

Manual of Standardization in the Romance Languages

MRL 24

Manuals of Romance Linguistics

Manuels de linguistique romane

Manuali di linguistica romanza

Manuales de lingüística románica

Edited by

Günter Holtus and Fernando Sánchez-Miret

Volume 24

Manual of Standardization in the Romance Languages



Edited by Franz Lebsanft and Felix Tacke

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-045573-1
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-045808-4
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-045606-6

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019946307

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2020 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Cover image: © Marco2811/fotolia

Typesetting: Meta Systems Publishing & Printservices GmbH, Wustermark

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Manuals of Romance Linguistics

The new international handbook series *Manuals of Romance Linguistics (MRL)* will offer an extensive, systematic and state-of-the-art overview of linguistic research in the entire field of present-day Romance Studies.

MRL aims to update and expand the contents of the two major reference works available to date: *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik (LRL)* (1988–2005, vol. 1–8) and *Romanische Sprachgeschichte (RSG)* (2003–2008, vol. 1–3). It will also seek to integrate new research trends as well as topics that have not yet been explored systematically.

Given that a complete revision of *LRL* and *RSG* would not be feasible, at least not in a sensible timeframe, the *MRL* editors have opted for a modular approach that is much more flexible:

The series will include approximately 60 volumes (each comprised of approx. 400–600 pages and 15–30 chapters). Each volume will focus on the most central aspects of its topic in a clear and structured manner. As a series, the volumes will cover the entire field of present-day Romance Linguistics, but they can also be used individually. Given that the work on individual *MRL* volumes will be nowhere near as time-consuming as that on a major reference work in the style of *LRL*, it will be much easier to take into account even the most recent trends and developments in linguistic research.

MRL's languages of publication are French, Spanish, Italian, English and, in exceptional cases, Portuguese. Each volume will consistently be written in only one of these languages. In each case, the choice of language will depend on the specific topic. English will be used for topics that are of more general relevance beyond the field of Romance Studies (for example *Manual of Language Acquisition* or *Manual of Romance Languages in the Media*).

The focus of each volume will be either (1) on one specific language or (2) on one specific research field. Concerning volumes of the first type, each of the Romance languages – including Romance-based creoles – will be discussed in a separate volume. A particularly strong focus will be placed on the smaller languages (*linguae minores*) that other reference works have not treated extensively. *MRL* will comprise volumes on Friulian, Corsican, Galician, among others, as well as a *Manual of Judaeo-Romance Linguistics and Philology*. Volumes of the second type will be devoted to the systematic presentation of all traditional and new fields of Romance Linguistics, with the research methods of Romance Linguistics being discussed in a separate volume. Dynamic new research fields and trends will yet again be of particular interest, because although they have become increasingly important in both research and teaching, older reference works have not dealt with them at all or touched upon them only tangentially. *MRL* will feature volumes dedicated to research fields such as Grammatical Interfaces, Youth Language Research, Urban Varieties, Computational Linguistics, Neurolinguistics, Sign Languages or

Forensic Linguistics. Each volume will offer a structured and informative, easy-to-read overview of the history of research as well as of recent research trends.

We are delighted that internationally-renowned colleagues from a variety of Romance-speaking countries and beyond have agreed to collaborate on this series and take on the editorship of individual *MRL* volumes. Thanks to the expertise of the volume editors responsible for the concept and structure of their volumes, as well as for the selection of suitable authors, *MRL* will not only summarize the current state of knowledge in Romance Linguistics, but will also present much new information and recent research results.

As a whole, the *MRL* series will present a panorama of the discipline that is both extensive and up-to-date, providing interesting and relevant information and useful orientation for every reader, with detailed coverage of specific topics as well as general overviews of present-day Romance Linguistics. We believe that the series will offer a fresh, innovative approach, suited to adequately map the constant advancement of our discipline.

August 2019

Günter Holtus (Lohra/Göttingen)

Fernando Sánchez-Miret (Salamanca)

Preface

The standardization of Romance languages is a well-established domain in Romance studies. As shown in our detailed introduction (“Romance standardology: roots and traditions”), there is a considerable amount of research on this classical issue, and all the contributors to this manual draw heavily on it. However, this volume strives to do more than just provide an essential update of previous research findings. The first part of the book, dedicated to the theories of linguistic norm, presents, of course, overviews on traditional and proven methodologies, which have constantly enhanced our understanding of standardization. Nonetheless, it also ventures to include more recent approaches to the construction of regulated forms of language that are not easily found in former manuals. In the same manner, the second part on language-specific instruments and reference tools combines articles treating the traditional realm of language codification and modernization (i.e., orthographies, normative dictionaries and grammars). This engaging section encompasses elaborate analysis of the hitherto neglected issue of normative pronunciation (orthoepy) as well as the ever more dynamic field of usage guides (the so-called dictionaries of language difficulties).

