, Louis Kossuth, also spent his exile in New York, spreading the message of a free Hungary against the Hapsburg Empire (Leeds 1991: 56).

German intellectuals and freethinkers, including Franz Lieber, professor of international law at Columbia University, and Carl Schurz, editor of *The New York Evening Post*, lived in New York as political refugees after the defeat of the German revolution in 1848.

Most of the two million Irish who left their homeland after the Potato Famine of 1846-1847 came to New York (Federal Writers' Project 1938b: 102). During this period, more than 70% of immigrants to the United States settled in the city (Dinnerstein - Reimers 1988).

The 1845 U. S. Census, the first to ascertain birthplace, noted that 36% of New Yorkers were foreign born. The New York foreign born population was estimated to be approximately 52% from Ireland, 22% from other areas of British sovereignty, 19% from German states, 3% from France, 3% from other European countries and 1% from Mexico or South America (Derived from Rosenwaike 1972: 40).

The 1870 census, the first to ask parentage, determined that almost 83% of New Yorkers had at least one foreign born parent, and by 1900 this percentage remained almost the same (84%) (Rosenwaike 1972: 71, 91). In 1870 New York continued to be the U. S. city with the greatest concentration of Irish, Germans and English. This in itself distinguished New York from other United States cities, where those of third generation or later American stock predominated (Rosenwaike 1972: 110).

But was the New York of the mid-19th century simply multiethnic and not multilingual? To answer this question we must look at the sociolinguistic profile of both the Irish and the Germans during this important historical period.

The use of Irish Gaelic by Irish New Yorkers has been well documented by Nilsen (this volume). Suffice it here to say that approximately 28% of the Potato Famine immigration were Irish speakers and that there were as many speakers of Irish Gaelic in Brooklyn as there were in Cork City. A most important sociolinguistic role that New York has had includes being the promoter and protector of LOTEs that have been oppressed in the country of origin. This was indeed the role that New York played with regards to Irish Gaelic, with an Irish language column appearing in a New York Irish newspaper in 1857 before it was done in Ireland. It was also in New York where the first society for the preservation of the Irish language was founded in 1873, three years before the Dublin society was established (Nilsen, this volume).

During the same period, German was used broadly in the city. Speaking of the lives of Germans in the New York City of the 1850s in a way that is reminiscent of what many say of New York Latinos today, Karl

Theodore Griesinger, a German who was exiled in New York between 1852 and 1857 writes:

Life in Kleindeutschland is almost the same as in the Old Country ... There is not a single business which is not run by Germans. Not only the shoemakers, tailors, barbers, physicians, grocers, and innkeepers are German, but the pastors and priests as well. There is even a German lending library where one can get all kinds of German books. The resident of Kleindeutschland *need not even know English in order to make a living* (Still 1956: 162. My emphasis).

German speakers complained of harassment in government agencies. Ernst (1949: 175) tells us: "As a result, the Germans demanded bilingual keepers of almshouses, hospitals, and dispensaries, German interpreters in the courts, and the publication of city ordinances in the German newspapers." Clearly, German was used not only in the ethnic community, but throughout the city to do business whether of an economic or social nature with German speakers.

It is clear from the above evidence that New York's multilingualism was promoted from its earliest history to the end of the 19th century, as a means to encourage trade. But a change of immigration starting in 1880, along with an increasingly shrinking economy, and the experience of the First World War, brought about changes in attitudes toward newcomers, played out many times, as objections to the use of LOTEs in society. In the midst of increasing multilingualism, our language policy changed from promotion to just plain tolerance.

4.2. A policy of LOTE tolerance: 1880-1920. Italians, Jews, and a shrinking economy

The New York of the late 19th century was extremely multilingual, as attested by Moss (1897) when describing the Lower East Side:

Within these narrow limits we have people from every quarter of the globe - Americans, Irish, Germans, Italians, French, Hungarians, Englishmen, Chinamen, and a dozen other nationalities. ... On Greenwich Street we will see immigrants' boarding-houses which will bring us in touch with every nation of Europe. ... Signs in Syrian, Turkish and Arabian characters may be seen, and frequently the anglicized names of the store-keepers may be read on the sign-boards and window-panes in our own language (Moss 1897, Vol. III: 161, 269).

A taste of the restriction that was to come was felt in 1882 when the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed, legislation that had little effect in New York City, but that reflected the attitude of the country at large toward

ethnolinguistic groups who were not only linguistically and culturally, but also racially, different.

The great influx of immigrants in the late 20th century was precisely of Italians and Eastern Europeans, mostly Jews, who were not only linguistically and culturally different, but who were seen as racially distinct. At first, tolerance was exhibited. Table 7 shows the 26 countries from which immigrants came between 1892 and 1924 and who were processed at the federally financed facility at Ellis Island. One third of the immigrants who passed through Ellis Island reported New York City as their final destination.

Table 7
Countries of origin of immigrants entering Ellis Island, 1892-1924*

Country	No. of Immigrants
Italy	2,502,310
Austria-Hungary	2,275,852
Russia	1,893,542
Germany	633,148
England	551,969
Ireland	520,904
Sweden	348,036
Greece	245,058
Norway	226,278
Ottoman Empire	212,825
Scotland	191,023
West Indies	171,774
Polish Republics	153,444
Portugal	120,725
France	109,687
Denmark	99,414
Roumania	79,092
Netherlands	78,602
Spain	72,636
Belgium	63,141
Czechslovakia	48,140
Bulgaria(1901-31)	42,085
Wales	27,113
Yugoslavia	25,017
Finland	7,833
Switzerland	1,103

* Source: *Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration, 1892-1924.* Washington, D. C.

A December 1912 Report by the Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island, William Williams, confirms the heavy reliance on LOTES to work:

Not one of the least difficult features of Ellis Island work is that *much of it must be done through a great number of foreign languages*. The service of interpreters are required who read, write and speak the following languages or dialects: Albanian, Armenian, Bohemian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Dalmatian, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, Flemish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Lithuanian, Magyar, Montenegrin, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Rumanian, Russian, Ruthenian, Servian, Slovak, Slovenian, Spanish, Swedish, Syrian, Turkish, Yiddish (pp. 26-27) (My emphasis).

The same report quotes the following rule for the Registry Division:

No inspector shall attempt to inspect an alien with whom he cannot converse either personally or through an interpreter (p. 2).

The Railroad room at Ellis has been described as a place in which "linguists worked the floors separating the aliens into groups ... and where [e]ach ticket seller had to have a number of languages at his command in order to ask an alien where he or she was going" (Corsi 1935, in Botkin 1956: 199). Missionaries at Ellis also served as interpreters and distributed Bibles and other literature in as many as twenty-eight LOTES.

The linguistic diversity of the city during this time was considerable, since there were great linguistic differences among Italians and Jews. The great linguistic heterogeneity of Italians was captured by Fiorello La Guardia (1961: 65), mayor of New York from 1934 to 1946 and interpreter at Ellis Island, in this instance of miscommunication with a girl from northern Italy: "No one understood her particular dialect very well, and because of hesitancy in replying to questions she did not understand, she was sent to the hospital for observation. ..."

The linguistic heterogeneity of Jews is made evident in the following quote: "Jews of New York come from nearly every country under the sun, talk fluently in nearly every known tongue and dialect, and mentally reveal the imprint of an infinite variety of cultures" (Federal Writers' Project 1938b: 126). Of the Lower East Side, where many Jews settled, Roskolenko (1971) says: "The Lower East Side was a small nation unto itself ... The signs on the stores were mostly in Hebrew or Yiddish, with some occasional English lettering to help out the strangers from uptown or the Gentiles wandering about Orchard Street's bargains" (p. 83). Speaking of his mother, Roskolenko (1971) tells us: "My mother could talk Russian to Russians, Polish to Poles, and Yiddish to our own ... My mother, who arrived in 1895 speaking Russian, Polish, Yiddish, and

Hebrew, never learned to speak English. She picked up some simple phrases, all mispronounced with ease, but she continued to speak all the tongues of her childhood" (pp. 17, 131).

