

**Monolingual Multilingualism? Standard languages and their impact on multilingual policies and practices in Europe: a historical perspective**  
October 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>, FU Berlin

Abstracts

*Georges Lüdi (University of Basel)*

**Traces of monolingual and plurilingual ideologies in the history of language policies in France**

The standardisation of French has a long history, from the choice of the dialect of the Ile de France as working language of the court in the Middle Age, over the efforts to control the norm („bon usage“) by corpus planning in the 17th century (Vaugelas, foundation of the Académie française by Richelieu) to the implementation of the standard language (status planning) by the means of legislation — and through the Education nationale — in the 19th century.

In this evolution, two periods seem of particular interest and will be focused in this paper, the French Revolution and the transition between the 20th and the 21st century.

(1) During the French Revolution and after a first attempt to preserve the prevailing linguistic diversity by translations in most varieties of the country had failed, Grégoire and Barère claimed, in 1794, for a radical policy of uniformisation („*éradication des patois et des langues régionales*“) as a tool for nation building, even if the authorities did not have the instruments to impose it, and France had to wait for social, political and economic changes taking place in 19th century to see this policy succeed (partially).

(2) Today, there is an increasing debate about the role of the „bon usage“ in the new challenges faced by French as an international language. Leading social scientists as well as institutions think that too normative and monolingual conceptions of French severely endanger the future of the language as a foreign language, in particular in Africa, and make a plea for a revalorisation of regional varieties of French as well as of multilingualism. The promoters of French have to choose, they say, between the focus on the elitist „bon usage“ of Paris, necessarily limited to few learners, or on a vehicular use of French, taking profit of regional and non conventional varieties and of multilingual repertoires. Those who defend a normative ideology argue, on the contrary, that the future of French depends on increased efforts to preserve and spread the „bon usage“. The issue of the debate is still open.

*K. Anipa (University of St Andrews)*

**Centrifugal and centripetal forces in the sociolinguistic history of Spain**

It is fairly well known that Spain tends to pride itself on being the oldest configured nation in Western Europe; perhaps more widely known (amongst linguistic historiographers, at least) is the fact that it was Spain that saw the birth of the first formal grammar of a non-classical language, namely Elio Antonio de Nebrija's (1492) *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Far from being accidental, the virtual coincidence of these two issues was consequential, for the latter was occasioned by the former, a state of affairs encapsulated in Nebrija's oft-quoted words '*siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio*'. In his eloquent prologue, dedicated to Queen Isabel, Nebrija set out his vision for a codified, standardized, national language for his nascent nation-state, for which he wished, with his grammar, to lay the foundation stone.

The interesting thing is that, not only did he designate the language he set out to codify as '*lengua castellana*', but equally referred to the nation-state as '*reino y república de Castilla*'. At the same time, reading between Nebrija's lines gives away his implicit awareness of prevailing social

tensions at the time. The linguistic sequel of those tensions has yet to be carefully and systematically studied; at best, general historians have worked on the socio-cultural dimensions, whilst historical linguists have documented the linguistic aspects of Renaissance Spain. What has not been done as yet, to the best of my knowledge, is a careful, focused study of that chunk of the history of Castilian, within the parameters of historical sociolinguistics, mainly from the perspective of attitudes to language variability and varieties at the time, as well as their cumulative effects thereof.

The aim of this paper, therefore, is to analyse the SOCIOLINGUISTIC implications and consequences of the underlying tensions in the emerging nation-state in the Iberian Peninsula: from Nebrija's 'reino y república de Castilla', via Juan de Valdés's (1535) 'Librija era Andaluz adonde la lengua no sta muy pura', Cristóbal de Villalón's (1557) '¿Pues todavía se lee la gramática del Antonio? [...] Agora digo que no me maravillo que todos los españoles sean bárbaros, porque el pecado original de la barbarie que a todos nos ha tinido es esa arte', to Fernando de Herrera's (1580) 'No se puede sufrir que la embidia castellana [...] quiera dar á entender [...] que no ay cosa buena en toda la grandeza d'España, sino en el Reino de castilla' and Gonzalo Correas's (1625) 'a cada uno le está bien su lenguaxe'. Thus, between such early indications as the Court formula 'hable burgos, que por Toledo yo hablaré' (attributed to King Alfonso XI) and the present day, we have many centuries of sociolinguistic vicissitudes and machinations that, undoubtedly, have had effects on the nurturing and ultimate configuration of Castilian as the standard, national language of Spain.

