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Language Ideology, Policy, and Planning in Peru

Yuliana H. Kenfield
University of New Mexico

If you’re curious about modern policy and ideologies towards indigenous Andean languages, Serafin M. Coronel-Molina’s *Language Ideology, Policy, and Planning in Peru* offers a solid analysis of the efforts involved in maintaining and revitalizing Quechua, an official language of Peru. The Andeans of Latin America have spoken sixteen variations of the Quechuan language family since pre-colonial times, and Quechua remains a vital *lingua franca* for over one-third of the modern Peruvian population. Born in the Quechuan city of Huancayo, Coronel-Molina is an associate professor at Indiana University, Bloomington, with extensive research in Quechuan linguistics. Using ethnography of communication to frame his observations about language ideologies, he addresses the actions of the High Academy of the Quechua Language (HAQL) Cusco, Peru.

Coronel-Molina sets the scene by providing an overview of current policies and initiatives for the revitalization and maintenance of the Quechua languages in Peru, activities that have evolved before and since Spanish colonization. He outlines archival evidence to illustrate numerous sociocultural and historical scenarios that have endangered present-day forms of Peruvian Quechua. Presenting official documentation about its foundation and by-laws, Coronel-Molina introduces the High Academy of the Quechua Language (HAQL) and highlights two of its major ideologies: the purism of Qosqo-Collao Quechua and the Inkanismo. From his perspective, these ideologies of the Academy explain both the failures and potential opportunities for revitalizing the Quechuan languages. Coronel-Molina delineates how the essentialist Quechuan purist and Inkanismo ideologies are rooted in the Inka past of HAQL members and how they hinder the HAQL’s ability to preserve and sustain all the dialects present in the numerous Quechuan communities of the Andean world. While HAQL members see the Inkanismo as an important movement which strengthened the Andean peoples’ identity and self-esteem, Coronel-Molina believes Inkanismo offers modern Andean people only a fantasy that impedes concrete actions for revitalizing their Quechuan languages.

After examining historical and modern ideologies about Quechua, Coronel-Molina provides an analysis of the Corpus and Status Planning of the HAQL, particularly its work expanding domains of use for Quechua. He emphasizes its critical role in raising the status of the entire Quechua language family to a single dialect or sociolect. Coronel-Molina also provides rich, representative examples of HAQL’s practices, penning critical comments regarding status planning. In particular, he critiques the Inka-centered ideology of the HAQL through its participation in the theatrical performance of *Inti Raymi*, the
Inka’s festival for the sun, as a strategy for raising the status of Quechua. Coronel-Molina sees this strategy as useless because it focuses only on historical customs while excluding contemporary Quechuan culture. Moreover, he posits that the planning efforts of the HAQL depict primarily the Cusco sociopolitical region, omitting national and regional inputs. He follows these critiques with his own illustrations of the Quechua writing systems (an important inclusion that may interest grammarians and linguists). Coronel-Molina examines and exemplifies the differences between the Quechuan five-vowel alphabet writing system developed by the HAQL and the Quechuan three-vowel alphabet system that several other linguists advocate. (Cerron-Palomino, 1980; Hornberger, 1995; Krogel, 2010) For Coronel-Molina, HAQL’s sole use of the five-vowel written Quechua earmarks their regionalist-centric ideology.

Summing up his outlook, Coronel-Molina focuses on the pedagogical strategies applied by the HAQL. He not only describes in detail HAQL’s curriculum and teaching goals, he also includes his own observations of the teacher-student interactions during Quechua lessons. For him, the prevailing teacher-centered instructional approach was a major stumbling block, since it inhibited student engagement. Coronel-Molina also points out the shortcomings due to HAQL’s lack of a permanent location; as a result, some sessions would take place in different venues, many of which were not conducive to learning.

His final recommendation to the Academy: be open to work with outside experts and collaborate with other institutions that share the goal of maintaining and revitalizing the Quechua languages. From his viewpoint, the HAQL members isolated themselves to serve their own circle in the urban city of Cusco and excluded the rural Quechuan communities in Peru. His final chapter summarizes his own recommendations to the HAQL and again illustrates his evaluative stand that HAQL’s ideology seems not to reflect an ethnographic approach.

The key strength of this book is that it encourages readers to reflect on diaglossic creations, the use of one language variation over a second language variation which, in this case, was caused by HAQL’s ideological bias. This diaglossic phenomenon is rooted in HAQL members’ historical pride in their Inkan ancestors, a pride which creates an imaginary divide between the Quechua spoken by the Inka and that spoken by current indigenous speakers. Coronel-Molina examines the negative implications of positioning the Qhapaq Simi or Inka Quechua as the purest Quechua dialect by the Academy members in stating, “…in insisting on the superiority of their Inca Quechua sociolect instead of recognizing the value spoken by the people, they [HAQL members] create dichotomies between … pure or authentic and corrupted or distorted language” (p.125). Coronel-Molina’s discussion on its poor community-outreach practices could also help explain the disconnection with the indigenous Quechua communities of Peru and the HAQL.

In his effort to illustrate the ideological stands of the HAQL, Coronel-Molina makes an important note about the sociopolitical aspects of this indigenous region of Cusco (e.g., neo-indigenismo, a movement in Latin America which seeks inclusion of indigenous peoples in social and political participation). He provides the sociocultural context to help the reader understand the resistance of the HAQL to outside linguistic expertise. Further, he offers some hints helping readers understand HAQL’s resistance to outside
help by the Academy’s rejection of suggestions for standardizing the written Quechua system in Peru.

Coronel-Molina’s analysis of the research data seem to reflect more of an evaluative approach to research than an ethnographic approach to understanding. For example, he introduces very prescriptive research questions from his study: What expectations does the public have of the HAQL, and how do these affect its activities in the three spheres of language planning? What kinds of projects does the HAQL carry out, and with whom does it collaborate to achieve them? In what ways, if any, does it work with other regional and international branches of the Academy, local schools and top-down institutions, such as government planning agencies and non-government organizations? These questions do not reflect an interest in understanding how the HQLA goes about language policy and planning; rather they set an evaluative tone about whether the HQLA meets the expectations of the scholar from a purely linguistic viewpoint. Coronel-Molina states that the goal of his ethnographic study was “to understand the contribution to Quechua language planning, maintenance and revitalization made by the HQLA” (p. 4). However, throughout the book, he frames the practices of the HQLA without presenting their perspective or letting HQLA members illustrate their realities and their own reasoning. He repeatedly presents a dichotomous choice: Should we or should we not value the contributions of the Academy? This leaves me with the sense that this work was an evaluative one and not a deeply descriptive one.

In sum, Language Ideology, Policy and Planning in Peru will be useful for linguistic scholars, language maintenance researchers, and language academy leaders, especially in Andean countries and Latin America, a region of keen emphasis not only on the language policy, planning, and pedagogy of Quechua, but also on the politics of language. In developing language policy and planning of endangered languages, Coronel-Molina has opened a discussion of critical relations between language academies and their purist language ideologies—a discussion which can give birth to forms of double diaglossia. If we extend this discussion, we can begin to critically self-analyze our micro- and macro-linguistic practices, practices that might be exclusionary to speech communities that we want to serve.
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