

American Indian English (AIE)

Native Americans often were and are multilingual. Each language is functionally well suited to its own cultural context. In earlier times it was important to speak several languages “so that ... guests who come to the community from other tribes can be made to feel at home more easily” (Leap 1981: 132f). Yet after European contact, language became a target of missionaries, administrators, and educators because it was a prime carrier of culture (see *US language policy*). From the Indian point of view maintenance was important (1) because their languages were a part of Indian cultural heritage (daily life, personal interaction, political decision-making, ceremonial responsibilities) and (2) because their languages expressed cultural traditions (like animacy: corn grows; people don’t grow corn). These languages remind us that “no single language has a monopoly over truth, logic, or precision of expression” (ibid.: 133). There are still more than 200 native languages spoken in the US and Canada as compared with about 500 at the time of European discovery. Indian languages were weakened or destroyed through deliberate genocide or more subtle processes such as “removal,” the reservation system, and constant pressure to join the mainstream.

It is important to see that AIE is not unitary. Leap uses the plural American Indian *Englishes* to emphasize this point. For behind each variety lies an ancestral language that has an effect on the grammar and the rules of discourse of AIE (Mesthrie et al. 2000: 270). For example, “...to speak Ute English is to speak the Ute language in a form [i.e. English] which non-Indians will understand” (ibid.: 272). A further significant point is the use of imagery different from StE. A Navajo would not say, “I must go there,” but something like: “It is only good that I shall go there.” Or: “The horse is running for me,” instead of “I make the horse run” (Leap 1993: 79f). In addition, the use of silence is more common: AIE speakers may use up to three times longer periods of silence before they answer a question or say something in a discussion (ibid.: 87ff). Leap goes so far as to say, “... the ancestral language base underlying each Indian English variety gave its speakers ways to communicate in ancestral language terms even though they were talking to outsiders” (ibid.: 271).

As with other ethnic varieties of AmE AIE is closely related to the local, often non-standard forms of non-Indian English. Hence Ute Indians also speak Basin English, which is shared by Indians and non-Indians in north-eastern Utah and which is sometimes referred to as “Cowboy English,” phonetically [kboi+ingls] in Ute pronunciation, and syllable structure (ibid.).

In this sense we must look at any generalizations about AIE with reservation. That said, Leap points out that many of the “long-short” contrasts such as /i:/-/ɪ/ or /eɪ/-/e/ are not always maintained, which means that the same vowel may be used in *his* and *he’s*. Since some consonants of English do not have counterparts in the ancestral languages, e.g. /ð/ and /θ/, they will be realized with more familiar phonemes, such as /d/ and /t/ (Leap 1993: 45ff).

Possible grammatical differences include lack of plural or possessive inflections and the treatment of uncountable nouns as countable ones (e.g. *furnitures*, *homeworks*). Furthermore, the order of sentence elements may be different than in StE, cf.

They ride bikes is what I see them do. (San Juan Tewa)

There are circle dance songs that we have. (Mescalero Apache)

What he is doing there is he announcing. (Lakota) (ibid.: 77)

Since English in the US is tied to American values and de facto officially promoted, the ability to speak English has been a prerequisite for many types of employment and better living. Native American children were once forced to attend boarding schools thus separating them from tribe, tradition, and traditional language. The result has been a loss of interest in Indian culture and languages, which are sometimes seen as primitive, as well as reluctance among young people to speak their heritage languages for fear of making mistakes.

Leap, W.L. (1993) *American Indian English*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Mesthrie, R., J. Swann, A. Deumert, and W.L. Leap (eds.) (2000) *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.

Education (see Chapter 7)

European expansion and the concept of the frontier (see Chapter 7)

Language of the frontier

The frontier – pronounced /frʌn'ti:ɹ/ in GenAm and not /'frʌntʃə/ as in RP – is a central American mythical-ideological concept. It designates an area, not a line (as elsewhere); it is where wilderness and civilization meet; and it is not a stopping point or limit, but offers an opportunity to go on. It represented something new: “We may safely conclude that the Colonial koiné ... was created by the migrant population of British Northerners, together with English, Welsh, Germans, and other immigrants who moved westward...” (Fisher 2001: 84). And the people who moved onto the frontier have been characterized as democratic, boisterous, exploitative, mobile, unconventional, rude, and optimistic. This clearly involved a social (self-)selection of people, who, among other things, showed an often open disdain for learning and books. They rejected thought and careful planning in preference to action and success. In the following we look at a few aspects of frontier life which may be regarded as important for language.