From the standpoint of standardization, it is justifiable to distinguish between “major” and “minor” Romance languages. The chapters on Romanian, Italian, French, Catalan, Spanish and Portuguese always follow the same, full-fledged scheme (four articles each); a more concise chapter is dedicated to “minor” Italo-, Gallo- and Ibero-Romance languages not to mention Romance-based Creoles. Even though each language is treated separately, the introductory essay additionally contains a section intended to provide the reader with a comparative approach.

It goes without saying that in order to be useful and easily accessible, a manual needs a coherent structure and an analogous, corresponding treatment of the objects. However, if the reader detects excessive or disturbing heterogeneity in the presentation of (some of) the data, we as editors have failed to convince the contributors of the well-foundedness of our approach. We assume, of course, responsibility for any shortcomings in this respect.

Many esteemed colleagues have contributed to making the idea of a Manual of Standardization in the Romance Languages come true. First of all, we’d like to thank our General Series Editors Günter Holtus and Fernando Sánchez-Miret for their patience and support; of course, a lot of gratitude goes out to the many contributors of this volume – those who have fulfilled the promise of a substantial article and those who have generously helped us out in the case of a few missing articles by assuming that task on short notice. Furthermore, we also wish to thank Steven Dworkin for his advice in the early stages of this volume. We would also like to express our appreciativeness to Brandon Davenport, who has tirelessly improved the style of many manuscripts, as well as to Judith Strunck, Thea Göhring and Judith Harzheim, who rendered their services of laboriously reading and copy-editing the

whole volume. Last but not least, many thanks to the De Gruyter editorial team for their unconditional assistance we received during the long editing process: Ulrike Krauß, Christine Henschel, Gabrielle Cornefert, Anna Hofsäß and Monika Pfleghar.

Bonn, June 2019

Franz Lebsanft and Felix Tacke

Table of Contents

Introduction

- Franz Lebsanft and Felix Tacke
0 **Romance Standardology: Roots and Traditions — 3**

Theories of Linguistic Norm

- Ludwig Fesenmeier
1 **Linguistic Norm in Classical Grammar and Rhetoric — 63**
- Jörn Albrecht
2 **Linguistic Norm in the Prague School of Linguistics — 107**
- Johannes Kabatek
3 **Linguistic Norm in the Linguistic Theory of Eugenio Coseriu — 127**
- Carsten Sinner
4 **Linguistic Norm in Sociolinguistics — 145**
- Angela Schrott
5 **Linguistic Norm in Linguistic Pragmatics — 165**
- Felix Tacke
6 **Linguistic Norm in Cognitive Linguistics — 183**
- Franz Lebsanft
7 **Linguistic Norm in Discourse Linguistics — 209**

Instruments and Reference Tools for Language Codification and Modernization

- 8 **Romanian — 231**
- Camelia Stan
8.1 **Orthography and Orthoepy — 231**

- Rodica Zafiu
8.2 Normative Grammars — 245
- Rodica Zafiu
8.3 Normative Dictionaries — 261
- Isabela Nedelcu
8.4 Dictionaries of Language Difficulties — 281
- 9 Italian — 297**
- Gerald Bernhard
9.1 Orthography and Orthoepy — 297
- Elisa De Roberto
9.2 Normative Grammars — 317
- Luca Lorenzetti
9.3 Normative Dictionaries — 341
- Luca Lorenzetti
9.4 Dictionaries of Language Difficulties — 373
- 10 French — 399**
- Bernhard Pöll
10.1 Orthography and Orthoepy — 399
- Sybille Große
10.2 Normative Grammars — 417
- Luca Melchior
10.3 Normative Dictionaries — 441
- Johanna Wolf
10.4 Dictionaries of Language Difficulties — 461
- 11 Catalan — 481**
- David Paloma
11.1 Orthography and Orthoepy — 481

- Jenny Brumme
11.2 Normative Grammars — 497
- Elisenda Bernal
11.3 Normative Dictionaries — 519
- Òscar Bladas Martí
11.4 Dictionaries of Language Difficulties — 535
- 12 Spanish — 559**
- Felix Tacke
12.1 Orthography and Orthoepy — 559
- Carla Amorós-Negre
12.2 Normative Grammars — 581
- Sebastian Greußlich
12.3 Normative Dictionaries — 605
- Franz Lebsanft
12.4 Dictionaries of Language Difficulties — 629
- 13 Portuguese — 651**
- Maria Filomena Gonçalves
13.1 Orthography and Orthoepy — 651
- Augusto Soares da Silva
13.2 Normative Grammars — 679
- Ulrike Mühlischlegel
13.3 Normative Dictionaries — 701
- Maria Filomena Gonçalves
13.4 Dictionaries of Language Difficulties — 725
- 14 “Minor” Romance Languages — 747**
- Sabine Heinemann
14.1 “Minor” Italo-Romance Languages — 747

	Ursula Reutner	
14.2	“Minor” Gallo-Romance Languages	— 773
	Sebastian Postlep	
14.3	“Minor” Ibero-Romance Languages	— 809
	Carolin Patzelt	
14.4	Romance-based Creoles	— 831
	Index of subjects	— 851

