Deping Lu*

Crossing in linguistic communication

Abstract: Although "crossing" as a new concept comes from Rampton's seminal work, this article argues that crossing defines linguistic communication in a perspective of process, act, and especially change. As a controlling principle for linguistic communication, it might be in a different way complementary to Husserl's shared sense, Habermas's reaching understanding, and Searle's shared intentionality. Crossing denotes changes in phase, sphere, and universe, characterizing the process of communication and having a meaningful value for continuing interpersonal relationship and reinforcing communicative competence. Crossing is also constitutive of communicative order both in monolingual contexts and in superdiversity multilingual settings. Against the backdrop of globalization, a new communicative order is being shaped in the reality of mobility and diversity. This new order of linguistic communication is characterized by dramatic code-switching, rhetorical mirror effect, and focus on linguistic medium. The mobility of human resources requires crossing to take creative strategies to achieve what monolingual crossing could not.

Keywords: crossing; linguistic communication; meaning; semiotic device

1 Introduction

It is common to see one person speaking to another, and being spoken to in turn, but it is less common to see through what happened prior to and is occurring within the speaking process. It is precisely through speaking that one person discloses himself to another by virtue of the linguistic channel that he has just opened. The other, who decides to act as an interlocutor, has actually ratified the link to the linguistic channel which the speaker has in anticipation opened. In ratifying this linguistic link, the interlocutor will at least make an initial assessment of the speaker's intention, deciding to accept the message conveyed. Ratifying the link requires speech maintenance for the purpose of further understanding whatever is behind or beyond the speaker's words. Here, the speaker's move incites a response from the hearer, and the hearer begins to take the role of the speaker (Mead 1962).

*Corresponding author: Deping Lu**, Beijing Language and Culture University, Beijing, China, E-mail: dplu_dplu@163.com

Under such conditions, a flow of communication starts and moves along. This sketch is typically an outline of a real situation of linguistic communication in our society.

Nonetheless, no description like this can claim the right to having proffered an illustration of the nature of linguistic communication. Linguistic communication should in nature be taken as "things […] pass[ing] from the plane of external pushing and pulling to that of revealing themselves to man, and thereby to themselves" (Dewey 1929: 166). The point of what a person does through communication resides in the process leading from the exterior to the interior. It does not simply rest on any exterior linguistic flow, but also presents self in interpersonal encounter, and represents thinking with semiotic devices. Conceiving linguistic communication in this way might help us more closely approach the nature of linguistic communication. The point of linguistic communication can be represented as "crossing," which we want to discuss following Rampton (2005). However, in differentiation from Rampton, this concept is not confined to the "use of language varieties associated with social or ethnic groups that the speaker doesn't normally 'belong' to" (Rampton 2005: 28), but is taken as one that denotes the basic infrastructure of linguistic communication. Crossing is not merely helpful to stake out the issue, but also illustrative of situated linguistic communication. It encapsulates speech acts of sorts and reflects the whole process of linguistic communication, including the prior status, ongoing process, and effect after linguistic activity. The point at issue of crossing is concerned with changes in the speaker and listener with regard to personality in the individual sense, sociability in the social sense, and knowledge in the informational sense. The person who speaks creates a change in status, such as a shift from silence to speaking, and a transformation in the person to whom he is speaking, such as *he* or *she* becoming *thou* in dialogue (Buber 1937), and agreement in the intersubjective relationship (Husserl 2001), such as shared intentionality (Searle 1992) or mutual understanding (Habermas 1998) reached in communication.

As Dewey pointed out, communication alters things discursively and confers them in a semiotic way with the meanings which were absent before: "where communication exists, things in acquiring meaning, thereby acquire representatives, surrogates, signs and implicates" (Dewey 1929: 167). Because an understanding of others is reached mostly through communication (Merleau-Ponty 1964), crossing, as a semiotic process, embodies the meaningful function of exchange between oneself and others. In crossing, a person consummates his communicative purpose, and his dialogue partner also begins to know the ulterior meaning inside the motivation of speaking to him. It is by crossing that participation in communication shows its value in conforming to the social norms of dialogue. The speaker actively takes off his face veil through linguistic presentation, so that he discloses his inner situation consciously or unconsciously,

somewhat combined with the response of the hearer. Only in this way could the hearer afford to judge whether the speaker is truthful or not in the communication.