Newspapers, books, and literacy

There was a widespread and testified thirst for news: one newspaper enterprise per 12,000 in 1840 in the West; in the Mississippi Valley about one-third of the families subscribed to one or more papers. The West was important for the national book market; for example, an early winter shortened the “publishing season” (Billington 1974: 81). Sometimes even tiny towns had more than one bookstore. Nevertheless, the West contributed to lasting American anti-intellectualism: “The West naturally attracted men of action and material ambition, rather than the studious and the contemplative” (ibid.: 89). In the Appalachian region the literacy rate in 1860 lay at 54%; in the North: 94% (Fisher 2001: 84).

Billington, R.A. (1974) *Westward Expansion: A History of the American Frontier*. 4th ed. NY: Macmillan.

Fisher, J.H. (2001) “British and American. Continuity and Divergence,” in: J. Algeo (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. vol. 6 *English in North America*. Cambridge: CUP, 59–85.

“The American Vulgate”

Language in the West is characterized in popular literature such as that collected by Botkin (1983) by its non-standard grammar, its attempts to represent local-regional pronunciation and uncultivated usage in modified spelling, and its boastful, exaggerated, and somewhat anti-establishment tone. Indeed, it is this language more than any other that has earned it the title “The American Vulgate.” The following excerpt, an anonymous example of American frontier tall talk illustrates some of these features.

*I was **ridin** along the Mississippi in my wagon, when I came **acrost** a **feller** floating down stream, **settin** in the **starn** of his boat fast asleep. Well, I hadn't had a fight for ten days; felt as tho' I should have to **kiver** myself up in a salt barrel, to keep so wolfy about the shoulders. So says I, hallo stranger, if you don't mind your boat will run off and leave you. So he looked up at me **slantindicular**, and I looked down on him **slantindicular**. He took out a **chor** of tobacco, and **says he**, I don't **vallee** you tantamount to that; and the **varmant** clapped his wings and crowed. I **ris** up, **shuch** my mane, **croocked** my neck, and nickered like a horse. He run his boat plump head foremost ashore. I stopped my wagon, and set my triggers. Mister, **says he**, I can whip my weight in wild cats, and ride straight thro' a crab apple orchard on a flash of lightning – clear meat axe disposition – the best man, if I an't, I wish I may be **tetotaciously exfluncuated**. So we come together; he was a pretty severe colt, but no part of a priming for me. I put it to him mighty droll – in ten minutes he yelled enough, and swore I was a **ripstaver**! **Says I**, **an't** I the **yellow** flower of the forest? And I'm all brimstone but the head, and that's aquafortis! **Says he**, stranger, you're a beauty, and if I only **know'd** your name, I'd vote for you next election. **Says I**, my name is Nimrod Wildfire – half horse, half alligator, and a touch of the **airthquake** – that's got the prettiest sister, fattest horse, and ugliest dog in the district, and can out run, out jump, throw down, drag out and whip any man in all **Kentuck**!*

(Blair 1960: 281)

Text: Frontier speech: “The Boast”

The linguistic features which this text reveals are only generally regional inasmuch as this may be seen as a fairly representative example of the English of the Old Southwest, the section of the United States that was the geographic southwest before the trans-Mississippi addition of the Louisiana Purchase (1803). The region includes parts of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee as well as trans-Mississippi Texas and Arkansas, but probably extends considerably farther to the north. More to the point, the language is socially marked, representing a type of person often considered (by the (sub)urban Middle Class) to be rural (hicks), uneducated (ignoramuses), and unpolished (boors). The use of “grandiloquent” language, that is, high-sounding but otherwise non-existent words (*slantindicular*, *tetotaciously exfluncuated*) belongs to this tradition.