Abbreviations

Cat.	Catalan
CLat.	Classical Latin
Eng.	English
Fr.	French
Frp.	Francoprovençal
Ger.	German
Glc.	Galician
Grk.	Greek
It.	Italian
Lat.	Latin
MGrk.	Modern Greek
Occ.	Occitan
OFr.	Old French
Pt.	Portuguese
R.	Russian
Rom.	Romanian
Sp.	Spanish
VLat.	Vulgar Latin

Introduction

Franz Lebsanft and Felix Tacke

0 Romance Standardology: Roots and Traditions

Abstract: Standardology is the study of linguistic standardization. The purpose of this introduction is twofold: on the one hand, it explains the roots and traditions of this linguistic discipline by exposing the key concepts “standard”, “standardization”, “pluri-” or “polycentric standard” and “polynomic standard”, their origins and the most important contributions to them. On the other hand, it provides a comparative standardology, that is, a comparative overview of the activities of “formal” standardization in the Romance languages by characterizing the main domains of codification, the most important actors and relevant concepts underlying the codification and modernization of Romance standard languages up to the present day.

Keywords: standard, standardization, destandardization, restandardization, language codification, language planning, language cultivation, language modernization, *ausbau* language, pluricentricity, polynomic norm

1 Overview

This Manual is about standardization in the Romance languages. In this introduction we will explain what linguists understand by “standard” (2.1) and “standardization” (2.2) and discuss some models that try to understand how standardization works. We hold that “standard” is the normal – the ordinary, conventional – use of language by the socio-culturally dominant class, i.e. normally the (more or less) well-educated, (upper) middle stratum of a modern, industrial and post-industrial society. The “standard” is also called the “prescriptive norm” or the “exemplary use” of language in the sense that a certain “normal” use receives the status of a privileged, i.e. “normative” form of language use. We understand standardization as the complicated processes that lead to the standard. As we explain, the standard may be the result of long-lasting, informal activities that gradually shape the dominant, prestigious use of language. However, these informal processes are normally accompanied by formal activities that give explicit recognition to the linguistic norm or standard. They include the elaboration not only of systematically designed reference books on orthography and orthoepy, on grammar and vocabulary but also unsystematic though much more accessible, “popular” usage guides that discuss the “difficulties” of the standard.

The focus of this Manual is on formal standardization usually supported in the Romance-speaking countries by state and parastatal institutions, especially lan-

guage academies. Most – not all – Romance languages are spoken in different countries. In the case of French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish, this is also the result of linguistic “transplantation” by colonization. In all the situations that give rise to plurinational languages, we are facing the diversification of the standard, particularly the development of national (or regional) “variants” of the standard. We address this problem as the “pluricentricity” of the standard and we will describe how this field of research developed (2.3). The description of the formal standardization of each and every Romance language may be called “standardology”; it also lays the foundation for a “comparative standardology”, a term coined by Joseph (1987, 13; cf. also Muljačić 1993; Pöll 2001). The exposition of such a comparative standardology, which will complement the language-specific chapters of this Manual, is the object of section 3. Finally, section 4 will provide general information on the structure and the use of this Manual.

2 Concepts and theories

2.1 Standard

2.1.1 Standard and norm in British and North American linguistics

On August 22, 1138, English forces sent by King Stephen I and commanded by William of Aumale and Walter Espec repelled Scottish invaders led by King David I on Cowton Moor in Brompton parish around 2 miles north of the little town Northallerton in Yorkshire. The English had gathered around a “*carroccio*, a cart with a pole carrying northern church banners. At its top was a silver pyx containing the host. This was the Standard” (Bradbury 2005, 152). Therefore, the 1138 clash between the English and the Scottish has since been known as the *Battle of the Standard*. A standard, Bradbury (2005, 278) explains,

“was an ancient way of marking the leadership of a group. Each standard bore distinguishing marks – images, designs and sometimes text. Standards were used by the Romans and throughout the Middle Ages. A standard provided a signal flag for group manoeuvres and a rallying point”.

The Romans called the standard *vexillum*; the Medieval Latin writers used the word *standardum* – *Battle of the Standard* corresponds to *bellum standardi* –, a borrowing from Old French *estandard* which again is perhaps of Frankish origin.¹ Even though

¹ FEW 17, 219b ***standhard** ‘standfest’ = ‘steady, stable’. FEW 17, 220a rejects the etymology accepted by OED, s. v. *standard*: Latin *extendere* ‘to stretch out’ + *-ard*.

using a folk etymology, Richard's of Hexham (1884–1889 [1135–1138]) *De gestis Regis Stephani et de bello standardii* (sic) gives a similar explanation:

“dicitur a stando standardum, quod stetit illic, militie probitas vincere sive mori” (DMLBS online s. v. *standardum*, *standardus*; “*standard* is said from *to stand*, because there stood the warriors' worth to conquer or to fall”).

Whereas continental Old French only uses *estandard* as a military term (TL, vol. 3, 1357–1360), Anglo-Norman French also develops the metaphorical meaning ‘(of weights etc.) standard’ in the 13th century:

“cum nous eyoms les estaundartz et les essaumplaries de nos poys et de nos mesures baylé a garder a akun de nos ministres [...] BRITT i 190 (= Nichols 1865, 1,189; text from ca. 1292)” (AND online, s. v. *estandard*¹).