The concept of crossing renders linguistic communication available not merely as including speech acts in terms of Austin (Austin 1962), but much more beyond speech acts. It focuses on process-oriented change, which stipulates what a speaker or listener should do, and what kind of experience he or she might undergo. This crossing experience accrued in linguistic communication seems relevant to individual growth in society. Crossing requires an initial change from the speaker, while societal convention safeguards the change toward the purpose of communication. Put simply, when a person speaks to somebody else in a way conventional to social norms, the other person spoken to has to shift to the social role of interlocutor, as represented in linguistic response.

2 Semiotic devices and transitions in crossing

During linguistic communication, what a person intends to complete is crossing from phase to phase, sphere to sphere, or even universe to universe. In linguistic communication, one seeks to realize changes in situation, identity, and specifically the outcome. As to the change in situation, one transfers from nonverbal silence to speech. It is precisely through this verbalized change that a speaker breaks through his voiceless totality and begins to verbally enter into infinity (Levinas 1969), which means a transference to the newly acquired communicative identity. This change in identity indicates that the speaker is considered as voluntarily communicating with another, and through speaking the person becomes able to share communication and be accepted. These changes in communication happen less spontaneously and are completed more often than not in a way of process. The person experiencing these changes has crossed from a previous state to a new one.

This initial link of silence with speaking is meaningful in exploration of the rules governing linguistic communication. Crossing should not be conceived as a linguistic act in itself, but rather represented as some meaningful transition. Precisely through mutual crossing, people arrive in a meaningful transition toward each other and finally reach an understanding. In a meaningful connection with a speech partner, the speaker changes himself positively. It is positive because the speaker has obtained a great deal from the crossing of others toward himself, and entering into another mentally and linguistically. In contrast, any halt or termination in crossing implies a hedge from conflicts in crossing, either in the initial phase or in the crossing process. Crossing seeks to consummate the connection of people and to enliven latent communication of silence, including mental penetration, sociability maintenance, and message conveying.

Motivation to crossing is multiple in dimension, but searching for changes for both speaker and interlocutor is mainly constitutive of the motivation. In crossing, the speaker changes from silence to speech with a verbal move. This means that the speaker begins to remove the silent screen from his face, setting this change exclusively for the person with whom he wants to communicate in a face-to-face way. He is carrying out a self-presentation toward the other by means of such a verbalized shift. The attitude of the interlocutor to the speaker's presentation enhances the content of this change. Response from the interlocutor speaks of his attitude. When a move incites a verbal response, the meaning of crossing arises from linguistic communication. A move acts as the active side of crossing, but a response is by no means passive. Since crossing is from one phase to the next, a response from the interlocutor really performs the role of collaboration to help finish the phase of crossing.

Undoubtedly, in the silence prior to speaking, linguistic communication has been rehearsed repetitively to confirm certainty of speaking: "Silence were but the modality of an utterance (Levinas 1969: 91)." The speaker has changed status from silence to speaking, and speaking itself implies that silence is only preparation for speaking to somebody. Just as Levinas ingeniously illustrated, "silence is not a simple absence of speech; speech lies in the depths of silence" (Levinas 1969: 91). One person has been thinking about what to say in silence. Silence as the initial phase of crossing fulfills a representational role, in imagination, in a mode of zero sign, projecting what would happen in communication. Change of silence to speaking could be rephrased as transference of probability to certainty in communication. Differing from speaking, silence in semiotic function could be taken as a preparation for the primary mode of communication as well (Lu 2019).

Solitude naturally does not restrain one from enhancing knowledge that is produced in contemplation. Yet, knowledge cannot be shared with others in solitude, and it must be merely enriched through the words spoken to him. Even if there is no linguistic response from others, one still perceives something from face-to-face encounter. Infinity is transcendent precisely because others are somewhere in the future, everything being undecided. Linguistic communication actually renders crossing active in opening in totality toward the infinite, which serves as the source of new experience and knowledge. The experience and knowledge one is to acquire from others are not simply analogous to what one has achieved through solitary contemplation.

A formulaic greeting signals just such a change in which the initiator believes he is obtaining a linguistic response from others. Reflection in silence becomes instinctive. This consciousness makes giving a timely response to greetings socially indispensable. Mutual crossing like this launches reciprocity in crossing. One participant crosses from speaking to silence and the other from silence to

speaking. A round of linguistic communication is completed. Silence is replaced by speaking, and only in this instant does silence become a sign, denoting that some latent communicative repertoire is being activated. Silence certainly means something that communicative participants can make sure of. In face-to-face interaction, communication starts from silence, but fills up the silence with linguistic discourse. Even from silence to speech, silence is still scattered across speech, in modes of lapsed turns of talk, tacit responses, and silent pauses in code-switching. It is crossing that spans between silence and speaking. It is through semiotic devices that crossing realizes these changes. As "intentional relation of representation" (Levinas 1969: 124), change from phase to phase indicates that the speaker has created a new infinite self, signaled with utterance, from that of closed totality, marked with silence. In short, phase crossing implies change from totality in silence to infinity in openness toward others. The infinity arises from communicating with others. When one person does not speak to any other, he is in total sameness enveloped by thinking. He can surmise, from intimations sent from others, what he should say to the person. However, if merely in contemplation, he cannot get anything from others, who send semiotic signals only in speaking.