In a rather striking paradox, however, Spain remains one of the least linguistically unified nations in Europe, due to diverse social forces pulling in different directions. The repercussions thereof provide an ideal terrain for reflecting on the centuries-old phenomenon of multilingual monolingualism, not only discernible from such a statement as José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero's recent 'somos un país antiguo y diverso, con diversas lenguas', but (to a certain extent) enshrined in the Spanish Constitution. This paper focuses on some key dimensions of a long-standing paradoxical relationship between Castilian and other languages of Spain, how that relationship has determined the dynamics of a standard language ideology and related discourse, as well as the impact, over time, on linguistic pluralism in the region.

*Alexander Haselow (Universität Hamburg)*

### **The history and present state of standardization in Iceland and Great Britain**

The development of a standard variety is usually the result of two different types of activities, namely corpus planning (activities directed at changing or preserving the linguistic structure one variety of a language involved) and/or status planning (activities directed at changing the social functions these varieties fulfil in a speech community, cf. Kloss 1969). Even though both activities are closely linked with each other, the social and political backgrounds in a particular language area often motivate the predominance of one of these types of conscious language planning. Iceland is the paradigm example for corpus planning, which was designed to inhibit natural consequences of linguistic development and the formation of different varieties of the language and thus to preserve linguistic unity. The activities began to attract wider attention when they were tied with a nationalist ideology, which reached its peak during the struggle for independence from Denmark. The development of a standard in Great Britain, on the other hand, was based predominantly on status planning, which had the effect of ousting all linguistic varieties and replacing them with a single one in the public sphere, namely the East Mercian dialect. Again, the rise of the standard was closely related to the emergence of a national identity, which was the separation from France and the unification of the various Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

In spite of the diverse socio-cultural and political settings in both areas one may find commonalities

of evolution with respect to language standardization, which will we summarized in the following three claims: (1) the establishment of a standard seems to be successful only if it is linked to parts of the social identity of the speakers (such as national identity) since preferences for language varieties are always articulated within the context of an ideology that reflects society's view of itself (Romaine 2007: 685); (2) the successful implementation of standard norms requires a stigmatization of all other variants, which in the case of Iceland and Great Britain occasionally took extreme forms, and (3) the period of nation building is followed by a period of local identity formation, in which, due to a consciousness for local cultural heritage, more room is given to linguistic variety.

## References

- Kloss, Heinz. 1969. Research possibilities on group bilingualism: a report. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism
- Romaine, Suzanne. 2007. Linguistic diversity and language standardization. in: Marlis Hellinger & Anne Pauwels (eds). Handbook of language and communication: Diversity and Change. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 685-714

*Mirja Saari (Universität Helsinki)*

### **The development of Finland into a bilingual state**

Finnland ist heute ein Land mit zwei Nationalsprachen, Finnisch und Schwedisch. Der Anteil der Schwedischsprachigen beträgt zwar nur 5.5 %, aber die Stellung der Sprache hat historische Gründe: während 600 Jahre, bis 1809, war Finnland ein Teil Schwedens. In dieser Zeit war Schwedisch die Sprache aller Administration, Gesetzgebung und Ausbildung, Finnisch dagegen – besonders gegen Ende der Periode – die Sprache der Bauern, Fischer und Kleinhandwerker. 1809 kam das Land als ein autonomes Grossherzogtum unter den russischen Kaiser. Trotz der Annektierung mit Russland blieb die sprachliche Situation anfangs unverändert. Schwedisch behielt seine Stellung als die einzige offizielle Sprache, und Russisch wurde nicht eingeführt. Was die sprachliche Situation änderte, war die nationalromantische und nationalistische Bewegung in Europa am Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts. Im Zusammenhang mit dem nationalen Erwachen wurde die Sprachfrage ein politisches Thema. Viele schwedischsprachige Akademiker in Finnland sahen die Zukunft des finnischen Volkes in einer starken nationalen Kulturidentität und einer eigenen finnischen Sprache. Bis in diese Zeit hinein hatte man Finnisch hauptsächlich nur mündlich gebraucht, aber jetzt fing man an, die Sprache zu einer Kultursprache zu entwickeln und finnische Schulen zu gründen. Dabei wurde Finnisch bewusst zur Sprache sehr vieler akademischer Familien, die bis dahin Schwedisch benutzt hatten. Es dauerte aber bis 1903, dass Finnisch gleichberechtigt mit Schwedisch wurde. Als Finnland sich 1917 selbständig erklärte, wurden sowohl Finnisch als Schwedisch Nationalsprachen.