Blair, W. (1960 [1931]) *Native American Humor*. NY: Chandler.

Botkin, B.A. (1983 [1944]) *A Treasury of American Folklore. Stories, Ballads, and Traditions of the People*. NY: Bonanza Books.

Spelling (see Chapter 4 *Spelling in Middle English (and beyond)*)

Working class literature

in the nineteenth century must be seen from two perspectives, that of socially critical authors who wrote about the working class with great sympathy, but from their own perspective and writers who were themselves members of the working class. Among the former we find the pro-Chartist novels of Kingsley (*Alton Locke*, 1850), Disraeli (*Sybil, Or the Two Nations*, 1845), and Gaskell (*Mary Barton, A Tale of Manchester Life*, 1848 or *North and South*, 1854).

Elizabeth Gaskell

It is from Gaskell that the following short excerpt has been taken. It is a first interchange between a young Southern English woman and Nicholas Higgins, the father of a young and sick Northern English girl. Here the Northerner Higgins is a mill worker in the fictional town of Milton (= Manchester). His language shows numerous features of the English of the North.

“Where do you live? I think we must be neighbours, we meet so often on this road.”
 “We put up at nine Frances Street, second turn to th’left at after yo’ve past th’Goulden Dragon.”
 “And your name? I must not forget that.”
 “I’m none ashamed o’ my name. It’s Nicholas Higgins. Hoo’s [She’s] called Bessy Higgins. Whatten yo’ asking for?”

(from Elizabeth Gaskell. *North and South*, p. 54)

The latter group can best be seen in the emergence of the popular press and WC literature in the nineteenth century. Among writers with direct experience of poverty and the exploitation of child labor the most prominent was **Charles Dickens**.

Charles Dickens

(1812–1870) came from a family that struggled to survive under straitened circumstances in the 1820s. The impressions this left on young Charles shaped his attitudes and provided many of his themes and characters. Example: *Hard Times* (1854), which pillories both the hard-working self-made man and the self-seeking leader of the highly exploited striking workers. Novels by Dickens are well known for their sympathetic but somewhat paternalistic sketches of working class life. See Text 8.3: from *The Pickwick Papers* (1837).

In the US, pointedly labor-oriented literature has never been widespread and did not generally appear until later than in Great Britain. Writers like Upton Sinclair and other muck-rakers in the first decade of the twentieth century touched on the problems of labor. And writers like Clifford Odets did so more directly with his play *Waiting for Lefty* (1935) in the 1930s.

Māori English and NZE

Ethnic varieties are prominent in all three southern hemisphere ENLs, as pointed out throughout chapter 8 and again especially in chapter 12. In Australia there are varieties often identified with Aboriginal Australians,

viz. Aboriginal English, Kriol, and Torres Straits Creole. In New Zealand Māori English is recognized as a distinct variety (see Warren and Bauer 2004 on its phonology). Hulme's 1985 prize-winning novel *The Bone People* is set on South Island and revolves intensely about interaction between Pakehas (Europeans, whites) and Māoris. Joe is one of the three main protagonists, a Māori. He has called Kerewin, a Pakeha, on the telephone. They refer to Joe's "adopted" son Haimona/Himi. Piri is Joe's *coz* (cousin).

New Zealand English (cum Māori)

On Wednesday, Joe rang at midday.

"Hello, guess who's got the afternoon off?"

"You, by the sound of it." ...

"E ka pai ... well, I thought you might like a drink at the pub. Not like last time," he says hastily, "hell, was I ever sorry about that ... I was almost glad Himi was hurt, because it meant I didn't have to stay round too long."

5

"I'm an ogre?" she asks incredulously.

"O no," he sounds shocked. "What I meant was that I had behaved badly, and you knew it, and I knew it, and I knew you knew it."

"Well, to say something very original, that morning I knew you know I know you know, you know. So to speak."

He giggles.

10

"You do have a knack of saying things so unequivocally."

"Shuddup. I'll see you down at the Duke in about an hour?"

"Beaudy." ...

And this afternoon is flowing along nicely on small talk and beer. Two in a row, great! she thinks.