Phase change is marked with words, such as polite inquiry about location when one walks to an unfamiliar place. The person to whom one speaks finds that the inquirer is like a person in the street and entirely irrelevant to him. He has however changed to the subjective status of *thou* in which this stranger wants to establish a face-to-face relationship with him. "Speech consists in the other coming to the assistance of the sign given forth" according to Levinas (1969: 91), so the words spoken to a person render this change inevitable because of social convention that obliges to the community members.

Regardless of mode difference, words and gaze can be similarly counted as semiotic devices which might be equally identified and understood in semiotic interpretation. But their pragmatic goals are quite different. A person being gazed at does not have a special duty to give any response to the other person who gazes at him. When a person goes into the street, being gazed at appears to be so general that it does not require any notice or response at all. By contrast, words of inquiry are specific to the person. The hearer knows that these words rather than the gaze are indications of what the speaker wants to express. He grasps these words when they are spoken to him, and surmises from the words something he does not yet know, but ought to know. The words of inquiry have a semiotic function different from what a gaze would have. In crossing from silent gaze to speaking, the speaker has to find a person who might satisfy his initiation of dialogue. The speaker has the communicative competence to find a partner and get what he wants to get. It is precisely in crossing that the speaker makes use of his experience of available

linguistic communication to link with the current situation, renewing his communicative experience after entering dialogue relationship.

The communicators learn a great deal from dialogue. This process consists of a comprehensive process of acting and reflection. A participant reflects on what he has heard, reshuffles the information, and integrates it into his cognition. In the words heard, the experience has been reproduced in discourse by the partner in linguistic communication. The communicative initiator has to penetrate the verbal cover in order to locate the truth of experience. Seen from this point of view, crossing is in the dilemma that one needs a verbal device to send a message, while the message receiver must simultaneously remove the verbal screen to understand what has been wrapped within it by the sender. This dilemma of communication is usually phrased in terms of encoding and decoding. However, what has been encoded and decoded is not merely the message to be conveyed, but rather mechanism that is to be concealed under crossing. This kind of dilemma requires the communication participants to face it simultaneously and resolve it together. The speaker has to cross this dilemma in order to reach a new phase, whereas the hearer as the communicative partner must respond to speaker as a social convention.

Semiotic devices, like linguistic signs, are indispensable to phase crossing. As Foucault (2002: 65) observed: "Knowledge always resided entirely in the opening up of a discovered, affirmed, or secretly transmitted, sign." Organizing and expressing experience, attitude, and information are integral to communicative crossing of content. The surrogate role of signs relevant to the communicative dilemma determines the twofold character of crossing. The communicators make instrumental use of signs for saying and thinking. This is related to silence and speaking. The twofold character implies that linguistic communication has to simultaneously undergo two processes, one concerned with phonation, wording, and grammatical organization, and another with thinking. In this sense, the twofold nature of crossing may be conceived as supplementary to Husserl's *shared sense*, Habermas's *reaching understanding*, and Searle's *shared intentionality* among others. Briefly, thinking is merely constitutive of one side of crossing at most.

Knowledge about breaking silence and starting off communication is communicative competence (Hymes 1972). Communicative competence includes linguistic competence, such as Chomsky's knowledge of grammar (Chomsky 1965), and informational competence, such as propositional truth in enunciation. Knowledge about crossing from silence to speaking should be added to this list. This competence is concerned with acute cognition of breaking silence in a timely manner and selecting speaking styles appropriate to the communicative situation. The person with such competence ought to know that silence is inner monologue,

or an alternate of dialogue. The linguistic unity of silence and speaking determines that silence as a potential speaking is able to be realized in phonetic contour, lexical option, and grammatical structure. Refusing to speak does not mean insufficient communicative competence. In comparison, speaking is vulnerable, whereas silence is powerful. Speaking is disclosing self to others. Keeping silence in linguistic communication is therefore a method of avoiding being in a vulnerable position. Seen from this standpoint, crossing actually means a mutual effort to speak rather than any escape through silence. Breaking silence in the initial crossing phase by speaking in a reciprocal manner naturally becomes a rational social option in linguistic communication.