This is also true for Medieval Latin in Britain:

“**5** standard measure or weight, authorized exemplar of a unit measure or weight. **b** (~um regis or sim., w. ref. to official standard measure or weight). **c** (of money). **d** (as adj.) standard” (DMLBS online, s. v. *standardum*, *standardus* with examples from 1274 to 1534; cf. Du Cange, s. v. 2. *standardum*).

and since the 14th century for Middle English:

“(a) A standard measure of volume; *the kinges* ~, an official standard measure of volume; (b) a standard measure of length; also, an authorized exemplar against which to measure a form for tile-making [1st quot.]; *the kinges* ~, an official standard measure of length; (c) a standard weight; *the kinges* ~, an official standard weight; (d) a rule or main consideration; also, a standard of authority [2nd quot.]; (e) *cook*. a main dish in a course of a meal, an entrée” (MED online, s. v.).

The first uses of *standard* in relation to language are found in the 18th century (Joseph 1987, 3s.):

“’Twas thus they [the Greeks] brought their beautiful and comprehensive Language to a just *Standard* [...] The *Standard* was in the same proportion carry’d into other Arts” (Shaftesbury 1711, 138s.).

“Racine was of another opinion; he no where gives you the phrases of Ronsard: His language is the language of the times, and that of the purest sort; so that his French is reckoned a standard” (Richard West to Thomas Gray, April 4, 1742, in: *The Poems of Mr. Gray. To which are prefixed Memoirs of his Life and Writings by W[illiam] Mason*, York, A. Ward, 1775, 136).

Comparing French and English in the same century, Jonathan Swift (1712, 15; cf. Crowley 1989, 93) imagined an English standard analogous to the French *bon usage* of the 17th century:

“But the *English* tongue is not arrived to such a Degree of Perfection, as to make us apprehend any Thoughts of its Decay; and if it were once refined to a certain Standard, perhaps there might be Ways found out to fix it for ever”.²

Announcing the imminent publication of Samuel Johnson’s dictionary (1755), Lord Chesterfield laments the fact that “we had no lawful standard of our language set up, for those to repair to, who might chuse to speak and write it grammatically and correctly” (Chesterfield 1754, 588) in his famous *Two Letters on fixing a Standard of the English Language*.

However, the OED, which mentions neither Swift nor Chesterfield, assigns (s. v. *standard*, A. I., 12. a) only the meanings ‘a definite level of excellence, attainment, wealth, or the like, or a definite degree of any quality, viewed as a prescribed object of endeavour or as the measure of what is adequate for some purpose’ to Lord Shaftesbury’s text and (s. v. *standard*, A. I., 10. a) ‘an authoritative or recognized exemplar of correctness, perfection, or some definite degree of any quality’ to Richard West’s statement. According to the OED, the figurative use of *standard* (first as an adjective) refers to language with the meaning ‘the variety of a spoken or written language of a country or other linguistic area which is generally considered the most correct and acceptable form’ only in the 19th century (*standard English*):

“1836 *Q[uarternly] Rev[iew]* Feb. 356 It is, however, certain that there were in his [sc. Higden’s] time, and probably long before, five distinctly marked forms, which may be classed as follows: – 1. Southern or standard English, which in the fourteenth century was perhaps best spoken in Kent and Surrey by the body of the inhabitants [...]” (OED, s. v. *standard*, B. 3. e).

and another nearly hundred years later as a noun (‘a standard form of a language’: *Received Standard, Modified Standard*):

“1913 *Mod[ern Lang[ua]ge] Teaching* Dec. 262/2 While within the London sphere of influence [...] Received Standard goes on quite gaily, the London type of Modified Standard has won the day in this area, among those sections of the community who might otherwise speak a Kentish or Surrey type of Modified Standard” (OED, s. v. *standard*, A. 16. d).

The quotation comes from the very influential philologist Henry C. Wyld (1870–1945) who develops an early model of linguistic varieties in British English (Wyld 1913; cf. also Crowley 1989, 174–204):

² Cf. also “the *Court* [of Charles II], which used to be the Standard of Propriety and Correctness of Speech” (Swift 1712, 19) and “those books [the *Bible* and the *Common Prayer Book*] [...] have proved a kind of Standard for Language” (Swift 1712, 32).

Tab. 1: Linguistic Varieties (Wyld 1913, 257).

A. Class Dialects		
I. Received Standard		
spoken	a) in towns	Practically uniform all over England.
	b) in the country	
II. Modified Standard (Vulgar and Provincial Variants of Standard)		
spoken	chiefly in large towns	Varies from town to town and from class to class. Generally modified by nearest regional dialect.
B. Regional Dialects		
spoken	a) in purely rural areas	Vary from district to district. Often more or less modified by Received Standard.
	b) in country towns	

According to Wyld (1913, 250), the (English) standard is simply “the speech [...] of the higher classes” as

“the product of the Metropolis, modified, to some extent, on the one hand, by the type of English in use in the University city of Oxford, and, on the other, by the East Midland type of Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk”.