Not only were households such as that of Roskolenko multilingual, but the interaction with neighbors was also multilingual. And beyond the home and the immediate community, even the work domain functioned in LOTES. Roskolenko describes his mother's work place: "They talked every language but English; and the foreman, when queried over some confusion in the work, *answered in every language* (Roskolenko 1971: 54. My emphasis).

During the period of massive immigration, public bilingual education, with transitional purposes such as the one common today, was available in New York City. Jacob A. Riis (1892), describes these bilingual efforts:

To help them along, it [the Declaration of Independence] is printed in the school-books with a Hebrew translation and another in Jargon, a "Jewish-German," in parallel columns and the explanatory notes in Hebrew. The Constitution of the United States is treated in the same manner (p. 53).

On the eve of World War I, New York City had three times the number of foreign-born residents than the average city (Bogen 1987). And by the 1920s, one out of every four immigrants to the United States chose New York as their place of residency (Rosenwaike 1972: 92).

But the presence of the many Italians and Jews in the city, clearly seen as racially distinct, the city's changing economy, and the impending world crisis, paved the way for the change to the restrictive language policy of the 1920s. In what is reminiscent of the English Only Language Amendments of the 1980s and 1990s, in 1915 New York Republicans suggested an amendment to the New York State Constitution that would mandate literacy in English for all voters in New York (Fishman 1993). The aim of this legislation was to weaken the power in the polls of New York Jews who tended to vote Democratic and Socialist. Restriction of LOTES began to be seen as a way to limit the participation of LOTE speakers in the city's political, social and economic life.

Despite the impending restriction, New York City published newspapers in the greatest number of languages in the world throughout this period. Park (1922: 7) describes the situation in New York City in the 1920s:

The Albanians, Armenians, Bulgarians, Chin, Czechs, Croatians, Danes, Finns, French, Germans, Greeks, Italians, Japanese, Jews, Levantine Jews, Letts, Lithuanians, Magyars, Persians, Poles, Portuguese, Rumanians, Russians, Serbs, Slovaks, Slovenians, Spanish, the Swabians of Germany, the

Swedes, Swiss, Syrians of New York City, all have a press. The Hindu and Turkish press have only gone out of existence since the war. There is the Hebrew press, which represents a class rather than a large group. There are also language colonies in New York like the Assyrians, Belgians, Dutch, Estonians, Flemish, Norwegians, the Spanish of Catalonia, Uhro-Russians, Welsh and Wends, which have a press outside the city.

Clearly New York was highly multilingual during this era, although the government's response to the use of LOTEs in the city for the greater social, political and economic participation of its citizens, was starting to change.

4.3. *A policy of LOTE restriction: 1920s to 1950s. The 1930 economic depression*

Restrictive legislation requiring English to participate in political life, requiring being white for equal participation as citizens, and finally restricting access to the United States of all but those belonging to the old ethnolinguistic groups, was quickly passed in the 1920s.

In 1921 the English Literacy Law was passed, requiring English Literacy for voting. In 1923 the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that East Asians were not eligible for citizenship because they were not white, according to a 1790 naturalization law that restricted citizenship only to free white people. Finally, in 1924 the Johnson-Reed Act¹⁰ was passed, establishing a quota of 2% of the foreign born of each nationality that had been counted in the 1890 census.

The effects of the restrictive immigration policy and the decrease in immigration brought about by the Depression of the 1930s, brought about the gradual decline of the use of LOTEs in New York City. As fewer speakers of LOTEs came into the city, shift to English occurred. But despite the rapid language shift of Italians and Eastern Europeans, an important change in the linguistic landscape of the city occurred between the 1940s and the 1950s, with the great influx of African Americans and Puerto Ricans, both ethnolinguistic groups which were non-immigrant, and yet had been excluded from greater socioeconomic opportunities because of skin color and/or colonial status (For more on the Black migration to New York, see Rosenwaike 1972: 140).

In 1940 eighty-eight percent and in 1950 eighty-three percent of Puerto Ricans in the United States were living in New York City. The role that the Puerto Rican migration to New York has had on its multilingualism cannot be underestimated, for this migration consisted of a group of LOTE speakers who were U. S. citizens, and yet were subjected to greater

segregation than earlier groups. New York's more enduring multilingualism today, especially with regard to Spanish, is a result of the greater exclusion which Puerto Ricans have suffered. At the same time, the linguistic demands that these U. S. citizens placed in the city were answered differently from when they came from immigrants with few rights. The more pervasive multilingualism of New York City today in comparison to other U. S. contexts can clearly be traced to the presence of a large Puerto Rican population in the city.

4.4. *A Return to LOTE tolerance: 1960s to 1990s. Civil rights and economic expansion*

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 abolished the national origin system¹¹ and gave preference to those who had close relatives in the United States, those with occupational skills needed, and refugees. This led to a renewed and more diverse immigration, especially from Asian countries, as well as from all of Latin America, the Caribbean and African countries.

As in the 1960s, today New York continues to have the largest number of Puerto Ricans in the United States. But New York City is also the place in the United States with the greatest number of Dominicans, Jamaicans, Barbadians, Trinidadians, Guyanese, Haitians (Youssef 1992: 63), Chinese from the Mainland, from Hong Kong and Taiwan, (Youssef 1992: 65), Indians and Pakistanis (DeCamp 1991: 37), Colombians, Ecuadorians, Salvadorans, Peruvians, Soviet Jews, Poles, Rumanians, Italians and Greeks (DeCamp 1991: 50-51), Israelis (both Hebrew-speaking Jews and Arabic-speaking Palestinians) and Egyptians.

As we saw in section 2, the new immigrants are more different racially and linguistically than in the past. But many are better educated and occupationally prepared than earlier immigrants. Leeds (1991: 5) has said about these new immigrants: "Many were trained professionals who didn't have to assimilate culturally to enjoy the city's economic benefits." Many of the new immigrants were also already bilingual and speakers of English as a Second Language or a different variety of English upon arrival. It remains to be seen whether this greater familiarity with the English language and bilingualism might result in increased LOTE maintenance among this new wave of immigrants.

New York City still attracts most foreign firms who want to expand to the United States, as well as national businesses wanting to develop their operations abroad. It is precisely the multilingual ability of New

York that enhances the importance of New York City in the growing internationalization of business:

Foreigners, whether immigrants or visitors, feel more at home in New York than in any other American city. Attracted by its cosmopolitan culture, its vibrant bustle, its creative tempo, they regard it as more hospitable and politically stable than metropolitan centers in Europe or Asia (Twentieth Century Fund 1980: 5).

The multilingualism of New York City gives voice and expression not only to the tired, the poor and the huddled masses, but also to the business executive, the diplomat, the politician, the artist and the intellectual. Power factors are often inverted in New York City, with wealthy LOTE speakers being sometimes more powerful than their English-speaking counterparts. As we saw in section 2, today, as in the past, New Yorkers are highly multilingual.

5. Do New York's businesses and government institutions have different language policies? What are those policies?

As we have seen, New York has done more than tolerated its multilingualism, it has actually promoted it for expediency.¹² From early times, except for a short restrictive period, New York has been conscious of its need to use LOTE for its own benefit, sometimes to reap the *economic benefits* of selling more, both to the international community and to the large ethnolinguistic community, sometimes to obtain the *social and political benefits* of integrating the numerous newcomers as soon as possible and of participating in the international multilingual community.