In meinem Vortrag werde ich den Übergang ins Finnische unter den schwedischsprachigen Gebildeten im 19. Jahrhundert diskutieren. Der Sprachtausch ist nicht auf einmal geschehen, sondern während mehreren Generationen war man in hohem Grad zweisprachig. Der Übergang wurde auch nicht friktionsfrei durchgeführt. Gleichzeitig mit dem neuen Status des Finnischen entstand eine Gegenbewegung für das Bewahren der schwedischen Sprache und Kultur in Finnland. Heftige Streite wurden in den 70er und 80er Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts und auch später bis in die 30er Jahre des 20. Jahrhunderts ausgetragen. An diese Streitigkeiten nahmen jedoch nur akademisch gebildete Leute teil, aber sie haben dazu beigetragen, dass eine Sammlung auch unter den sog. Finnlandsschweden stattfand.

## **Standardization in Flanders: a history of hostility towards language variation**

Contrary to the situation in most other European nations, standardization in Flanders - the Dutch speaking part of Belgium - was mainly a 20th century phenomenon. Until the late 19th century French was predominant in government and administration, which blocked a “natural” process of standardization of Dutch in Flanders.

When a new cultural and economic elite started its campaign demanding equal rights for Dutch from the Francophone Belgian establishment, they did not opt for the construction of a Flemish Dutch standard out of the local and regional varieties. Instead they preferred borrowing the Dutch standard from the neighbouring country, the Netherlands, for strategic reasons (De Wever 2008; Broomans et al. 2008):

\* It was easier to claim the status of national language for the Netherlandic Dutch, which had been established as the national language of the Netherlands for centuries.

\* Choosing standard Dutch from the Netherlands would at least linguistically restore a unity with the Dutch, which was broken politically since the 16th century.

Up to the sixties and seventies of the 20th century, Netherlandic Dutch was propagated both in education and in the media as the standard in writing and in the more formal speech. It was expected then that this (endoglossic) standard (cf. Auer 2005) would gradually gain acceptance in informal speech too.

In our paper we will focus on the consequences of this language policy for all Flemish variants and varieties which deviate(d) from this ideal norm.

Campaigns were set up against the use of Flemish dialects or regional varieties because the use of standard Dutch was seen as a *conditio sine qua non* for upward social mobility of the Flemish people. However, the vast majority of the Flemish people were and are not willing to use standard Dutch in informal speech. They prefer so-called *tussentaal*, literally ‘intermediate language’, a new mixed variety of standard Dutch and dia/regiolectal elements (De Caluwe 2009). This new variety has met with a remarkable hostility from certain linguists, teachers, writers, journalists (Jaspers 2001). For these people, with a firm grip on official language policy, the use of standard Dutch has a highly symbolic value: it is the symbol of the emancipation of a linguistic community (De Caluwe 2006). In their opinion, accepting a typically Flemish spoken variety of Dutch, quite deviant from standard Dutch, would constitute a threat to the status of Dutch and of the Flemish people in Europe for two reasons.

(1) It would break the linguistic unity between Flanders and the Netherlands, thereby weakening the position of Dutch and the Dutch speaking community in Europe.

(2) It would demotivate people from other (European) countries to learn Dutch and to get acquainted with the Dutch/Flemish culture when they learn that Flemish people themselves don’t use the Dutch standard language in their daily communication.