Then Piri comes over.

"Giddyay," she says, grinning happily.

15

"Giddyay," he replies, with a grin for her ...

"Get up. I want to talk to you."

Joe puts his schooner down slowly. "Why? I'm drinking with Kerewin. What's so important that you think you can interrupt us?"

"You know bloody well what. Excuse us, Kere."

"Okay," she says with surprise.

20

(The Bone People, pp. 131f; Picador edition of 1986)

There is, in fact, little in this text that reflects Māori English aside from the short phrase in Māori (*E ka pai* (l. 4) "good, great, thanks, mate"). Consequently, this is realistic since most Māoris use English that is only occasionally different from Pakeha English. In general, the text has a NZE tone to it as indicated by the spellings *Shuddup*, *beaudy*, and *giddyay* (12, 13, 15f), which indicate the T-Flapping of NZE (§11.2.3). The pragmatic aspects are among the most obvious features of the text: the Māori phrase, the Australasian greeting (*giddyay*), the mild, but typical expletive *bloody well* and not just the use of first names among these recent acquaintances, but the hypocoristic shortening *Kere* (< Kerewin; cf. Simpson 2004).

Simpson, J. (2004) "Hypocoristics in Australian English," in: E.W. Schneider, K. Burridge, B. Kortmann, R. Mesthrie, and C. Upton (eds.) *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. vol. 2. *Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 643–656.

Warren, P. and L. Bauer (2004) “Maori English: Phonology,” in: E.W. Schneider, K. Burrage, B. Kortmann, R. Mesthrie, and C. Upton (eds.) *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. vol. 1. *Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 614–624.

US language policy

Implicit policy

The United States is consensually English-speaking. 98% of the population rates itself as at least minimally fluent in English. The traditional expectation has been that schools and the school system solve the task of somehow making everyone into fluent users of English. All the while the maintenance of the home languages was seen as a private – and week-end – problem, often implemented within a religious tradition. **Example:** in the 1960s 80% (= around 2000) of church-sponsored schools (Roman Catholic, Orthodox Christians, Jews, and some Protestant groups) offered some ethnic language teaching (Fillmore 2004: 340f). Consequently, English is imposed as part of the exercise of everyday social control. However, literacy in English has sometimes been a prerequisite for the right to vote meaning that language policy is hegemonic; it also has had a gate-keeper function.

Types of policy

Promotion-oriented: Public institutions (especially the government) use English for its laws and its administration.

Expediency-oriented: Transitional bilingualism facilitates education and political access and guarantees legal rights.

Tolerance-oriented: A kind of laissez-faire policy exists as in the case of German, which from the 1600s until the First World War was widely tolerated.

Restriction-oriented: Access to social, political and economic benefits depends on the knowledge of English.

Repression-oriented: Deculturation and linguistic genocide has been practiced on African slaves, Indians, and Germans during and after World War I.

Language planning

“Language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes” (Cooper 1989: 45). This includes *corpus planning*, which has to do with standardization, regularization, or codification (see §8.1.1). It also includes *status planning*, which regulates the use of languages in various domains (official, semi-official, regional languages). All in all, the United States has had a policy of tolerance (laissez-faire) and has never had *national* legislation making English the official language. This is the case because the dominance of English was self-evident, there was a general respect for the rights of minorities, and there was a need to co-opt non-English-speaking groups.

The Bilingual Education Act

is a federal law recognizing the lack of knowledge of English as a long-standing educational problem in a basically monolingual English system. The Bilingual Education Act (actually Title VII of the Elementary Secondary Education Act as elaborated by the Lau guidelines of 1975) insured bilingual education for the Limited English Proficient.

The Lau Guidelines

In the case *Lau v. Nichols* (against the San Francisco United School District) the plaintiff argued that lack of linguistic access to education was a violation of the XIV Amendment (Equal Protection) and of §601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 against discrimination “on the grounds of race, color, or of national origin.” In its findings the Supreme Court saw discrimination in the effective removal of children unable to use English from participation in the schools’ educational program. Having the same textbooks, teachers, curriculum, etc. was not enough: The Lau guidelines mandated access to the content of teaching *in a language known by the children* but also school time to learn English as a second language (Fillmore 2004: 344f).