Some years earlier, Sweet (1908, 7) – to whom Wyld (1913, 253) refers – had formulated more or less the same idea:

“Standard English itself was originally that mixture of the Midland and Southern dialects which was spoken in London during the Middle Ages, just as Standard French is the dialect of that district of which Paris is the centre”.

“Standard English, like Standard French, is now a class-dialect more than a local dialect: it is the language of the educated all over Great Britain. But although it has, to a great extent, supplanted the local dialects, it is still liable to be influenced by them; each speaker imports into it something of his own local form of speech, whether it be a rustic dialect or the vulgar cockney of London, Liverpool, or any other large town. The best speakers of Standard English are those whose pronunciation, and language generally, least betray their locality”.

It is not our purpose to discuss Wyld’s concept of (English) standard any further,³ which in our time has come under heavy attack from a discourse linguistics (or analytical) perspective, since it purports an alleged intrinsic superiority over other class dialects (cf. Wyld 1934; Crowley 1989, 196–204; Milroy 1999, 31–33; Hackert 2012, 124–126). Notwithstanding the ideological shortcomings of his approach, one

³ Note, however, that Wyld’s “modified standard” corresponds more or less to the actual concept of “regional standard”, which has proved particularly fruitful for the description of French (*français régional*) and Italian (*italiano regionale*).

cannot deny the adequacy of the definition of the standard as a prestigious social dialect. Bloomfield (1935 [1933], 48), who is unjustly quite absent in these modern debates because of his rather simplistic identification with anti-prescriptivism (Milroy/Milroy ³1999 [1985], 5s.), insists on the extrinsic properties of the standard:

“Children who are born into homes of privilege, in the way of wealth, tradition, or education, become native speakers of what is popularly known as ‘good’ English; the linguists prefers to give it the non-committal name of *standard* English. Less fortunate children become native speakers of ‘bad’ or ‘vulgar’ or, as the linguist prefers to call it, *non-standard* English. For instance, *I have none, I haven’t any, I haven’t got any* are standard (‘good’) English, but *I ain’t got none* is non-standard (‘bad’) English”.⁴

He also introduces notions opposite to “standard” and at the same time draws a line between “non-standard” and “sub-standard” speech (Bloomfield 1935 [1933], 50), a terminological distinction which has never been respected in later linguistic research:

“In such [i.e. older-settled] communities the non-standard language can be divided, roughly, to be sure, and without a sharp demarcation, into *sub-standard* speech, intelligible at least, though not uniform, throughout the country, and *local* dialect, which differs from place to place to such an extent that speakers living some distance apart may fail to understand each other”.

Bloomfield’s use of the words *non-standard* and *sub-standard* belongs to the earliest occurrences of the adjectives (OED, s. v. *nonstandard*, A. 1. b *Linguistics*. ‘Containing or designating a feature that is especially associated with uneducated usage’; s. v. *substandard*, 2. Of speech: ‘not conforming to standard usage, nonstandard; *spec.* employing forms which are widely used but are considered incorrect’). His discussion of the negation *ain’t* as a non-standard form is rather sophisticated. In his view, this topic is not a futile one, although it is often treated in an incompetent way (Bloomfield 1935 [1933], 22):

“It is part of his [sc. the linguist’s] task to find out under what circumstances the speakers label a form in one way or the other, and, in the case of each particular form, why they label it as they do: why, for example, many people say that *ain’t* is ‘bad’ and *am not* is ‘good’. This is only one of the problems of linguistics, and since it is not a fundamental one, it can be attacked only after many other things are known. Strangely enough, people without linguistic training devote a great deal of effort to futile discussions of this topic without progressing to the study of language, which alone could give them the key”.

⁴ Over the years, the form *I ain’t got none* has become a shibboleth of Non-Standard English, cf. Trudgill/Hannah (2017 [1982], 1): “Thus: *I haven’t got any* is a sentence of Standard English, no matter how it is pronounced, while *I ain’t got none* is not a sentence of Standard English, consisting as it does of forms used in many non-standard dialects”.

This “key” is delivered, some decades later, by the development of sociolinguistics during the 1960s in Britain and the United States. A focus on the early work of William Labov shows that his concept of standard refers to the “normal” dialect of the (upper) middle class within a certain socio-geographical microcosm (namely, the City of New York). It becomes a “normative”, prestigious value – an “exterior standard of correctness” – insofar as the teachers’ speech differs from the vernacular of the students (Labov 1964, 88; ²2006 [1966], 318). The justification underlying the imposition of the teachers’ standard (Labov ²2006 [1966], 333) is that of social success:

“One of the reasons for the resistance of children to the middle class norms is that their teachers advocate a language, and an attitude towards language, which is quite remote from everyday life. The teacher quoted above told me of her difficulties in explaining to children the importance of pronouncing the word *length* as [lɛŋθ] and not [lɛnθ].