Change from sphere to sphere means that the speaker crosses from one communicative sphere (Bakhtin 1986) to another using linguistic devices. For instance, he might push linguistic communication from verbal ritual (Goffman 1976) to formal discussion, or transform communicative flow from business formalities to amicable talk. Along with this transformation, linguistic communication is more often than not represented as an ensemble of multiple spheres of communication. These spheres constitute communication chains mapping out social communicative reality.

A person crosses communicative spheres either within one stretch of communication or between communicative stretches. Whatever any crossing of spheres this may be, it requires participants to make adjustment in focusing on propositional content in one sphere, or on smoothing intersubjective relationship in another. Interpersonal verbal rituals like formulaic greetings might complete the communicative function through temporarily establishing an intersubjective relationship instead of a continuous message exchange. As Goffman succinctly illustrated, "part of the force of these speech acts comes from the feelings they directly index; little of the force derives from the semantic content of the words" (Goffman 1976: 269). Usually, nothing is to be told in greeting a person, but formulaic greetings are sufficient as responses at a working site for example.

No less than this, although multiple spheres wrap up linguistic communication in the form of fluid contours, they still exist analytically in a structural relation. Some of the communicative spheres perform a function of bracketing other spheres in a way of meta-communication (Bateson 1972). But it is not easy to give the whole of linguistic communication consisting of communicative chains a consensual definition. It is precisely in this way that semiotic devices such as modified pitch in pronunciation, shortening or lengthening in sentence sequence, thematic shifting and the like indicate that communicative participants have crossed from one sphere to another. Since "thematic content, style, and compositional structure – are inseparably linked to the whole of the utterance" (Bakhtin 1986: 60), each sphere within the communicative flux has an inherent consistency in contrast to

adjacent others. Therefore, once a person succeeds in shifting to the present sphere, a formally informational exchange might consequently be changed to an informal talk, or vice versa. Along with sphere change, the participants develop linguistic communication in a new framework.

Stylization of these semiotic devices serves as a marker of the sphere change and refers to the extent to which communicative participants have developed their communicative competence (Hymes 1972). The semiotic devices stylized for dividing, bracketing, and shifting communicative spheres include wording modification in conversational organization and nonverbal signals. Communicative competence is developed exclusively in the society in which the person being spoken to lives. From a communicative point of view, sociability has actually been maintained and enhanced in the shifting of multiple spheres. Attitude to information exchange and interpersonal relationship is expressed by way of shift. Sociability tends to be kept in the forms of "being with and for one another" (Simmel 1971: 24) instead of the concrete content of proposition. Some of the linguistic factors are utilized to refer to the function of information exchange, disparate from those of keeping interpersonal relationship. In contrast, some would be predominantly used to referring to the sociability-oriented function. Only through excluding pragmatic purpose can sociability be established between communicators and conferred with a communicative value as being capable of dividing communicative spheres. Stylization rather than thematic content plays this role of communicative sphere dividing. Communication in terms of crossing across spheres means differentiating between the planes of the communicative act. Since meaning arises through communication (Dewey 1929: chap. v), the meanings brought about in transference between communicative spheres can be conceived as characterization of the crossing process.

It is worthwhile to point out that communicative competence is by no means enhanced in a single speech event, but developed dynamically through multiple sphere shifts. The participants in communication try to bracket their message flux by shifting toward a consensus goal. They might alleviate some embarrassment arising in former spheres, bracketing the whole communication in a new way. Once one of the spheres in a stretch of linguistic communication is selected by the participants to set the ensemble of communicative episodes in a meta-communication framework, the attitudes toward the communicative acts can reach a mutually acceptable outcome. This may determine whether or not they will launch communication anew in the future. Communicative chains therefore possess a temporal dimension to mirror the lasting rhythm of interpersonal relationships. In short, crossing serves to structurally combine sub-communicative spheres and to temporally link future communication with the present sphere.