California had passed the Chacon-Moscone Bilingual Education Act of 1976, which mandated bilingual education where there were ten or more non-English speakers (or 15+ LEP students). It also made a language census necessary in schools. In some districts bilingual education was carried out well; but not everywhere. By 1997 about 30% of those who needed bilingual educational aid were getting it in some form or other. The return of opposition came in the form of Proposition 227 in 1998 (ibid.: 351f) as we see in the following chronicle.

Chronicle of anti-immigrant/anti-diversity initiatives (especially in California)

- **English-only movement** emerged in the 1980s (e.g. Virginia declared English its official language in 1981).
- **1986:** Proposition 63: English the only official language in California; no other language allowed in public documents and meetings
- **1994:** Proposition 187 “denied social services, health services, and other services to the children of undocumented immigrants” (Fillmore 2004 [editors’ introduction]: 339)
- **1998:** Proposition 227: eliminates bilingual education for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students; it also limits LEP students to one year of support in learning English (passed 61% to 39%) (Fillmore 2004: 354)
- **2006:** “The U.S. Senate voted for two separate amendments to make English the national language and to make it the common unifying language of the country.” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English-Only_movement) This amendment was never adopted.

Backlash against bilingual education

Hostility toward bilingual education has come to be associated with Spanish-speaking immigrants, as seen in the adoption in California of Proposition 187 in 1994. The proposal passed 59% to 41% (Fillmore 2004: 350), but was overturned as unconstitutional in 1997 in a federal court. Of course, with 25% of its residents foreign-born (a third of all the foreign-born in the US) the fear of “native Americans” of being overrun was perhaps understandably strong. After Proposition 227 passed, little changed in districts which wanted to continue with bilingual education programs since the initiative allowed parents to petition for it – and this was actually encouraged in such districts (ibid.: 356).

Still, immigration continues and language diversity exists along with it. Is the status of English threatened? The arguments pro and contra:

A: A polyglot country is good because it stimulates “intellectual abilities and skills” and is “an asset in a global economy.”

B: Yet it may interfere with “the need for ‘national identity’ and ‘cultural homogeneity’ in a nation that has absorbed millions of immigrants” (Rumbaut 2007: 2).

Some say that B is the case when “contemporary immigrants are not assimilating linguistically, particularly Spanish-speakers from Latin America in areas of dense ethnic concentration.”

Huntington's hypothesis

Huntington (2004) argued “that the arrival of Latin American immigrants in large numbers during the last three decades of the 20th century threaten the core of American identity and culture in the 21st century.” This, he says, is so because

- “they all speak a common language”;
- “they are regionally concentrated and residentially segregated”;
- “and they are less interested in linguistic and cultural assimilation”

Yet: the US “has probably incorporated more bilingual people than any other nation in the world since the time of Franklin [18th century]” (ibid.: 2). Is the US a “graveyard for languages” since nowhere else is “the rate of mother tongue shift toward (English) monolingualism” so fast as in the US? (ibid.: 3). “Contrary to Huntington's assertions, even the nation's largest Spanish-speaking enclave, within a border region that historically belonged to Mexico, Spanish for all intents and purposes appears to be well on the way to a quiet natural death by the third generation of U.S. residence.” (Rumbaut 2007: 23) Or: “As can be seen, irrespective of which definition is considered, no mother tongue can be expected to survive beyond the third generation given the linguistic survival probabilities now prevailing in Southern California” (ibid.: 24). For many Asian languages such as Chinese, Vietnamese, and Korean the life expectancy narrows to 1.5 to 2.0 generations (ibid.: 25). Rumbaut cautiously concedes: “It is possible that Spanish will be retained more in the future because it is no longer negatively stigmatized in schools; because continuous immigration creates more opportunities to speak Spanish in the future; or because Spanish-language media become increasingly prevalent over time” (ibid.: 25f).