Yet, there has always been a difference in the way that private businesses and public agencies view LOTE use. In private business, a policy of LOTE promotion is usually followed because doing so increases the number of potential buyers and participants, and thus profits. In government agencies, at best, only a policy of LOTE tolerance has been instituted. This section explores the city's language policy today, giving instances of LOTE promotion by business and LOTE tolerance by government agencies.

5.1. New York's business policy of LOTE promotion

That LOTE have been instrumental in the *economic* development of New York is attested to by the linguistic and cultural flexibility shown by

those who sell in the city. An example of this flexibility is given by Raquel Rivera, a Puerto Rican woman, who recalls how Spanish was used by Jewish merchants in East Harlem: "In the 20s and 30s the *Marqueta* was almost all Jewish. What happened was the Jews began to sell Puerto Rican products like *plátanos* and other items. Everyone communicated very well.... The Jewish vendors always knew a few words in Spanish..." (Quoted in Sánchez-Korrol 1983: 56).

The use of LOTE in order to sell in New York City has been a prevalent strategy throughout history in every single business domain. Speaking of the Bronx Hunts Point Market, a supplier of figs says:

When I first came into this business and that was before the war - to do business here you had to know Jewish phrases. Then, some years later, you had to pick up a few Italian words to make it. Now I'm trying for all the Korean words I can (*New York Times*, February 18, 1976, quoted in Kim 1981: 3).

Today, *businesses in New York, whether international or domestic, have a policy of LOTE promotion*, with LOTE being used to capture the pockets, as well as the hearts, of those with purchasing and investment power. For example, the AT & T Language Line, a twenty-four hour toll-free telephone service that gives access to interpreters in one hundred and forty languages, is used not only by public New York City agencies, but also by many hotels, banks, airlines, law offices, utilities, and Fortune 500 businesses, as Table 8 indicates. LOTE are used not only with clients or customers who speak little English, but in an effort to communicate better with and to sell more to those who may be bilingual.

Con Edison, New York's utility company, acknowledges LOTE as tools to provide better services to their customers. Bills are printed in Spanish, and Spanish Call Centers have been created where customers can speak to a Spanish speaking representative. Con Edison field personnel now have access to a guide that provides translation into ten languages of customers: Chinese, French, Greek, Italian, Korean, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Vietnamese and Yiddish. Likewise, NYNEX, the telephone company, has established a Multilingual Center with approximately two hundred and twenty-five Spanish speaking and forty Chinese speaking representatives in order to remain competitive.

Today LOTE are also widely used not only in the press, but also in TV and radio programming in New York City. This LOTE use benefits not only the LOTE speaking community, but New Yorkers in general. Information about the United States and the world is provided, allowing LOTE speakers to be knowledgeable participants in U. S. society. Also,

Table 8
NYC institutions/business regularly using the AT&T Language Line*

Social/Health Services

NYC Sheriff's Office, NYC Police Department, NYC Commission on Human Rights, NYC Health Department, NYC Poison Control, NYC Mayor's Office, NYC Transit Authority, NYC Department for the Aging, NYC Youth Line, NYC Department of Environment, NYC Housing Preserve and Development Agency, NYC Sanitation Department, NYC Emergency Medical Center, NYC 911, United Lifeline, Healthfirst, Hospitals & Health Services 61, NYC Health and Hospital Corporation

Legal Services

District Attorney: Queens, Bronx, Kings, New York County, Bureau of Prisons, NY Victim Services, Legal Referral Service, NYC Department of Probation, NYC Department of Juvenile Justice

Business (Consumer Service)

Northwest Airlines, Kraft General Foods, Pepsi Cola Co, Con Edison, LILCO, Brooklyn Union Gas, NYNEX, Vicon Fiber Optics Corp., Goldman Sachs & Co, Prudential Securities, Frey Realty, Chemical Investment Services, Nabanco, Thomas J. Lavin Law Offices, International Warranty, Riverside Memorial Chapel

Business (Tourism/Hotels)

Hilton Hotels, Marriott Hotels, Grand Hyatt New York, Loews New York, Helmsley Hotels, Palace Hotel, Sheraton New York

Business (Finance/Banks)

Bank of NY Mortgage Co, Four Seasons New York, Chase Manhattan, American Express Bank

* Source: Mike Cuno, AT&T Language Line

products are advertised in LOTEs, expanding the market and spurring economic activity.

LOTE radio programming abounds in New York City. For example, WNWK-FM, devotes many hours to Spanish, differentiating between various Latino groups, about thirty-five hours to Greek, twenty-three hours to Italian and one hour or less to Arabic, Armenian, Bengali, Bulgarian, Farsi, Macedonian, Serbian, Slovak, and Urdu (Moss - Ludwig 1991: 256). There are four full-time Spanish language AM radio stations: WSKQ, WKDM, WADO and WJIT. A new technological innovation, the Subsidiary Communications Carrier or SCA makes it possible for many ethnolinguistic groups to have access to the radio. There are several Chinese, three Haitian, one West Indian, and two Italian subcarriers in

New York. Customers buy a receiver for about \$100. One Chinese language broadcasting company, transmitted through the SCA, has reported that it sold over ten thousand receivers in the city (Moss - Ludwig 1991: 257).

Five UHF television stations also broadcast programming in different languages: WNYC, Channel 31, WNYE, Channel 25, WNJU, Channel 47 (located in northern New Jersey), WXTV, Channel 41; and LPTV, Channel 44. WXTV, owned by Spanish International Television (SIN) provides twenty-four-hour-a-day Spanish language programming with Spanish language films and variety shows. Although WNJU has predominantly Spanish language television, it also transmits in seven other languages, including Tagalog, Chinese, Korean and Serbo-Croatian. WNYC, a public broadcasting station, offers 16 hours of TV programs in Italian, 12 hours in Japanese, 4 hours in Cantonese with Mandarin subtitles or vice-versa; it also broadcasts in Greek, Polish and Brazilian Portuguese (Leeds 1991: 11, Moss - Ludwig 1991: 258). LPTV provides public access at \$120 per airtime hour. Programming includes Farsi, Bengali, Hebrew, Greek, Russian and English Creoles. Table 9 displays the hours devoted by UHF television and Cable Television to LOTE TV programming. As the Table shows, American Cablevision of Queens (ACQ) and Brooklyn-Queens Cable (BQ) have added five pay channels in LOTEs: the Korean Channel, Apple Television (Chinese), Indian TV, Greek Channel, and Galavisión (Spanish). Spanish is the language most used in television broadcasts, and if Cable TV is included, it is followed in descending order by Chinese, Korean and Greek (See Table 9).

At present, New York has twenty-nine daily newspapers in LOTEs, as shown in Table 10. Over half of these were established after 1970. The Chinese and Koreans have eight and seven dailies respectively and Latinos have two (See the section by Ramón Vargas in Diloné et al. 1995).

5.2. *New York's institutional policy of LOTE tolerance*

Spurred by the extensive LOTE use of many New Yorkers, city agencies have developed and adopted multilingual policies in the last decade. But although, as we have seen, businesses promote the use of LOTEs in the city, *governmental agencies only tolerate its use as a very transitional and temporary measure with those who do not speak English*. It is to these official multilingual policies for non-English speakers in city agencies and institutions that we now turn.