Universe crossing denotes semiotic traveling. In linguistic communication, people enter mutually into each other's discourse universes. Apart from the physical setting, communicators are trying to establish a communicative context. It is precisely in this context that communication becomes a semiotic platform on which one person is able to move to another person's discourse universe. Back-channel signals, polite or complimentary meta-linguistic words, and friendly nonverbal signs together render this semiotic platform sustainable in the time limit of the communication that every participant agrees on. In crossing over this discursive channel, communicative members demarcate the boundary of the discursive universe in which they agree to share sense, but exclusive to non-members or to the people whose communicative membership is yet to be temporally ratified. Membership in this discursive universe is claimed by virtue of speaking to somebody else and in waiting for a response. The person who speaks to somebody else and gets ratification from the hearer, is in a privileged status. He has appropriated discursive power in deciding the topic, rhythm, and style of the situated communication. Crossing becomes a social right in communication life.

Obviously, crossing may be stratified in function into individual and social dimensions, although such stratification is empirically difficult. Any crossing by virtue of semiotic devices is traced back initially to crossing within the person themselves, which implies creating a new change in self totality, configuring interior experiences after crossing, and building status between the semiotic crossing and the interpersonal relationship. Such in-between changes are social, consequently endowing crossing with a social feature. Communication seems to be highly optional before linguistic exchange, but limited in entering into linguistic communication. Crossing sets a person in the association of free individuals and constrained in communication sociability.

This classification of crossing is a theoretical attempt at a description rather than an empirical study. However, empirical evidence provides defense for the validity claimed for conceptual structuring. Once we move to linguistic phenomena, findings in linguistics, in particular in the ethnography of communication, soundly testify to the principle of crossing. Gumperz propounded the concept of "contextualization cues" (Gumperz 1982: 130–152) to combine background information or knowledge with linguistic signs. In order to reach successful communication, a person in linguistic communication has to think about the semiotic signals sent to identify the situation of the partner prior to linguistic communication. Penetrating through semiotic cues to background information reflects the twofold nature of communicative crossing. The experience acquired through crossing has the characteristic of thickness, which requires crossing to anchor simultaneously in experience at two levels. Level penetrating crossing is to reduce

thickness, rendering experience transparent for understanding and transferal. Crossing stipulates what is constitutive of the infrastructure of linguistic communication in daily life. Since the complexity of communication is related to the diversity of everyday life, crossing as the core concept of linguistic communication ought to be transformed into concrete communicative practices, contributing to the communicative habitus specific to a community, society or a culture (Bourdieu 1977). It is precisely in this thinking that crossing in linguistic communication is characterized by the "semiosphere" (Lotman 2005), which functions to surround crossing in a semiotic realm, demarcated by virtue of exclusive membership in a society or culture. The validity for communication is claimed for social practice (Habermas 1998). Realizing and maintaining communication is entirely claiming validity for a society. This is the communicative reality.

3 Crossing across the linguistic boundary

We have illustrated the features and function of crossing basically on the ground of an ideal linguistic community, regardless of divergences between stratified social groups and those between different linguistic code systems. Except for social factors, linguistic habitus somewhat stabilizes the communicative barriers between social groups, as illustrated in terms of Bernstein's "restricted codes" and "elaborated codes" (Bernstein 2003). However, crossing across social barriers might help overcome the obstruction hampering communicative equality and freedom. The obstacles are either vertical or horizontal. A vertical impasse in communication is brought about by deficient commonness of voice in specialty-oriented divisions of social labor, whereas a horizontal impasse stems from voice repression under the pressure of a hierarchical social structure.

The crossing of linguistic communication requires effort on both the vertical and horizontal levels. It horizontally enlarges the scope of communication by increasing speaking opportunities among multiple social members. It also needs to vertically foreground expressions of lower social class, rendering the non-meaning of the discourse of subjugated groups meaningful to the subject group (Guattari 2015). In the words of Guattari, crossing as "transversality in the group is a dimension opposite and complementary to the structures that generate pyramidal hierarchization and sterile ways of transmitting messages" (Guattari 2015: 118). However, crossing such as this is too idealized to perform in a real society. The issue in question in a pyramidal structure of social order is not just that the subject group must hear from the subjugated, but also that the subjugated group has to let their opinions be heard by the subject group who controls the society.

"Development of the relation of forces" (Guattari 2015: 77) requires linguistic crossing to act as a social mission. All social members ought to work toward this goal.

Nonetheless, crossing horizontally across multiple social members and vertically across hierarchical social groups means social practice, but does not mean immediately dismantling the barriers among social members or groups. This does not deny that crossing in linguistic communication requires social conditions to be met. Multiple instances of communication, the situation of cross-group communication, and transversality over a society might help alleviate the tension in communication, both horizontally and vertically. Apparently, crossing is integral to linguistic communication and significant to the extent that it will configure social contact between people in a better way. Linguistic contact, mutual understanding, and sociability growth are expected from crossing in terms of Guattari's social transversality.

