Language and Reality: Being One With Everything

Abstract

The first assumption of Hyperphysis is that "there is an objective Reality. This Reality is observer-independent, yet, it is understood that the observer interacts with the very same reality being able to change it and of course of being changed in a greater or lesser degree." This principle of the existence of an objective Reality explicitly includes ideas, as J. R. Croca recently defined.

Language Planning has evolved from his first steps dedicated to "nation building" to a present framework that was first enunciated by Robert L. Cooper as a tool for Social Change, and recently by Bernard Spolsky as a broader, more flexible management tool, understanding the change of, either societal or diverse sizes of communities, always including, obviously, the individuals responsible for the proposed change.

Language as been the object of study of a science – Linguistics – that has difficulties accepting the inherent social nature of his object, pushing out this social nature of language to an hyphenated science: Sociolinguistics. This is far from peaceful. As A.-J. Calvet has stated, it is impossible to exclude the social nature of Language, therefore, there is no Linguistics that is not Sociolinguistics.

The proposed concepts of Hyperphysis and especially of Eurhytmy can provide an important breakthrough in the understanding of the relation between speech and language, individual and social – use or change through words and languages - and also human immaterial production and Reality.

_____

It is generally accepted that Language is one of the most powerful human tool responsible for the very survival of mankind, mostly because it enabled our ancestors to cooperate, acting collectively as one.

Linguistics is a science that was first defined by Ferdinand de Saussure in 1906-1911. The relatively vague date is due to the fact that his famous General Course on General Linguistics was not published by himself but by his students upon the collection of their notes.

Saussure acknowledge previous phases in this science, namely the first, building Grammar, that was a normative discipline, focused on correctness, a second one, Philology, that had critic as its main method, and included literary history, ethnography, etc. and a third one, comparative philology or grammar, that started to compare languages (Saussure, 1977, pp. 21-28).

According to Saussure, Language is the object of study of Linguistics and it is social in nature. Individual speakers learn it by speech practice among them. However, Saussure is clear stating that no individual has the totality of language, nor can they change it (Saussure, 1977, p. 40).

Saussure is also careful in defining what he called External and Internal Elements of Linguistics, and explicitly refuses the need of including what he called *Realia* which includes, for example "the dialectal fragmentation"[1]. To him, Linguistics is supposed to focus on what he called the "internal organism of Language"[2].

This was the embranchment that lead to different paths: one, Linguistics, The science of language in itself, by itself, as Saussure defined, even considering that slowly it has included over time several factors that were considered external by Saussure; Another path was later started in a scientific discipline called sociolinguistics, that proposed to cover several angles of the social side of language.

According to some sources, Sociolinguistics was first proposed as a term by Thomas Callan Hodson in the title of his 1939 article "Sociolingistics in India" published in Man in India (Joseph, 2004). However, Calvet proposes a very different history of the discipline, starting with Meillet, precisely at the same time of Saussure, but not knowing his work until after his death, for the reason that we pointed out already: the "Course" was published by his students after his death (Calvet, 2003).

This same author, in a different book (Calvet, 1993, pp. 3-4) clearly expose the central tension between Linguistics and Sociolinguistics, based in the way social, or external, factors are included or excluded. Calvet quotes William Labov stating that is not possible Linguistics without Sociolinguistics (Labov, 1976, p. 37).

---

[1] My translation from the Portuguese text.
[2] Idem.

This tension that is based in the way that the social factors are included or studied is aggravated by the tension between the individual and the social instances of Language.

Note that all agree that Language is a social reality, only completely understood in that abstract instance. However, the way we reach it is by extrapolation from individual use.

To further complication, individual use has several factors – variation, for instance – that are social, even when they are individual, since they express an intention of effect on their listeners.

However, the notion that individual speakers cannot produce changes in Language is clearly disputed.

Institutions are intentionally changing the language phenomena for centuries. We can trace several examples in the studies of Language Planning, a science that evolved mainly from the middle of the twentieth century, and one could almost safely say that belongs to the Sociolinguistics family.

Several authors agree in considering three phases in Language Planning development. The first, and the one that consecrated the field, was mainly focused on what was called the "nation building" problems that arose with decolonization, one of the most important being the choice of the official language of the new states. The second, a critical phase of the first one, was the scrutiny of the decisions and the theoretical and ideological frameworks used previously. The third and final – for the time being – was an imposition of the present reality: globalization and the information and communication technical revolution (Salomão, 2011, pp.165-167).

Please, remember the fact that reality imposed a different course for the discipline.

Language Planning, according to Ricento (Ricento, 2006, p. 29), and widely accepted by other authors, has three main areas of intervention: Corpus, Status and Acquisition. Corpus, dealing with changes in the "language itself" just like Saussure proposed; Status, dealing with the organization of several languages in a defined community or nation, and finally, Acquisition, dealing with learning and teaching new languages or varieties.