Table 9
LOTEs in UHF and Cable Television (Hours per week)*

LOTE	CH31 WNYC	CH25 WNYE	CH47 WNJU	CH41 WXTV	CH44 LPTV	MH ^a Cble	ACQ ^b Cble	BQ ^c Cble	TOTL HRS WK
Bengali					1.0				1.0
BrazilPort	0.5								.5
Chinese	4.0	7.0				28	84	84	207.0
EastInd	1.0						56	56	113.0
Farsi					1.0				1.0
Filipino			0.5						.5
Greek	4.0		2.5		1.0		70	70	147.5
HaitCr			2.0						2.0
Hebrew					4.0	3	3	3	13.0
Italian	16.0								16.0
Japans	12.0		3.0						15.0
Korean		5.0	1.5				84	84	174.5
Polish	2.5								2.5
Russn					1.5				1.5
Spansh			89.5	133.5	16.0	2	168	168	577.0
Yugosl			.5						.5

* Source: Tables 10.4 and 10.6 of Moss and Ludwig, 1991, pp. 259, 264.

^a MH = Manhattan Cable.

^b ACQ = American Cablevision of Queens.

^c BQ = Brooklyn-Queens Cable.

In November 1989, the revised New York City Charter mandated the creation of the Mayor's Office of Language Services (OLS) (Agencies Face 1992, Campbell 1994). OLS works with thirty-one city agencies to ensure that services "are provided to all New Yorkers regardless of language barriers" (NYC Language Services Program, June 1992: 1). "Language barriers," OLS says, "cost the City money, interfere with the safety of residents and public employees, and cause misunderstandings, tensions and lost work time" (Language Sensitivity Training 1993: 1). At present OLS has four language professionals who provide interpreting and translation into Spanish, Chinese, Russian and Korean. In addition, the Office publishes a Language Bank Directory of approximately two thousand employees who can interpret in as many as seventy-two languages. OLS has developed Language Identification Cards for use in New York City public agencies in the following 15 languages: Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Korean, Haitian Creole, French, German, Arabic, Vietnamese, Italian, Hindi, Urdu, Hebrew, Yiddish, Polish. Since 1989, publications prepared

Table 10
New York City press in LOTEs*

Language	Name ^a	Year ^b	Frq	Circ
Arabic	Al-Hoda		m	10,000
Bengali	Bangali	1991	w	7,000
	Thikana	1990	w	10,000
	Shombag	1993	w	3,000
Chinese	Asian American Times	1986	w	20,000
	China Press	1990	d	20,000
	China Times	1988	w	20,000
	China Times Weekly News	1980	w	13,000
	China Tribune		d	10,000
	International Daily News	1982	d	40,000
	Neo Asian American Times		d	
	Sing Tao Daily	1966	d	60,000
	Sing Tao Jih Pao	1966	d	50,000
	The United Journal	1951	d	30,000
	World Journal	1967	d	75,000
Estonian	Vaba Eesti Sona		w	6,000
French	France Amérique	(1827)	w	30,000
Finnish	Finnish Newspaper	1954	w	3,000
	Greenpoint Gazette	1906	w	5,000 Bil
German	Staats-Zeitung und Herold	1834	w	15,000
	Aufbau (Jewish)	1934	biwk	8,000
Greek	Campana	1917	2xm	80,000
	Ellenika Nea		w	5,400
	Ethnikos Kerix		d	40,000
	Hellenikos Tachydromos		d	5,000 Bil
	National Herald	1915	d	40,000
	Orthodox Observer	1971	w	130,000
	Proini	1977	d	65,000 Bil
	The Reporters	1985	w	10,000
Gujarati	Naya Padkar	1990	w	8,000 Bil
Haitian Creole	Haiti Observateur	1971	w	32,000 Bil (FrHCrEng)
	Haiti Progrès	1983	w	90,000 Bil (FrHCr)
Hebrew	Hadoar	1921	biwk	4,000
	Israel Shelanu	1979	w	70,000
	Maariv Israel Newspaper	1991	w	10,000
	Yedioth Achronoth	1921	4xwk	25,000
Hungarian	Hungarian Weekly Nepszava	1896	w	40,000 Bil
	Hungarian World	1902	w	2,000
Italian	America Oggi	1983	d	70,000
	Oggi 7	1991	w	20,000
Jamaican Creole	Jamaican Weekly Gleaner	1954	d	40,000
Japanese	Asahi Shimbun Intl	1986	d	11,000
	Nihon Keizai Shimbun	1987	d	15,000
	OCS News America	1975	biwk	17,000
	Japan Financial News	1995	w	130
	New York Nichibei		w	1,500
	US Japan Business News	1975	w	40,000

(Continued next page)

Table 10 (Continued)
New York City press in LOTE^a

Language	Name ^a	Year ^b	Frq	Circ
Korean	Chosun Daily News	1986	d	30,000
	Chosun Iibo	1984	d	5,000
	Joong-Ang Daily News	1975	d	
	Jung Ang Inc	1969	d	30,000
	Korea Central Daily	1975	d	27,000
	Korea Herald	1970	d	60,000
	Korean Times	1971	d	30,000
	Saegae Times	1982	w	10,000
	Sunday Korean Times	1992	w	15,000
	The News of Korea	1987	w	20,000
Latvian	Laiks	1946	smw	10,000
Lithuanian	Darbininkas	1915	w	4,500
	Laisve		biwk	1,500
	Tevyne		m	4,500
Norwegian	Nordisk Tidende	1891	w	6,000 Bil
Polish	Dziennik Nowojorski	1993	d	15,000
	Polish Daily News	1971	d	30,000
Russian	Kurier	1992	w	60,000
	Novorusskoye Slovo	1910	d	65,000 Bil
	Russian Advertising Weekly	1993	w	20,000
	Russian Weekly	1917	w	1,000
Spanish	El Diario/La Prensa	1913	d	60,000
	El Tiempo	1967	w	38,000
	Impacto	1975	w	57,000 Bil
	La Tribuna Hispana	1988	w	20,000
	La Voz Hispana	1980	w	68,000 Bil
	Noticias del Mundo	1980	d	28,000
	Noticiero Colombiano	1983	w	20,000
Resumen Newspaper	1971	w	22,000	
Swedish	Norden		w	1,000 Bil
	Nordstjerman-Svea		w	3,500 Bil
Turkish	Hurriyet	1982	d	6,000
Ukrainian	Robitnik Publishing	1920	bimnth	500 Bil
Urdu	Pakistani Post	1992	w	36,000
	Urdu Times	1980	w	50,000
Yiddish	Di yidishe vokh	1954	w	20,000
	Der Yid		w	7,300
	Algemeiner zhurnal		w	7,000
	Yiddish Forward	1897	w	10,000

^a Source: This table was drawn from data supplied by Ram6n Vargas, a graduate student at City College, included in Dillon et al. 1995, and supplemented by Table 17.1 of Bogen 1988.

^b The table includes only newspapers published in the New York City metropolitan area in LOTE^s. When publication is bilingual it is so indicated.

^c We have supplied here only information that we have been able to confirm through direct contact with the newspapers.

by the Mayor's Office are translated into Spanish, Chinese, Korean and Haitian Creole, and Russian is being added.

The most progress in providing services in LOTE^s in city agencies has been made in the Health Field. In 1986 the New York City Council passed an important local law which states:

The Board of Health shall require the immediate provision of interpretation services for non-English speaking residents in all hospital emergency rooms located in New York City, when such non-English speaking residents comprise at least ten percent of the patient population of the service area of a particular hospital.

Two years later, New York State's Department of Health passed a similar policy which requires language interpreters for emergency service within ten minutes of a request if the agency has more than 1% LOTE population that does not speak English well (Revised Part 405-Hospital Minimum Standards, 8/22/88 p. 10). Of eighty-three hospitals in New York City, seventy-eight have to provide translation into Spanish according to this policy, fourteen into Italian, five into Chinese, and four into Russian. All the municipal hospitals administered by the Health and Hospital Corporation use the AT&T Language Line Service to supplement translation into Spanish, Italian, Chinese and Russian, and for most other languages.