Some children, you correct them – and they aren’t anxious. They say, ‘What difference does it make?’ And I try to tell them that it does make [a difference]. There might be two people applying for a position, and someone might talk about the length [lɛŋθ] of the room, and someone else about the [lɛnθ] of a dress, and I said the one who spoke correctly, probably, in many instances would get the position”.

However, “(in)correctness”, with its corollaries of prestige and stigmatization, works as a valid variable of social success only in the case of accepting this value (Labov ²2006 [1966], 334):

“An African-American man gave me this view of the pressure exerted against working class children who adopt middle class standards of speech:

When I was small and going to school, if you talked that way, the kids would kid you, but we had a few kids that would do it, and we always kid them ... There was a girl who was always very proper ... so, she’d always walk up and say, ‘Pardon me.’ We’d all laugh, we knew it was correct, but we’d still laugh. Today, she end up successful”.

This is also true for the famous “deviant case of Nathan B.” who refuses to learn “correct” pronunciation (Labov ²2006 [1966], 160):

“A professor in the political science department had an informal conversation with him, in which he told Nathan B. that he had a promising future at the university, and that he would be glad to see him continue on the staff. However, he would have to take corrective courses to improve his speech. Nathan B. abruptly refused to do anything of the kind, and the academic world was closed to him. He continues, not unhappily, working in political science, but primarily as a writer and not as a speaker”.

To sum up, from a sociolinguistic standpoint the standard is the normal, i.e. the ordinary, conventional, use of language by the socio-culturally dominant class, i.e. normally the (more or less) well-educated, (upper) middle stratum of a modern, industrial and also a post-industrial society. For those who do not belong to this class and want to perform its social and cultural functions in accordance with aspi-

rations of social ascension, any deviance from the normal linguistic (upper) middle class behavior entails social and cultural sanctions. As a consequence, the acquisition of the standard use of language becomes a normative, imperative value, usually disseminated and imposed by school education seen as a guarantee of social mobility and cultural emancipation.

2.1.2 Standard and norm in Romance Linguistics

For anglophone writers and linguists, it has been quite common to speak of the “standard” of a Romance language for a long time. For example, we see that Sweet’s reference to Standard English also mentions the “French Standard” (cf. above, 2.1.1). In the same manner, West’s letter to Thomas Gray talks about Racine’s language as a standard of French theatrical style (cf. above, 2.1.1). Lord Chesterfield (1754, 588; cf. above, 2.1.1) compares Johnson’s dictionary not only with the “celebrated dictionaries of the *Florentine* and *French* academies” (Accademia della Crusca 1612; Académie française 1694) but also with the first dictionary of the Real Academia Española (1726–1739), “a good one too [...], in six large volumes in folio”. Even earlier, Swift raises his complaints (1712, 14s.) about the lack of an English standard in the context of French “perfection”. However, it “appears to be declining by the natural Inconstancy of that people and the Affectation of some late Authors to introduce and multiply *Cant* Words”, namely Jean de la Bruyère.

This long and well-established terminological tradition has no equal counterpart in Romance languages. The Romance terms – Rom. *limbă standard*, It. *lingua standard*, Fr. *langue standard*, Cat. *llengua estàndard*, Sp. *lengua estándar*, Pt. *língua standard* – are recent “reborrowings” belonging almost exclusively to the discipline of 20th-century linguistics. With reference to language – to the English language –, the word *standard* appears early in the Spanish translation of Bloomfield (1933) – the French and the Italian translations follow in the 1970s (Bloomfield 1970; 1974):

“Por ejemplo, *I have none, I haven’t any, I haven’t got any* ‘no tengo ninguno o nada’, es inglés ‘standard’ (‘bueno’), pero *I ain’t got none* es inglés ‘no standard’ (‘malo’)” (Bloomfield 1964, 54s.).

“Par exemple, *I have none, I haven’t any, I haven’t got any* est de l’anglais standard (‘bon’ anglais) mais *I ain’t got none* est de l’anglais non-standard (‘mauvais’ anglais)” (Bloomfield 1970, 50).

“Per esempio, *I have none, I haven’t any, I haven’t got any* appartengono tutti all’inglese standard (‘buono’), ma *I ain’t got none* è inglese non standard (‘cattivo’)” (Bloomfield 1974, 56).

Not by chance, francophone phoneticians working in Canada took up the older British (Jones ⁴1956 [1909]), as well as North American (Lounsbury 1904) tradition and have used the term *standard* for the description of “good” French pronunciation since the 1960s (Léon ²1969 [1966]; Léon 1972; Grundstrom/Léon 1973). In this re-

spect, the first three (out of four) examples given by the TLF, s. v. *standard*², reflect the influence of anglophone linguistics:

“LING. [En parlant d’un état de lang., d’une lang.] Qui est le plus couramment employé au sein d’une communauté linguistique, qui correspond à l’usage dominant jugé normal, sans tenir compte des variations géographiques ou sociales. *L’anglais, le français standard; prononciation standard. La langue standard tend à supprimer les écarts en imposant une forme unique entre toutes les formes dialectales*” (Ling. 1972).