As we can easily see, Language Planning is all about changing the social totality of language by a planned- intentional – action of an institution, a group or even a person.

In the beginning, it was considered that political power was a indispensable factor, but since the seminal work "Language Planning and Social Change" (Cooper, 1989), the way we consider intervention changed dramatically in two main areas, first, the idea that the power to produce change was accessible to a multitude of subjects, not only the political leaders; second, the idea that change in language, could produce social change, or, in other words, change reality itself.

Bernard Spolsky, that followed closely the work of Cooper, started to expand the possibilities advanced by Cooper, first in some details (Spolsky, 2004), later in a bold broadening of the overall approach (Spolsky, 2009).

This advances in the scientific field of Language Planning forced the revision of the relation between the individual speaker and language (as a social instance), but also the relation of language and reality.

From the compendia we traditionally consider examples such as Richelieu and the foundation of the French Academy, but we can easily observe in our close experience the interventions of unsuspected institutions, like, for instance, Pfizer, the pharmaceutical company, that was able to make disappear the word "impotence" from collective usage and substituted it for "erectile dysfunction", or the whole initiative of political correctness against racial or gender prejudices during Bill Clinton presidency, or even many unintentional cases of words or expressions used by comedians and readily adopted massively in the everyday use, showing some kind of viral behavior.

So, can we, individuals, change language? Yes, we can.

I had recently the opportunity to expose my undergoing work around three words that can have a strong influence on the local culture and their perceived importance (Salomão, 2013).

In spite of what one can think, reality as a concept is not so consensual. Among other reasons, it is of great importance, that the first assumption of Hyperphysis is that "there is an objective Reality. This Reality is observer-independent, yet, it is understood that the observer interacts with the very same reality being able to change it and of course of being changed in a greater or

lesser degree." as J. R. Croca recently defined (José R. Croca, 2001) (J. R. Croca, 2010)

This principle of the existence of an objective Reality that explicitly include ideas and that it is supposed to change and be changed by it, seems to me as highly promising also in my field of research.

Reality seen as something that also includes ideas and concepts and,of course, language, can provide a fructuous dialogue between sciences of language and sciences of physics.

The proposed concepts of Hyperphysis and especially of Eurhytmy can provide an important breakthrough in the understanding of the relation between speech and language, individual and social – use or change through language - and also human immaterial production and Reality.

Language enables us to act collectively as one, it enables us to produce and change reality and it enables us to produce an intelligible explanation for the universe that can be transmitted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Calvet, Louis-Jean. (1993). *La sociolinguistique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Calvet, Louis-Jean. (2003). Reflections on the Origins of Sociolinguistics in Europe. In Christina Bratt Paulston & G. Richard Tucker (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings* (pp. 17-24). Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Croca, J. R. (2010). Hyperphysis - The Unification of Physics. In J. R. Croca & J. E. F. Araújo (Eds.), *A New Vision on Physis - Eurhythmy, Emergence and Nonlinearity* (pp. 1-106). Lisbon: Center for Philosophy of Science - University of Lisbon.

Croca, José R. (2001). *A Realidade na Física Quântica*. Paper presented at the Colóquio A Mente, a Religião e a Ciência Universidade de Lisboa. http://cfcul.fc.ul.pt/equipa/3_cfcul_elegiveis/croca/arealidadenafisicaquantica.pdf

Joseph, John E. (2004). *T. C. Hodson and the Origins of British Socio-linguistics*. Paper presented at the Sociolinguistics Symposium 15, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. http://conferences.ncl.ac.uk/ss15/index.htm

Labov, William. (1976). *Sociolinguistique*. Paris: Minuit.

Ricento, Thomas (Ed.). (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy - Theory and Method*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Salomão, Ricardo. (2011). Comunicação Intercultural de Negócios: Lusofonia, Oportunidades e Desafios. *UBILETRAS* (2), 163-180. Retrieved from http://ubiletras.ubi.pt/

Salomão, Ricardo. (2013). *Três Palavras para Mudar a Comunidade*. Paper presented at the Seminário / Webinário "Política de Língua, Planeamento Linguístico e Mudança Social – Homenagem a Robert L. Cooper, CEMRI, Universidade Aberta, Lisboa. https://repositorioaberto.uab.pt/bitstream/10400.2/2658/1/3%20Palavras%20para%20Mudar%20a%20Comunidade.pdf

Saussure, Ferdinand de. (1977). *Curso de Linguística Geral* (José Victor Adragão, Trans. 3 ed.). Lisboa: D. Quixote.

Spolsky, Bernard. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, Bernard. (2009). *Language Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.