In 1988 New York City's Local Law 86 required that the Human Resources Administration's (HRA) Income Maintenance Centers provide bilingual staff whenever clients who spoke English poorly were at least ten percent of a Center's caseload. HRA also has a Language Service Coordinator who conducts surveys of bilingual staff and clients and coordinates the publication of a Directory of Community Organizations with staff willing to provide interpretation in forty-three languages. To identify the language of the clients, the Human Resources Administration has also prepared a Language Identification Card in Albanian, Arabic, Chinese, Haitian Creole, Hebrew, Hindi/Urdu, Italian, Russian, Spanish and Vietnamese with the following messages: "Do you speak X? Is someone with you who can interpret for you? Please be seated while I call someone to interpret for you." In 1993 eight percent of the clients of HRA were Spanish speakers who spoke English poorly or not at all, and over eleven percent of the clients of all the programs in HRA in 1993 have limited English speaking ability.

The New York City Police Force started hiring interpreters as receptionists in 1982. In 1992 there were seventy such receptionists in twenty-nine of the seventy-five police precincts. That same year twenty-three

percent of the nearly nine million calls to the Emergency Telephone Number, 911, were in Spanish. Three Spanish speaking operators stand by at 911 around the clock (Agencies 1992). New York's 911 also uses the services of the AT&T Language Line. In 1994 the other languages requested by NY 911 from the Language Line were: Akan, Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Bengali, Cantonese, Cambodian, Croatian, Czech, Dutch, Farsi, Finnish, French, Fukienese, German, Haitian Creole, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Latvian, Lithuanian, Malayalam, Mandarin, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Rumanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhalese, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish, Tagalog, Taiwanese, Thai, Trigrinya, Toisanese, Toucouleur, Turkish, Urkainian, Urdu, Vietnamese, Yiddish, Yoruba (Cuno, Personal Communication, see note 1).

Bilingual Help Telephone Lines, especially in Spanish and Chinese, are also available at the Department for the Aging, the Bias Hotline of the Human Rights Commission, the Heat and Hot Water Complaint Line of the Department of Housing Preservation and Development, and the Complaint Lines of the Department of Environmental Protection. Both the Help Centers of the Department of Finance which provides tax assistance and the Department of Transportation have Spanish-speaking employees to provide assistance in Spanish (NYC Language Services Program, June 1992: 12).

In April of 1992 the New York City Charter was amended adding a paragraph 18 to Chapter 35, Section 814, which requires appointing interpreters in city agencies where "non-English speaking users comprise at least five percent of the people to be serviced by the agency."

The New York State Courts have ruled that criminal defendants who cannot understand English are entitled to have the proceedings interpreted for them in a language that they understand. Also in Civil trials, the court has authority to appoint an interpreter for any party or witness who does not speak English. Section 387 of the Judiciary Law provides for the temporary appointment of an interpreter when it is necessary. Clearly the number one language in New York City is Spanish, with approximately one hundred and seventy full-time interpreters in the Unified Court System. But again beyond Spanish, per diem interpretation services are provided in forty-nine languages, as Table 11 shows.

LOTEs have also been recently used in a New York State Citizenship Campaign in which the Statue of Liberty says: "Have a voice. Make a difference. Become a U. S. citizen," not only in English, but also in separate brochures written each in Spanish, Haitian Creole, French, Chinese,

Table 11
Rank Order of LOTEs used in New York City's unified court system 1993-1994*

LOTE	Hrs paid per diem interpreters	LOTE	Hrs paid per diem interpreters
Spanish	81,297	Albanian	1,208
Chinese ^a	25,386	Turkish	1,040
Russian ^b	19,770	Japanese	792
Korean	12,242	Portuguese	707
Arabic	11,681	Romanian	509
Polish ^c	9,479	Czech	429
Wolof	7,084	Thai	280
French	5,500	Armenian	236
Creole	4,950	Yiddish	232
Haitian Creole	4,937	Cambodian	230
Greek	4,259	French Creole	217
Urdu ^d	3,880	Sinhala	200
American Sign	3,698	Hungarian	154
Punjabi ^e	3,438	Tagalog	98
Italian	3,132	Macedonian	77
Hindi ^f	2,665	Indonesian	56
Croatian	2,302	Pushtu	56
Vietnamese	2,143	Yoruba	49
Other Indian Langs	1,798	German	21
Bengali ^g	1,709	Malayalam	21
Hebrew	1,509	Bulgarian	14
Farsi	1,444	Hakka	14

* Source: Unified Court System. Per Diem Interpreter Expenditures. Fiscal Year 1993-94.

^a This total was derived from the following figures reported separately: Cantonese-Mandarin 11,716; Cantonese 6,273; Mandarin 4,927; Chinese 2,470.

^b This total combines 16,902 given for Russian and 2,868 for Russian/Polish combination.

^c This total combines 6,611 given for Polish and 2,868 for Russian/Polish combination.

^d This total combines 1,986 given for Urdu and the following combinations: 539 for Bengali-Hindi-Urdu; 898 for Hindi-Punjabi-Urdu; 201 for Hindi-Urdu, 256 for Punjabi-Urdu.

^e This total combines 2,121 for Punjabi, 161 for Hindi-Punjabi; 898 for Hindi-Punjabi, Urdu; 258 for Punjabi-Urdu.

^f This figure includes 1,405 reported for Hindi and the following combinations: 161 for Hindi-Punjabi; 898 for Hindi-Punjabi-Urdu; 201 for Hindi-Urdu.

^g Includes 1,170 for Bengali and 539 for combination Bengali-Hindi-Urdu.

Russian, Korean, Italian, Polish, Arabic and Hindi, and without an English language translation. The use of LOTEs in a citizenship campaign implicitly acknowledges what officially has never been recognized in the United States, that we are a multilingual nation with many LOTE speak-

ing citizens, and that because we're a nation of immigrants, loyalty toward the United States is not the purview of native English speaking monolinguals.

5.3. Language policy in schools

The question of LOTEs in schools is so important and controversial that it is here treated separately; although as we will see, the policy of schools toward LOTEs parallels what we've said before about their promotion in business (private schools) and their temporary tolerance in government agencies (public schools).

Despite the multilingualism of New York City, there are fewer schools that seriously teach a second language in N.Y. than in most cities in Europe, Asia or developing countries. Schools that develop additive bilingualism in New York City are limited to expensive elite schools or private ethnic schools. Among the private bilingual schools in New York City with an additive bilingual goal one finds a Lycée Français similar to that in many other countries. The large business community of the Germans, Japanese and Italians have also spurred the creation of one bilingual school for each of the three groups, with ties to the motherland. And the ethnolinguistic groups with strong religious affiliations all run bilingual schools. Jews have a large system of bilingual day schools, some Hebrew/English, others Yiddish/English, and an even larger system of supplementary schools. Greeks likewise have approximately twenty day schools. Muslims also have a growing number of schools, with Arabic taught only to read the Koran. Armenians have one day school, where Armenian language is taught during one forty-five minute period. In all these schools LOTEs are used as normal expressions of U. S. loyalty. For example, the morning Hebrew prayers in a Hebrew Day primary school are sung to the tune of "Yankee Doodle." During a graduation ceremony in an Armenian school, students say the Pledge of Allegiance to the American flag in traditional Armenian costumes against the background of Mount Ararat, the symbol of Armenian nationhood; and "America the Beautiful" is followed by the *Her Mayr* (Garcia 1988).