What we have discussed is basically crossing in an idealized linguistic community, characterized by monolingual speech. Beyond the monolingual boundary, crossing across different languages implies a great deal beyond what we have seen against a monolingual background. The stylization of crossing proposed by Rampton (2005, 2009) may be a heuristic tool for us to examine crossing between linguistic codes. Crossing from local vernacular English to Panjabi, creole, and stylized Asian English has been discussed extensively in Rampton's works (Rampton 2005, 2009), but such crossing is not confined to the function of message exchange. Crossing in stylization refers to transgression of the normative linguistic boundary, but it is by no means limited to a kind of rhetorical maneuver. Here, linguistic communication enters mirror projection, by which the adolescents of Anglo or Afro-Caribbean descent appropriate their Asian peer's interlanguage, or code-mixed creole, not for communicating required information, but for projecting an illocutionary force. Crossing is generally completed with the dislocation of language from its normal context. Adolescents of Anglo and Afro-Caribbean descent have vernacular English to communicate with, but tend more often than not to project stylized Asian English onto native English. In linguistic projection, normality transgressions of English, like an Asian accent in pronunciation, idiosyncratic lexical selection, ungrammatical sentence sequence, and so on, have produced meanings that are less able to be interpreted and difficult to find in a monolingual community. Crossing across heterogeneous linguistic codes discloses meaningful focus on the medium of language.

As a result of globalization, the linguistic superdiversity context has provided a reference point for our analysis (Blommaert and Rampton 2016; Vertovec 2007). Immigration waves have drastically changed our living environment. Scenes of language communication in the superdiversity context are composed of the

unprecedentedly diversified linguistic contact of native speakers with immigrants. Superdiversity in ethnicity, race, kinship, immigration path, livelihood, education background, working experience, and linguistic communication has created a situation of language contact that native English speakers could not previously imagine. It is through these superdiversified linguistic contacts that native English speakers get to know immigrants and communicate with them. Accented English can be heard from immigrants everywhere each day. Some words that immigrants bring with have found their way into English. Superdiversity in language contact appears to embellish the contours of English.

This background explains the reason why code-switching between Panjabi, creole, and Asian English has become a routine activity for Anglo and Afro-Caribbean adolescents. Diversified multilingualism has characterized both the school and extracurricular life of these adolescents. Linguistic resources that are diversified and enriched this way seems to imprint linguistic communication with designing features. It therefore becomes real for adolescents to cross diverse linguistic codes in the superdiversity context and feel unconstrained in appropriating interlanguage, accent, lexical irregularity, grammatical deformation, and the like for their "language game" (Wittgenstein 1958).

Several examples from Rampton (2005) may be helpful to explain this issue. Rampton takes examples of daily interactions among native English adolescents demonstrating crossing into stylized Asian English. The crossing is conducted by switching to Asian English pronunciation. Some of the speech events of crossing occur among native English adolescent speakers and Asian adolescents. In these examples, appropriation of Asian English functions as a language projection rather than as information exchange. Refusal by Asian adolescents to communicate in their own language testifies to the conclusion that both native English adolescents and immigrant children are fully aware of the prejudice in language projection. However, it is worthwhile noting that some Asian adolescents voluntarily speak Asian English when talking to a native English adult in order to build a social link. It is rare to find communication in a mixed code among Asian adolescents.

In example 1 (Rampton 2005: 148, extract III.1), from line 15 to 22, a group of native English adolescents switch their English pronunciation to a Bangladeshi accent. This switch in pronunciation seems to have been triggered by the fact that a Bangladeshi pupil was trying to push in on the dinner queue. Offensive words, like "out," "get out," "out boy out," "move it boy" were pronounced with an exaggerated Bangladeshi accent.

The temporary switch to stylized Asian English by the Anglo adolescents apparently means a hegemonic appropriation of a linguistic code to which they did not have ownership rights. Asian English is being negatively utilized here by

English native speakers for criticism, irony, parody, and the like. The opposite direction of crossing, i.e. from Asian English to normal English, does not seem to create the same effects. In contrast, the Bangladeshi student is expected to learn standard or vernacular English, although his interlanguage has produced the barriers that would lengthen his learning process, as if the language of English were an unattainable ideal to him. This implies that native, normal English is privileged for being the language form to be learned and followed, whereas Asian English as the language form of the learner and follower has been relegated to a lower level of linguistic value. Here, crossing seems to render linguistic codes distinct in social meaning. Native English adolescent speakers exert a hegemonic power to appropriate the linguistic code belonging to other social groups not for information exchange, but for showing their attitude, either active or negative, to the people who usually use it in daily life. The boundaries of this underprivileged linguistic code seem comparatively vulnerable to being broken through.