The definition of the TLF retakes some aspects of contemporary US-American socio-linguistics (“l’usage dominant jugé normal”) (cf. above, 2.1.1) but takes it for granted that the standard has already lost its (upper) middle class flavor (“sans tenir compte des variations géographiques ou sociales”). The reference to “normal” use (“couramment employé”) gives a hint at the more familiar concepts of *français commun* or *français courant*. The fourth example of the TLF stems from Dubois et al.’ (1973) article “standard, standardisé”, a dictionary of linguistics, which at that time was a prominent symbol of “modern” linguistics and which has been translated to Italian (Dubois et al. 1979a), Portuguese (Dubois et al. 1978), and Spanish (Dubois et al. 1979b). Although the reception of Labovian sociolinguistics (cf. Schlieben-Lange ³1991 [1973]) helped to accommodate the term *standard* in European Romance Linguistics in the wake of a variationist approach, the conceptual focus is understandably much more concentrated on the complementary aspects of the terms *non-standard* and *sub-standard* (Rom. *limba non-/sub[-]standard*, It. *lingua non-/sub[-]standard*, Fr. *langue non-standard/substandard*, Cat. *llèngua no-/sub[-]estàndard*, Sp. *lengua no-/subestándar*, Pt. *língua não-/substandard*). This is also true, though to a lesser extent, for Romance linguistics in German-speaking countries (cf. Holtus/Radtke 1986; 1989; 1990).

The terms *standard* and *non-* or *substandard* build a pair of complementary antonyms which recover the totality of diasystematic variation within a language. When *standard* is used in Romance linguistics, it should be highlighted that this use implies *a priori* a descriptive approach; the standard is seen as “just one variety among others”. Linguists emphasize the fact that the sociocultural value of the standard stems from extralinguistic, contextual factors. In Romance-speaking countries, these factors normally depend not only on state but also, or even more, on parastatal institutions, especially language academies (see below, section 3.2). In this sense, the prescriptive norm depends on the institutionalization of the standard. In the case of French, the relationship between standard and (prescriptive) norm is excellently explained by the reference grammar Riegel/Pellat/Rioul (©2016, 19s.):

“Le français standard, par exemple, n’est qu’une variété parmi d’autres, mais qui, promue au rang de langue officielle, se trouve strictement normée et contrôlée institutionnellement. Ainsi entendue, la norme du français telle qu’elle est fixée par l’Académie française, enseignée dans les écoles et codifiée dans les manuels didactiques (grammaires et dictionnaires) est un artefact qui ne fait que privilégier un usage identifié, selon les auteurs et pour des raisons histori-

ques, au parler d'une région (à Paris ou au 'jardin de la France' qu'est la Touraine) et des milieux cultivés en général".

With Spanish, the normative reference grammar (NGLE) seems to refer the concept *lengua estándar* to a sort of "general" Spanish used without any diaphasic markedness (on the theoretical relationship between standard languages and diasystematic markedness, cf. Krefeld 2011), as can be deduced from the following series of general oppositions introduced in the introduction:

"Las construcciones gramaticales poseen forma, sentido e historia; unas son comunes a todos los hispanohablantes y otras están restringidas a una comunidad o a una época. Pero además, las construcciones gramaticales poseen prestigio o carecen de él; se asocian con los discursos formales o con el habla coloquial; corresponden a la lengua oral, a la escrita o son comunes a ambas; forman parte de la lengua estándar o están limitadas a cierto tipo de discursos, sea el científico o el periodístico, sea el lenguaje de los niños o el de los poetas" (NGLE 2009, vol. 1, XLIII).

In other cases, the NGLE opposes *estándar* to other forms of diasystematic, i.e. to diachronic, diastratic and diatopic restriction; see for example comments like the following ones:

"El empleo de *calor* como femenino no pertenece al español estándar. Se registra sobre todo en la lengua popular del español europeo meridional, en el Río de la Plata y en ciertas regiones del área andina" (NGLE 2009, vol. 1, 113).

"Un gran número de estos verbos son de uso general en español, pero otros son antiguos, pocos usados o están limitados a determinadas regiones. Así forman parte del español estándar *haraganear*, *holgazanear*, *pastorear*, *vagabundear*; en cambio, están restringidos a la lengua popular o al registro conversacional de ciertos países *compadrear*, *cobardear*, *cantinflear*, *hombrear*" (NGLE 2009, vol. 1, 589).

Generally speaking, these restrictions hint at a lack of prestige so that *estándar* can be interpreted as widely "accepted" uses. Nonetheless, there is only one clear statement which associates the concept "español estándar" with that of "lengua culta":

"A pesar de que no existe un español estándar único, en el sentido de una sola lengua culta y uniformada que todos los hispanohablantes compartan, el grado de cohesión y homogeneidad del español actual es muy elevado" (NGLE 2009, vol. 1, 8).