A comparison with the situation in other European countries with a spoken variety deviating from the official standard language may inspire language policy in Flanders to reconcile the need for status planning of standard Dutch in a context of globalization on the one hand with the need of the Flemish people for a local spoken variety on the other hand.

### **References**

- Auer, P. (2005). Europe's Sociolinguistic Unity, or: A Typology of European Dialect / Standard Constellations. *Perspectives on Variation*. N. Delbecq, J. Van Der Auwera and D. Geeraerts. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter: 7-42.
- Broomans, G. / Jensma, H. / Vandevoorde H. and M. Van Ginderachter (2008): *The Beloved Mother tongue. Ethnolinguistic Nationalism in Small Nations: Inventories and Reflections*. Leuven, Peeters.

De Caluwe, J. (2006). Continuity and innovation in the perception of language as a symbol of social emancipation. In: *Innovation and Continuity in Language and Communication of different Language Cultures / Innovation und Kontinuität in Sprache und Kommunikation verschiedener Sprachkulturen*. R. Muhr. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang: 27-38.

De Caluwe, J. (2009). "Tussentaal wordt omgangstaal in Vlaanderen." *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 14(1): 8-25

De Wever, B. (2008). From Language to Nationality. The Case of the Dutch-speaking Belgians in the Nineteenth Century. In: Broomans et al. (2008), 49-61.

Jaspers, J. (2001). "Het Vlaamse stigma. Over tussentaal en normativiteit." *Taal en Tongval* 53(2): 129-153.

TALK CANCELLED!

*Remco Knooihuizen (The University of Edinburgh)*

### **State-nations, standardisation, and the ‘purity’ of Early Modern language-shift Englishes**

The Early Modern period (1500–1800) was the time of the emergence of nation-states. Different social developments contributed to the adoption of standard languages and their spread into domains previously occupied by Latin (Burke 2004). This spread of the vernacular, however, did cause an imbalance of some vernaculars over others: this is also the time of the emergence of ‘minority’ languages and significant shift towards the nationstates’ official languages.

In this paper, I address the supposed ‘standard’ nature of language-shift Englishes from this period, as can be gathered from contemporary and modern metalinguistic commentary, for example:

In Cornwall and the Scilly Islands, where Keltic was spoken till 150 years ago, I was struck by the ‘pure’ English talked by the peasantry, as compared for example with the dialect of the neighbouring country of Somerset.  
(Jespersen 1946)

I argue, first, that language shift in the Early Modern period was triggered predominantly by demographic factors, caused by migration of majority-language speakers into peripheral (minority-language) areas, rather than by any targeted and implemented policy of language shift.

Then I present data on early 17th-century Shetland Scots to discuss how language-shift Englishes may have become more standard-like than other vernacular varieties. In the absence of education or other mechanisms to acquire an only incipiently standardised Scots, koinéisation of majority-language immigrants’ dialects and a minority-language substratum may have resulted in a variety that may be perceived by some as ‘standard’. I give an overview of the processes involved in koinéisation and standardisation, and discuss linguistic data from Shetland and Mainland Scots in support of this claim.

*Winifred Davies (Aberystwyth University)*

### **The role of (lay)linguistic myths in the production of sociolinguistic norms in the German context**

By myths I mean beliefs about language(s) that are so firmly rooted and so frequently voiced that they can be considered part of our ‘cultural wisdom’ (Bauer & Trudgill 1998: xvi). Milroy (2001) has shown that not even trained linguists are free of such ‘myths’, although they are not necessarily the same ones as those propagated by lay people. According to Milroy, people in many western societies are influenced by a ‘standard language culture’. In societies with a ‘standard language