Latinos do not have a system of Spanish-English bilingual private schools in New York City, perhaps because of their lower socioeconomic status. Instead, they rely on the public schools to provide whatever Spanish language education exists. Usually Spanish is used only temporarily in transitional bilingual programs, although a very limited number of additive bilingual programs exist. As in the past, the New York City pub-

lic transitional bilingual programs use LOTEs to teach American History. Recently I witnessed a lesson about the Boston Tea Party taught in Spanish to sixth graders who had recently arrived from the Dominican Republic. The teacher, speaking in Spanish, transformed the phonology of "Boston". The students, speaking little English and not yet familiar with United States geography, didn't recognize Boston as a city. But as avid TV watchers, they knew the meaning of "getting busted". So a student, showing off the little English he knew, remarked in Spanish on how it was good that the Americans had "busted" the British tea, because otherwise the United States wouldn't be independent and free. Even before children become truly bilingual, they express loyalty toward their new country, and LOTEs are successfully used to develop this sense of loyal U. S. citizenship. In fact, the Pledge of Allegiance often serves as the first English repetition drill in the English as a Second Language class.

Students in New York public schools speak one hundred and thirty languages, although ninety-six percent of students who are English language learners speak the sixteen languages that appear in Table 12, with Spanish accounting for two-thirds of the non-English speaking students. There are five hundred and thirty-one New York City public schools with

Table 12
LOTEs for English Language Learners in NYC public schools, 1993-1994*

Language	Number
Spanish	104,654
Chinese	13,652
Russian	7,424
Haitian Creole	7,028
Korean	3,294
Arabic	2,039
Bengali	1,909
Polish	1,637
Urdu	1,600
Vietnamese	1,149
French	935
Albanian	764
Philipino	711
Hindi	581
Punjabi	537
Italian	519

* Source: Board of Education of the City of New York, Division of Bilingual Education. Facts and Figures 1993-1994, p. 4

bilingual programs in the following twelve languages: Spanish, Chinese, Haitian Creole, Russian, Korean, Arabic, Vietnamese, Polish, Bengali, French, Urdu and Albanian. Eighty-five percent of the students are in Spanish-English Bilingual Programs. Educational services in LOTEs for students who are still learning English are provided as part of the Aspira Consent Decree (1974) for Spanish speaking students, and of the Lau Plan (1977) drawn between the New York City Board of Education and the Office of Civil Rights for all others. Furthermore, the Regulations of the New York State Commissioner of Education, Part 154, require that whenever there are twenty English language learners with the same native language in the same grade, educational services in the LOTE or special English as a Second Language programs be provided. LOTEs are widely used in New York City public schools, but only until students learn English.

5.4. *New York's language policy. A summary*

Two distinct language policies are in place in New York City today. Private businesses have always used LOTEs to sell to the international or ethnic community in New York, and thus a *policy of promotion* continues to be followed. Businesses recognize and promote New Yorkers multilingualism because they know they can sell more in the language of the "heart", even if the customers are bilingual. Government today uses LOTEs only to enable monolingual LOTE speakers to participate in government services, court proceedings or education, and to that end it has adopted a *multilingual policy of tolerance during the transition to English stage*. Government only recognizes New Yorker's multilingualism when their clients are monolingual LOTE speakers, but once they're bilingual, LOTEs have little room in any social public domain in the city. Bilingualism is relegated to the home, and the ethnic community and its institutions.

Glazer and Moynihan (1963: 101) have said that "Spanish ... has a much stronger official position in New York than either Italian or Yiddish ever had." Yet, the difference between the positions of Italian and Yiddish at the end of the century on the one hand, and Spanish today on the other, has a lot to do with the higher level of government involvement today, rather than with the power of the LOTEs themselves. The use of Spanish in public institutions and schools, even with those who do not

speak English, continues to enjoy only limited acceptance, despite its mandated existence as a result of judicial decisions and governmental decrees.

6. *Conclusion*

There has never been official recognition and acceptance of multilingualism in the United States. Yet, this chapter shows that democratic *practices* have historically supported New York's multilingualism. Both the language minority and the language majority have benefited economically, socially and politically from this use of LOTEs in New York. Americans of all kinds, the native born and the foreign born, the wealthy and poor, the cultured and uneducated, have always spoken LOTEs in the city. New York's tolerance toward the use of LOTEs has been a decisive factor in its development, used successfully both to integrate newcomers and to spur economic activity.

As this chapter shows, official institutions in New York use LOTEs when serving the great number of *non-English speakers* in the city. Yet, New York City, like other U. S. contexts, has failed to support the LOTEs of its *English speaking citizens*, relegating them to the home and other private domains. For example, temporary transitional bilingual education programs for English language learners abound in New York City. Yet, developmental bilingual education programs for bilingual ethnolinguistic minorities who speak LOTEs at home or for English monolingual students who would want to become bilingual are almost non-existent in the city. English language monolingualism continues to be the sociolinguistic aim in New York City, as in the rest of U. S. society, and schools carry on this social mandate.

While the United States demands English language monolingualism for true membership in U. S. society, the rest of the world, and most especially the countries of the European Union, have made their citizens' multilingualism a societal priority. To increase the multilingual potential of its citizens, the European Union presently supports bilingual education models, as well as programs such as LINGUA and ERASMUS which send secondary school and university students to study in other countries and in other languages. A multilingual ability is considered a most important economic societal asset in an increasingly interdependent world.

At this historical juncture, it might be appropriate for the U. S. as a nation to reconsider its English monolingualism goal. During the territo-

rial and economic expansion of the United States as a great world power, the imposition of English monolingualism might have served us well socially and politically, regardless of the individual suffering of many. But the period of U. S. expansion without international cooperation is over, and our English monolingualism will not benefit us in a global world. Furthermore, even though English has spread throughout the world, its economic hegemony now competes with that of many other LOTEs, especially, at present, with Japanese. Our English monolingualism no longer holds the key to our economic hegemony.

More than any other nation in the world, the United States has the world and its languages within its territory. The potential for bilingual and multilingual Americans is in our midst. To activate this potential, we would need to understand that English monolingualism can no longer be the sole holder of our economic and social stability. We would need to trust the LOTEs of our bilingual citizens, and to understand that LOTEs can be valuable resources to negotiate our national and international welfare and to protect our interests. In the immediate future, this change in our national linguistic conception seems unlikely. In fact, as the recent trend in English Language legislation suggests, we may be facing a return to more restrictive language policy. New York's City historical use of LOTEs to its advantage may be an important starting point to analyze the benefits that U. S. societal multilingualism might hold.

Notes

1. Many people contributed to the writing of this paper. I would like to thank especially Ricardo Otheguy for his suggestions, comments and critique of an earlier draft of this paper. I am also grateful to Joshua Fishman and to Akie Tomozawa for their careful reading. A presentation of this material was made at the International Linguistics Association, New York, Spring 1996. Much of the contemporary data for this paper was drawn from interviews, telephone conversations and correspondence with many. For his help with the use of the AT & T Language Line in the city, I would like to thank Mike Cuno. For information on Con Edison, the help of Agnes Lugo is gratefully acknowledged. I thank Gladys Romani for giving so freely of her time in the interview she granted me at the Multilingual Center of NYNEX. Joseph Zwilling of the Archdiocese of New York and Frank de Rosa from the Diocese of Brooklyn were most helpful in faxing me information on the use of LOTEs in the Catholic Church. To Michael Miller, I am grateful for having supplied information regarding the Per Diem Court Interpreter program of the New York State Unified Court System. Barry Moreno, Librarian at Ellis Island, was most helpful in making documents available to me. I want to thank Margie McHugh and Victoria Wong from the New York Immigration Coalition for all the information they provided me with, and most especially for a very enjoyable lunch. The help of Chandra Hauptman of the Human Resources Administration is gratefully acknowledged. Valerie Oltarsh, Executive Director of the Office of

Immigrant Affairs, and especially Lillian Li and Carlos Rivera, both from the Office of Language Services, were most generous in meeting with me, answering many questions, and giving me access to many city documents. To Anselma Diloné, William Guerrero, Arcania Jáquez, Reina Salcedo and Ramón Vargas, graduate students in Bilingual Education, I am grateful for an exhaustive survey of ethnolinguistic resources in New York City, submitted as their M.S. Thesis. I am also indebted to Angel Lagomasini, Rosalina Monegro and Sonia Oviedo, also graduate students in bilingual education, for their photographic essay of multilingualism in New York. To all these people and the many other New Yorkers whose names are not mentioned here, I am truly grateful.