Crossing to stylized Asian English seems to have "made a symbolic proclamation about the transgression's relation to a wider social order" (Rampton 2005: 150). Seen from the point of view of the wider social order, stylized Asian English is "stereotypically associated with limited linguistic and cultural competence" (Rampton 2005: 150). The code crossing by Anglo adolescents reflects the linguistic attitude adopted in the dominant society. The social order of language reproduces the hierarchy of society that discriminates against members of that society. Stylized Asian English is projected onto vernacular English in the linguistic acts of these adolescents. It shows that linguistic awareness belongs to the "mirror stage" (Lacan 1977: 1–6), in which communicative crossing is associated with the collective psychology of society. The adolescents seem to treat the other linguistic code as a mirror to project their own linguistic status in a privileged manner. Imitating the performance of stylized Asian English is done to establish a new type of peer relationship in aligning with the "wider social order" (Rampton 2005: 150). The "mirror stage" speaks of the source of this linguistic consciousness.

As for example 2 (Rampton 2005: 153, Extract III.4), an Afro-Caribbean adolescent is unable to obtain a response from an Asian adolescent in normal English, but is able to get one from her once he shifts to stylized Asian English. This change symbolically indicates that Asian English has a stigmatic stamp imposed on it. Asian adolescents decline to use it in a communicative setting where vernacular English dominates.

With regard to example 3 (Rampton 2005: 154, Extract III.6), a Panjabi adolescent deliberately uses his Asian English to speak to an Anglo adult. This linguistic act discloses the matter implicit in stigmatization of Asian English. The adult does not respond to him, but exclusively communicates with the other adolescents who are speaking vernacular English. The other adolescents of

Anglo or Afro-Caribbean descent just laugh at this dramaturgical scene (Goffman 1959). The Panjabi student creates this scene with his stylized Asian pronunciation. Clearly, Asian English was not likely to be treated as acceptable medium of communication. The Asian adolescent tries to incite a crossing toward his own linguistic code, but social barriers prevented it from reversing.

For example 4 (Rampton 2005: 153, Extract III.5), an Indian male student speaks in stylized Asian English to an Indian female, but the female responds to him in vernacular English. The boy makes use of Asian English pronunciation in order to express critical views on the female's clothing. He seems to be using Asian English to identify the events, acts, and situations irregular to the dominating context. Likewise, in the opinion of the female student, uniform clothing is normalized institutionally in the school's regulations. She thus opts for vernacular English as the response code. They may be simultaneously aware of the stigma imposed on Asian English. Regardless of this, one brackets it in a symbolic way and the other detours to vernacular English. These four examples are instructive of the complexity of crossing. It seems that the linguistic repertoire available to a person does not naturally determine crossing.

On the one hand, raising communicative competence means transversality across social dimensions, either horizontal or vertical, to have more practice in communication. On the other, crossing social boundaries separating one language from another cannot be conceived simply as analogous to linguistic translation. In crossing, breaking through one semiosphere, in a metaphorical sense, through its membrane or filter (Lotman 2005), to arrive in another semiosphere is concerned not only with message exchange, but also with image presentation, stylized projection, and the like. Consequently, crossing in a mobile and changing society across diverse linguistic codes, entails an unprecedented challenge to us in superdiversity context.

4 Conclusion

Crossing as a controlling principle is conceived as the point of linguistic communication. It is represented as steps, like phase, sphere, and universe, leading to development of communicative competence. However, this competence cannot be raised by simply following learning steps. The aims of crossing, and the contextual condition for achieving these aims, are equally significant for linguistic communication.

In a monolingual context, crossing is required to overcome both horizontal and hierarchical obstacles brought about in institutional social structure (Guattari 2015). A shift in communicative spheres occupies a major part of the technique of

linguistic communication. The complexity of crossing is determined by a complex society, where sphere shift needs to be adjusted to the communicative process in a delicate way. In common sense terms, making a sphere shift appropriate to social communication is generally taken as the social ability a mature person ought to possess.

As a result of globalization, superdiversity, as seen in the same spatial and temporal context as diverse linguistic varieties, discloses that crossing and counter-crossing beyond ethnicity, culture, and custom is a new reality and is worth being treated as normal communication in globalization rather than irregular deviations to linguistic norms (Blommaert 2010). Linguistic communication faces the new challenge of providing a definition of linguistic "normality". The monolingual conception of nation-state is insufficient to explain these new communication scenes. Globalized mobility of information and human resources has provided an experimental area to examine the novelties of communication.