culture' the standard variety is often seen as the language per se and its characteristics of uniformity (or perceived uniformity) and determinacy (i.e. its boundaries are clearly delimited) are then postulated as ideal characteristics of all varieties. In this paper I will look at some 'myths' about language(s) that are linked to 'standard language culture' and consider how they contribute to the production of sociolinguistic norms. One 'myth' is the notion that variants can be clearly allocated to one variety or another and that varieties (at all levels, including languages) are clearly bounded systems. This is relevant, for example, for linguists who engage in the codification of standard varieties (e.g. Duden-Grammatik or Duden Bd 9: Richtiges und gutes Deutsch) or take part in language advisory activities (Sprachberatung). Another example is the use of labels like Fremdwort, even in works written by linguists, or the use of Strukturgemäßheit as a criterion for deciding on the status of a linguistic variant (e.g. is er braucht nicht gehen standard German or not?). The implication is that linguistic varieties have (or should have) clear boundaries. This leads to the belief, usually on the part of lay people, that the 'mixing' of varieties is a sign of incompetence or laziness or some other character weakness on the part of the speaker. I shall also examine critically the privileged status of the concept 'vernacular' in modern sociolinguistics, and consider to what extent it too has been influenced by the 'standard language culture', implying as it does that the ideal variety is characterised by internal coherence and integrity. Terms like 'mixing' (Vermengung) and semi-lingualism (Halbsprachigkeit), which are common in discussions of multilingualism in Germany, all point to the strength of this way of conceptualising language and clearly have negative connotations which influence attitudes towards multilingual speakers. I shall finish by considering to what extent we can conceptualise variation differently (e.g. Grace (1981) refers to multilinguals drawing on a pool of linguistic resources) and how likely it is that the influence of 'standard language culture' will persist or weaken in future.

## References

- Bauer, Laurie & Peter Trudgill. Eds. 1998. *Language Myths*. Penguin.
- Milroy, James. 2001. 'Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization.' In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5. 530-555.

*Yael Peled (Nuffield College, University of Oxford)*

## **Marching Forward into the Past: Monolingual Multilingualism in Contemporary Political Theory**

After a surprisingly long period of neglect, contemporary political theory became in recent years increasingly interested in questions of language diversity and language policy. A growing body of literature on the normative dimensions of language policy is now emerging within the discipline, with interesting work produced on matters such as language policy and liberal neutrality, the role of language in socioeconomic disadvantage and its implications for egalitarian theory, the scopes (and limits) of linguistic rights and linguistic justice in the context of allochthonous and autochthonous linguistic minorities within democratic theory.

This recent input from contemporary political theory is a welcome development in a long-neglected topic. However, contemporary political theorists' interest in linguistic questions remains nonetheless quite problematic, since without sufficient - or even basic - training in linguistics and sociolinguistics, much of the work produced by them is heavily influenced by their own uncritical linguistic ideologies, most commonly standard language ideology. As such, the work currently carried out in contemporary political theory of language policy is largely established on a misperceived conception of the "linguistic human nature" (i.e. that humans are essentially monolingual speakers of an ideal, static form of standard language), as well as on the consequential conviction that linguistic diversity is essentially a problem that needs to be addressed (primarily by

committing to the “old-fashioned” Herderian heritage, so to speak, of the linguistic territoriality principal). The linguistic ideological biases of the political theorists working in this area, thus, tend therefore to replicate themselves within normative political theorizing rather than being challenged and contested.

These linguistic misconceptions and misperceptions that underly contemporary political theory of language policy are the focus of the paper. Its replication and reproduction of standard language ideology and the monolingual perception of the linguistic human condition, it argues, makes this contribution quite problematic within the contemporary discussion of linguistic diversity and language policy in European context (and beyond). Recognizing, however, the significant potential of the contribution from political theory for examining the linguistic dimension of key topics such as social and distributive justice, political liberties and obligations, democratic deliberation and political legitimacy, human and civil rights and human development, the paper argues for the need to bridge the current gaps (theoretical, conceptual and methodological) between contemporary political theory and sociolinguistics. The importance of such bridging, the paper concludes, lies not only in the intellectual advancement of our academic understanding of the interrelations between language, society and politics, but also in its implications for policymaking and political praxis in the public sphere of European citizenry in particular, and similar political communities in general.