2. A recent comprehensive study of New York is offered in Jackson, Kenneth T. (ed.) 1995. *The Encyclopedia of New York City*. New Haven: Yale University Press/The New York Historical Society.

For an insightful study of today's immigrants in New York City, see especially, Bogen, Elizabeth. 1987. *Immigrants in New York City*. New York: Praeger; see also, Foner, Nancy (ed.) *New Immigrants in New York City*. New York: Columbia University Press.

A thorough demographic profile of today's immigration is provided by De Camp, Suzanne. 1991. *The Linguistic minorities of New York City*. New York: Community Service Society, Dept. of Public Policy, Population Studies Unit; and in the 1997 report of The Department of City Planning, *The Newest New Yorkers*. For classic studies of immigrants in New York City, see Glazer, Nathan and Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. 1963 [1970]. *Beyond the melting pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge: M. I. T. Press; Bayor, Ronald. 1978. *Neighbors in conflict: The Irish, Germans, Jews, and Italians of New York City, 1929-1941*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Most insightful for its treatment of immigrant life in the nineteenth century is Ernst, Robert. 1949. *Immigrant life in New York City, 1825-1863*. New York: King's Crown Press.

For studies of ethnic New York, see Caroline Zachry Institute of Human Development. 1950. *Around the world in New York: A guide to the city's national groups*. New York: Common council for American Unity; see also, Stern, Zelda. 1980. *The Complete guide to ethnic New York*. New York: St. Martin's Press. A recent treatment of the same topic is offered by Leeds, Mark. 1991. *Ethnic New York: A Complete guide to the many faces and cultures of New York*. Lincolnwood, Illinois: NTC Publishing.

There has been much published about the different ethnolinguistic groups in New York City. For those groups whose languages are treated in this volume, see references at the end of each chapter. Among the groups not included here that have been treated in the sociological literature, see the following: For Koreans, see Kim, Ilsoo. 1981. *New urban immigrants: The Korean community in New York*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. For Poles, see Jurewicz, Leslaw (ed.) 1979. *Polish-Americans in the City of New York: An Outline of socioeconomic and cultural needs*. New York: Polish and Slavic Center. For Brazilians, see Margolis, Maxine. 1994. *Little Brazil: An Ethnography of Brazilian immigrants in New York City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. For Yemenis, see Staub, Shalom. 1989. *Yemenis in New York*. Philadelphia: Balch Institute Press.

3. See especially, Hoover, Edgar and Raymond Vernon. 1959. *Anatomy of a Metropolis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; Hacker, Andrew. 1975. *The New Yorkers: Profile of an American metropolis*. New York: Mason-Charter; Fainstein, Susan S. et. al. (eds.) 1986. *Restructuring the City*. New York: Longman; Noyelle, Thierry. 1989. *New York's Financial Markets*. Boulder: Westview.

4. For studies of New York English, see especially, Babbitt, E. H. 1896. "The English of the Lower Classes in New York City and Vicinity", *Dialect Notes* 1, Part IX; Hubbell, Allan Forbes. 1950 [1972]. *The Pronunciation of English in New York City*. New York: Octagon Books; Feinštejn, Mark, 1980. "Ethnicity and Topicalization in New York City English", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 26: 15-24; Tannen, Deborah. 1990. "Talking New York", *New York 1990* 23, no. 37, Sept. 24: 68-75. The most famous study of English in New York is Labov, William. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. For a study of Puerto Rican English, see Wolfram, Walt. 1974. *Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation: Puerto Rican English in New York City*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
5. Only Spanish in New York City has been studied in the sociolinguistic literature. For Spanish in the Puerto Rican community, see especially, Language Policy Task Force. 1980. *Social dimensions of language use in East Harlem*. New York: Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños; Language Policy Task Force. 1978. "Language policy and the Puerto Rican community", *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe* 5, 1-2, Jan - August 1-39; Pousada, Alicia and Shana Poplack. 1982. "No case for Convergence: The Puerto Rican Spanish Verb System in a Language Contact Situation", In Fishman, Joshua A. and Gary D. Keller (eds.) *Bilingual education for Hispanic students in the United States*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 207-237; Zentella, Ana Celia. 1990. "Returned Migration, Language and Identity: Puerto Rican Bilinguals in Dos Worlds/Two Mundos", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 84: 81-100. See also, García, Ofelia et al. 1988. "Spanish language use and attitudes: A study of two New York City communities", *Language in Society* 17: 475-511; Zentella, Ana Celia. 1990. "Lexical leveling in four New York City Spanish dialects: Linguistic and social factors", *Hispania* 73: 1094-1105.
6. The concept of English not being New York's vernacular has been proposed by Ricardo Otheguy. I am grateful to him for sharing this idea with me.
7. Throughout this paper we use the linguistic labels or categories that appear in the census or survey to which reference is made.
8. This volume includes a chapter on Caribbean English Creole and not one on African American English or Ebonics. Although not without controversy (see the discussion by Winer and Jack, this volume, pp. 303-304), Caribbean English Creole falls closer to a LOTE in the continuum of English language varieties than does African American English. Whether African American English can be considered a LOTE has been vehemently argued. There is no question that both African American English and Caribbean English in general contribute to the linguistic heterogeneity of New York City, but the issue of African American English or Ebonics in the city is so important that it deserves a separate study.
9. The U. S. census does not use Haitian Creole as a category. French Creole probably refers mostly to Haitian Creole, but may also include speakers of other French based Creoles.
10. The Johnson Reed Act of 1924 established a quota of 2 percent of the foreign-born of each nationality that had been counted in the 1890 census. In 1927 the quota was based on the proportion of population in the 1920 census.
11. The Immigration Act of 1965 abolished the national origin system. Preference was given to those who had close relatives or occupational skills needed in the United States, as well as refugees. A limit of 170,000 outside the Western hemisphere, 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere, and 20,000 from any country was established.

12. Heinz Kloss (1977) distinguishes between toleration of language rights and promotion of language rights. He also differentiates between the use of LOTE for the benefit of the ethnolinguistic group, or for the benefit of majority society, calling this last purpose "for expediency."