Crossing in a globalized situation tends to stimulate mirror projection rather than sense sharing between different languages. In linguistic mirror reflection, one finds a difference in ethnicity, culture, daily life, and even in ways of speaking between oneself and others. Immigrants coming from diverse countries with quite distinct language, dialects, and speaking styles crowd together in the metropolitan areas of Western industrial countries. They have to communicate with each other and also with local residents. This social reality renders it possible to hear diverse accents in the constant negotiation of meanings with others. If you go out on the street, you will easily find languages being treated in contrast or comparison, but never equally. Various ways of speaking in one linguistic community are generally represented as social registers, whereas in the superdiversity environment, different ways of speaking a language have been transformed into the mixed ways of different languages. In this projection of the linguistic mirror, it is difficult to select from the pronunciations, lexical items, and grammatical structures of multilingual repertoires, because each alternative might be simultaneously right and wrong.

Regardless of practice in use of semiotic devices, crossing seems significant not only in fulfilling semiotic functions, but also in releasing a medium-focused meaning in a superdiversity context. In a monolingual linguistic community, crossing renders hierarchical social communication less hampered through transversality beyond in-group social divergence. Likewise, sphere shift in crossing, as explained by Guattari, seems also indispensable to building a social order of communication. However, against the backdrop of globalization, a postmodern medium-centered communicative order is being shaped in the superdiversity context. This linguistic new order of communication is featured with dramatic code-switching, rhetorical mirror effect, focus on linguistic medium, and the like. The

mobility of human resources requires crossing to take creative strategies to achieve what monolingual crossing could not. This is the new meaning for crossing in today's era.

References

Austin, John L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Bateson, Gregory. 1972. *Steps to an ecology of mind*. London: Jason Aronson Inc.

Bernstein, Basil. 2003. *Class, codes and control*, vol. 1. London & New York: Routledge.

Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, Jan & Ben Rampton. 2016. Language and superdiversity. In Karel Arnaut, Jan Blommaert, Ben Rampton & Massimiliano Spotti (eds.), *Language and superdiversity*, 21–48. New York & London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buber, Martin. 1937. *I and thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Dewey, John. 1929. *Experience and nature*. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

Foucault, Michel. 2002. *Order of things: An archeology of human sciences*. London & New York: Routledge.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goffman, Erving. 1976. Replies and responses. *Language in Society* 5(3). 257–313.

Guattari, Felix. 2015. *Psychoanalysis and transversality: Texts and interviews 1955–1971*. Translated by Ames Hodges. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1998. *On the pragmatics of communication*. Edited by Maeve Cooke. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Husserl, Edmund. 2001. *Logical investigations*, vol. 1. Translated by J. N. Findlay. London & New York: Routledge.

Hymes, Dell H. 1972. On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*, 269–293. London: Penguin.

Lacan, Jacques. 1977. *Écrits: A selection*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. London & New York: Routledge.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1969. *Totality and infinity*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Lotman, Juri. 2005. On the semiosphere. *Sign Systems Studies* 33(1). 205–226.

Lu, Deping. 2019. Peirce's philosophy of communication and language communication. *Semiotica* 230(4). 407–423.

Mead, George. 1962. *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. In Charles W. Morris (ed.), Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1964. *Signs*. Translated by Richard C. McCleary. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Rampton, Ben. 2005. *Crossing: Language & ethnicity among adolescents*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Rampton, Ben. 2009. Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society* 38(2). 149–176.

Searle, John. 1992. *(On) Searle on conversation*. In Herman Parret & Jef Verschueren (eds.), Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Simmel, Georg. 1971. *On individuality and social forms: Selected writings*. In Donald N. Levine (ed.), Chicago & London: The University Of Chicago Press.

Vertovec, Steven. 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6). 1024–1054.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1958. *Philosophical investigations*. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Bionote

Deping Lu
Beijing Language and Culture University, Beijing, China
dplu_dplu@163.com

Deping Lu (b. 1964) is a professor at Beijing Language and Culture University. His research mainly includes classic semiotic theories, pragmatism, urban sociolinguistics, and Chinese internationalization. His recent publications include "*Peirce's philosophy of communication and language communication*" (2019), "*Path selection for Chinese internalization*" (2019), and "*Toward political semiotics of linguistic landscapes in China*" (2021).