*Matthew Ciscel (Central Connecticut State University)*

### **Multilingualism and Identity in the Margins: Post-Communist nation-building and language standardization in Macedonia and Moldova**

This study explores the key historical, cultural, political, and socio-economic factors that distinguish the arguably incomplete experiences of language standardization in two emergent European nation-states: the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the ex-Soviet Republic of Moldova. In the process, a Communist-era paradox in language policy is revealed: the simultaneous promotion and subjugation of marginal languages through programs of standardization, on the one hand, and policies of central language dominance, on the other. The inertial impact of this paradox on language policy, nation-building, and multilingualism in the two countries is shown to be substantial. Essentially, the national standard in each country suffers from a combination of a disputed *Abstand* and an incomplete *Ausbau* (Kloss, 1967). In addition, because of the relative weakness and instability of these new states on the margins of the European Union, large neighbor-states and other outside powers have continued to influence the accessibility of languages, identities, and economic opportunities for the populations there. Even the names of the standardized languages (Macedonian and Moldovan) are disputed, both internally and externally. Yet, despite the many similarities, the two new countries have established different levels of stability for the standard language, societal multilingualism, and national identity. In sum, the paper will compare language standardization and multilingualism issues in Macedonia and Moldova within their recently emerging contexts of post-Communist independence.

*J W Unger (Universität Wien)*

### **The thistle and the rose revisited: The impact of recent language policies on ideologies towards Scots and English**

The Scots language (the West-Germanic minority language spoken in Lowland Scotland) has been subject to the same pressures as most other European minority languages. Despite being the national language of Scotland in the 15th and 16th centuries, it had to compete with an economically, numerically and socially more powerful neighbour (English) that eventually came to be

seen as the standard. However, despite the gradual shift to English amongst the elite, and later the middle and working classes, and despite explicit attempts at eradication, it is still spoken today (albeit in a rather different form) alongside English in many parts of Scotland.

After briefly describing the wider historical context, this paper will examine how recent educational and language policies may have impacted on language ideologies towards Scots. In particular, the discursive construction of Scots and English in both top-down (e.g. policy documents) and bottom-up (focus groups) texts are analysed within a theoretical framework that combines the discourse-historical approach, critical approaches to language policy, and Bourdieu's notion of symbolic capital.

Despite the apparently high valuations of Scots found in 'top-down' texts, and assurances that it is not inferior to English, it is apparent these valuations apply only to certain very restricted 'linguistic markets', e.g. public celebrations and literary education. Policy-makers can therefore claim to be taking decisive action to support Scots, but are not taking account of the low value Scots will continue to have on the 'linguistic markets' of daily life, (e.g. in dealing with local government, non-literary educational settings, job interviews, etc.), and in international contexts (e.g. multinational companies based in Scotland, call centres), when measured against English.

*John Ole Askedal (University of Oslo)*

### **Ideological Controversies and Practical Consequences of Norwegian Language Planning since 1800**

At the time of the dissolution of the union with Denmark in 1814, the written language of Norway was literary Danish. A number of Norwegian intellectuals began questioning the appropriateness and propriety of that situation, playing with the idea of extending the new-won political independence to the cultural domain by creating an independent Norwegian national language to replace written Danish. From the 1830s on a process was set in motion that gradually resulted in a number of language planning initiatives. Arguably, this language planning and reform process has still not reached its final conclusion. In the present contribution I aim to discuss its main aspects, in particular:

- the different 19th century ideological positions that form the basis of the language planning initiatives and the reactions to it
- the emergence of „Nynorsk“ as an alternative variety of written Norwegian in addition to traditional Dano-Norwegian viewed in its historical and political context and the various names used for the Norwegian language varieties considered in a historical and political context
- main systematic features of the considerable number of language reforms carried through from 1907 to 2005
- the problem of system-internal variation in the official varieties, in particular “Bokmål”
- actually observable results of the official language reforms in actual usage in comparison with the modern version of the more traditional, unofficial “Riksmål” variety of Dano-Norwegian provenance, based on investigations of electronic corpora
- the relationship of “Bokmål/Riksmål” on the one hand and “Nynorsk” on the other with regard to the present-day Norwegian lexicography
- Norwegian language planning and language-norm debates seen as the result of a complex, multidimensional social alterity ('otherness') discourse.