Language maintenance

Ethnolinguistic Vitality (EV) is defined according to demographics, status, institutional-support factors, number of speakers, standardization, literary tradition, governmental or educational status. EV is “that which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in intergroup situations” (Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor 1977: 308). If group members have a positive estimation of EV, this has a positive effect on language use patterns. “Wherever there is bilingualism there is always a power differential between the languages involved – simply because access to sources of power ... are not equally distributed” (Myers-Scotton 2002: 52). This can result in structural convergence (esp. of the less powerful language).

Attitudes toward bilingualism

People espouse bilingualism strongly or very strongly (approx. 75%), yet they feel that English is “the common national language” that “unites all Americans.” This is, effectively, “English-*plus*.” Positive aspects of bilingualism are that “knowledge of a foreign tongue represents a scarce resource in a global economy”; furthermore, it has a role as part of a particular cultural heritage (Rumbaut 2007: 26). Yet, English is necessary for socioeconomic mobility and full participation in the adoptive society, esp. since there is “immense pressure for linguistic conformity on immigrant children from peers, schools and the media” (ibid.: 27).

- Cooper, R. L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: CUP.
- English Only Movement at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English-Only_movement
- Fillmore, L.W. (2004) "Language in Education," in: E. Finegan and J.R. Rickford (eds.) *Language in the USA. Themes for the Twenty-first Century*. Cambridge: CUP, 339–360.
- Giles, H., R. Bourhis, and D. Taylor (1977) "Towards a Theory of Language in Ethnic Group Ethnic Group Relations," in H. Giles (ed.) *Language, Ethnicity*. London: Academic Press, 307–348.
- Huntington, S. (2004) *Who Are We: The Challenges to America's National Identity*. NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: OUP.
- Rumbaut, Rubén G. (2007) "The Evolution of Language Competencies, Preferences and Use among Immigrants and Their Children in the United States Today," prepared for the US House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, border Security, and International Law. Hearing on Comprehensive Immigration Reform and U.S. Immigrant Integration, at: <http://www.aila.org/content/fileviewer.aspx?docid=22933&linkid=163643>.

Wales and East Anglia

Wales

apart from its accent, has developed in a way similar to the Southwest. This may be seen in the use of habitual *do/did* + V and of a quite varied paradigm for the present tense of the verbs *have* and *be*. For the former there is the use of *hath* throughout the present tense as in *I'th, ye'th, we hath* and for *be* there is *I be, theel thou bist* (also *thee art*), *shel wel theyl them be* (note pronoun exchange; see §10.2.2) These forms coexist with the parallel use of non-standard *am*, cf. *youl aml wel they am*. Third person singular masculine *he* has an unstressed form *a*, which was common in EModE. The use of *'en/un/n* as an unstressed object pronoun for the third person masculine and neuter also indicates the retention of earlier forms since this presumably originated from OE *hine* by aitch-dropping and loss of final schwa. The Celtic substrate also shows up in the use of prepositions, e.g. *there's a special name on that*, in the use of indirect question word order, e.g. *I don't know what time is it*, and in the use of the generalized, invariable tag question *isn't it?* (Penhallurick 2004: 103ff).

- Penhallurick, R. (2004) "Welsh English: Morphology and Syntax," in: B. Kortmann, K. Burridge, R. Mesthrie, E.W. Schneider, C. Upton (eds.) *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. vol. 2 *Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 102–113.

East Anglia

Here as in the South(west), the past tense of lexical *do* may be *done* while the past of auxiliary *do* is *did*, cf. *you done it, did you?* *Ought* occurs with *do*-periphrasis. Note also the form of *be* used when presenting oneself or another: *Here I be! Here he be!* (Trudgill 2004: 143f). There are also a number of further points such as the prevalence of Yod Dropping in words like *music*, *pew*, and *beauty*. *Ain't* is *in't*. A few irregular non-standard noun plurals may be heard: *housen*, *meece* ("mice"). *What* is used as a definite relative pronoun (ibid.: 146–152).

- Trudgill, P. (2004) "The Dialect of East Anglia: Morphology and Syntax," in: B. Kortmann, K. Burridge, R. Mesthrie, E.W. Schneider, C. Upton (eds.) *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. vol. 2 *Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 142–153.