References

- Agencies Face Language Barriers
1992 *New York Times* B, 8: 1, July 14, 1992.
- Bogen, Elizabeth
1987 *Immigration in New York*. New York: Praeger.
- Botkin, Benjamin Albert (ed.)
1956 *New York City folklore. Legends, tall tales, anecdotes, stories, sagas, heroes and characters, customs, traditions and sayings*. New York: Random House.
- Campbell, Gordon J.
1994 "New York City recognising the importance of multilingual communication", *Language International* 6, 1: 36-38.
- Clines, Francis X.
1994 "73,000 times in 22 tongues, I vow: 'I do.'" *New York Times* 1, 41: 1 (Oct 30, 1994).
- Corsi, Edward
1935 *In the shadow of liberty. The chronicle of Ellis Island*. New York: Macmillan Company. In Benjamin Albert, Botkin (ed.), 198-201.
- DeCamp, Suzanne
1991 *The linguistic minorities of New York City*. New York: Community Service Society, Dept. of Public Policy, Population Studies Unit.
- Department of City Planning
1992a *The Newest New Yorkers: An analysis of immigration into New York City during the 1980s*. June 1992.
1992b *Demographic profiles. A portrait of New York City's Community Districts from the 1980 and 1990 Census of Population and Housing*. August 1992. New York.
1993 *Socioeconomic profiles. A portrait of New York City's community districts from the 1980 and 1990 Censuses of Population and Housing.*, March 1993. New York.
1997 *The Newest New Yorkers*. New York: City of New York.
- Diloné, Anselma - William Guerrero - Arcania Jáquez - Reina Salcedo - Ramón Vargas
1995 *Ethnolinguistic resources in New York City*. [Unpublished M. S. Thesis, City College of New York, School of Education.]
- Dinnerstein, Leonard - David M. Reimers
1988 *Ethnic Americans: A history of immigration*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ernst, Robert
1949 *Immigrant life in New York City, 1825-1863*. New York: King's Crown Press.
- Fishman, Joshua A.
1966 *Language loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.
1972 *Language in sociocultural change*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
1993 "Yiddish and voting rights in New York, 1915 and 1921", *Language Problems and Language Planning* 18: 1-17.

Federal Writers' Project. New York City

- 1938a *Italians of New York*. New York: Random House.
- 1938b *New York Panorama, a comprehensive view of the metropolis*. New York: Random House.
- Garcia, Ofelia
- 1988 "The education of biliterate and bicultural children in ethnic schools in the United States", *Essays by the Spencer Fellows of the National Academy of Education*, Vol. IV, 19-78.
- Garcia, Ofelia - Ricardo Otheguy
- 1994 "The value of speaking a LOTE in U. S. business", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 532: 99-122.
- Glazer, Nathan - Daniel Patrick Moynihan
- 1963 *Beyond the melting pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- [1970] [Reprint edition]
- Gross, Alex
- 1990 "1992 vs Loisaida", *Language International* 2.3: 7-10.
- Hansen, Marcus L.
- 1931 "The minor stock in the American population of 1790", *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1931*, Vol. 1.
- Howe, Marvine
- 1992 "Tower of Babel on radio is adding voices", *New York Times* D, 9: 1, September 21, 1992.
- Jones, Charisse
- 1994 "Melting pot still bubbles at I. S. 237", *New York Times* 1, 41: 3 (June 12, 1994).
- Kandel, Bethany
- 1992 "Can you say taxi in Urdu?" *USA Today* A, 1: 5 (April 23, 1992).
- Kim, Illsoo
- 1981 *New urban immigrants: The Korean community in New York*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kleiman, Dena
- 1982 "A surge of immigrants alters New York's face". *New York Times*. September 27, 1982, B: 4.
- Klein, Alexander (ed.)
- 1955 *The Empire City. A treasury of New York*. New York: Rinehart and Company.
- Kloss, Heinz
- 1977 *The American bilingual tradition*. Rowley, Ma.: Newbury House.
- La Guardia, Fiorello
- 1961 *The Making of an insurgent: An autobiography 1882-1919*. New York: Capricorn Book.
- Labov, William
- 1966 *The Social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Laguette, Michel
- 1984 *American odyssey: Haitians in New York City*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

- Lait, Jack - Lee Mortimer
- 1948 *New York: Confidential!* Chicago: Ziff-Davis Publishing Company.
- Language Policy Task Force
- 1978 "Language policy and the Puerto Rican community", *Bilingual Review/Revista Bilingüe* 5, 1-2, Jan-August 1-39.
- 1980 *Social dimensions of language use in East Harlem*. New York: Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños.
- Language Sensitivity Training Outline and Source Materials
- 1993 New York: New York City Mayor's Office of Operations, Office of Language Services, November 1, 1993.
- Leeds, Mark
- 1991 *Passport's guide to ethnic New York. A complete guide to the many faces and cultures of New York*. Lincolnwood (Chicago): NTC Publishing.
- Levasseur, A.
- 1829 *Lafayette in America in 1824 and 1824: Or, journal of a voyage to the United States*, trans. John D. Goodman (Philadelphia: Carey and Lea).
- Margolis, Maxine
- 1994 *Little Brazil: An ethnography of Brazilian immigrants in New York City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moss, Frank
- 1897 *The American Metropolis. From Knickerbocker days to the present time. New York City life in all its various phases*. New York: Peter Fenlon Collier, Vol. 1, 2, 3.
- Moss, Mitchell - Sarah Ludwig
- 1991 "The Structure of the media", in: J. H. Mollenkopf - M. Castells (eds.), *Dual city. Restructuring New York*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- New York's New World
- 1990 *New York Newsday*, June 24, 1990.
- New York City Language Services Program.
- 1992 New York: New York City Mayor's Office of Operations, Office of Language Services, June 1992.
- Park, Robert E.
- 1922 *The Immigrant press and its control*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Paulston, Christina Bratt
- 1994 *Linguistic minorities in multilingual settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pedraza, Pedro - John Attinasi - Gerard Hoffman
- 1980 "Rethinking diglossia" in: Raymond Padilla (ed), *Theory in bilingual education*. Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University.
- Pfanner, Helmut F.
- 1983 *Exile in New York: German and Austrian writers after 1933*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Pousada, Alicia - Shana Poplack
- 1982 "No Case for convergence: The Puerto Rican Spanish verb system in a language contact situation", in: Joshua A. Fishman - Gary D. Keller (eds.), *Bilingual education for Hispanic students in the United States*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 207-237.
- Purdum, Todd S.
- 1993 "Buttoning every vote". *New York Times* Sec 9:1 (October 3, 1993).

- Reimers, David, M.
1985 *Still the golden door. The Third World comes to America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
[1992] [Second edition]
- Riis, Jacob A.
1892 *The Children of the poor*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
[1971] [Reprinted New York: Arno Press and The New York Times]
- Rosenwaike, Ira
1972 *Population history of New York City*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Roskolenko, Harry
1971 *1910-1914: The Time that was then. The Lower East Side 1900-1914. An intimate chronicle*. New York: Dial Press.
- Saiins, Peter. D.
1991 "In living colors: New York's surprising ethnic future", *The New Republic*, January 21, 1991, p. 14 (2).
- Sánchez Korrol, Virginia
1983 *From colonia to community: The history of Puerto Ricans in New York City, 1917-1948*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- Stern, Zelda
1980 *The Complete guide to ethnic New York*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Still, Bayrd
1956 *Mirror for Gotham*. New York: New York University Press.
- Tannen, Deborah
1981 "New York Jewish conversational style", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 30: 133-149.
1990 "Talking New York", *New York 1990*. 23, n. 37, September 24, 1990, pp. 68-75.
- Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on the Future of New York City
1980 *New York. World city*. Cambridge, Ma.: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain Publishers.
- Williams, William
1912 Ellis Island: Its organization. A Report, December 1912. [Unpublished MS.].
- Wolfram, Walt
1974 *Sociolinguistic aspects of assimilation: Puerto Rican English in New York City*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Youssef, Nadia Haggag
1992 *The Demographics of immigration: A socio-demographic profile of the foreign born population of New York State*. New York: Center for Immigration Studies.
- Zentella, Ana Celia
1990a "Lexical leveling in four New York City Spanish dialects: Linguistic and social factors", *Hispania* 73(4): 1094-1105.
1990b "Returned migration, language and identity: Puerto Rican bilinguals in dos worlds/two mundos", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 84: 81-100.

II THE LANGUAGE OF EARLY ARRIVALS: STILL ENCOUNTERED