Because the careful speech of educated speakers exhibits much less variation than that of other social groups, it is "esta expresión culta formal la que constituye el *español estándar*: la lengua que todos empleamos o aspiramos a emplear, cuando sentimos la necesidad de expresarnos con corrección" (DPD 2005, XIV). Of course, it is the institutionalized and recognized authority of the Spanish academies which "transforms" the standard into a prescriptive norm. The academies, however, maintain the position that the NGLE only describes what the educated strata of the His-

panic societies consider as recommendable in careful speech (NGLE 2009, vol. 1, 8; cf. below, 3.3).

As the two examples from well-known French and Spanish reference grammars show, linguists are aware of the problem of localizing the standard between the two poles of normal and normative appraisal in our days. They try to overcome the distinction between “descriptive” and “normative” grammars (Riegel/Pellat/Rioul 2016, 24–27; NGLE 2009, vol. 1, 5s.) by integrating normative aspects in their descriptive approach. As a consequence, they make a sharp distinction between judgments of “correctness” and of grammaticality. “Correctness” concerns the sociocultural prestige or stigma of a linguistic form; “grammaticality” its conformity with the structure of the language. It is obvious that these reference grammars have serious reservations about judgments of “(in)correctness”, which they only report. On the contrary, judgments of (a)grammaticality are far more important for them since they concern the adequacy of linguistic description. The latter refer to the “vraies [!] fautes contre la langue” and are marked by an asterisk (Riegel/Pellat/Rioul 2016, 27; cf. also NGLE 2009, vol. 1, 8). Perhaps the Italian reference grammar Renzi/Salvi/Cardinaletti (2001) gives the best explanation for the different treatment of the two types of judgment:

“Tra i principi fondamentali della ricerca in grammatica generativa c'è l'idea che la nostra conoscenza dei fenomeni si fa attraverso la distinzione delle frasi dalle non-frasi, cioè di ciò che è *grammaticale* e quindi *accettabile* (che in questo caso vuol sempre dire *grammaticalmente accettabile*), da ciò che non lo è”.

[...]

“Le forme considerate ‘scorrette’ dalla sensibilità grammaticale di tutti o di alcuni sono forme effettivamente usate, o altrimenti nessuno penserebbe di giudicarle tali. Queste forme, in quanto esistenti, non potevano non venir registrate in questa grammatica, naturalmente in modo ben distinto da quelle *agrammaticali* (le sole che si fregiano di asterisco)” (Renzi/Salvi/Cardinaletti 2001, vol. 1, 26, 30).

Renzi/Salvi/Cardinaletti (2001) describe these forms indicating their diasystematic status – the construction *A me mi piace*, for instance, belongs to the “parlato spontaneo” (2001, vol. 1, 148) –, the reference to any standard and prescriptive norm remains, however, totally implicit.⁵

2.2 Standardization

According to the OED (s.v.), the deverbal noun *standardization* has been attested since 1896; unfortunately, the OED doesn't permit to reconstruct the use neither of

⁵ Although some types of left dislocations are described as “neo-standard”-features (Cerruti/Crocco/Marzo 2017, 10) – a concept that goes back to Berruto (2012 [1987]) –, this doesn't seem to be the case for the *a me mi piace*-type.

the noun nor the corresponding verb *to standardize*, attested since 1873 (OED, s. v.), in relation to language. Wyld's famous *History of Modern Colloquial English* does not use these words, even though it describes the "emergence" of the modern Standard (Wyld 1920, 5). In our days, of course, the history of English is described as a history of standardization on the basis of Haugen (1966b) and Milroy/Milroy (³1999 [1985]). This is true for the history of English considered as a whole (cf. Bergs/Brinton 2012, chap. VII) but also looked at epoch by epoch (Old English: Kornexl 2012; Middle English: Schaefer 2012; Early Modern English: Moessner 2012; Late Modern English: Auer 2012). The reference to Haugen (1966b) does not imply, by any means, that in the anglophone tradition the emergence of a standard – the standardization – is necessarily seen as the result of deliberate, institutionalized action. Hope (2000, 51) rightly makes this point:

"[Standardisation] may be much more of a 'natural' linguistic process than has previously been thought. One of the paradoxes of the relationship between standardisation and prescriptivism is that prescriptivism always follows, rather than precedes, standardisation. It is therefore wrong to see prescriptivism as the ideological wing of standardisation: standardisation can be initiated, and can run virtually to completion (as in the case of English in the early seventeenth century), in the absence of prescriptivist comment. In fact, it is arguable that prescriptivism is impossible until standardisation has done most of its work – since it is only in a relatively standardised context that some language users become conscious of, and resistant to, variation".

Hope's observation is in consonance with the belief that the standard is the product of a primarily bottom up-process (standard as the "normal" use of a certain class; cf. above, 2.1.1) which is only secondarily followed by a top-down process of deliberate action (standard as a "normative" value, imposed on other classes by education). In this sense, Stewart (1968 [1962], 534) distinguished between "formal" and "informal" standardization. However, the concept of standardization definitely gained momentum when it was referred to as formal, i.e. intentional, planned interventions on language. In this latter sense, *standardization* refers to the process of consciously conforming language use to a standard (making "is" to "ought") as well as to the codification of the standard. Weinreich (1953) seems to be among the first linguists who handle the concept in this way. One of the main differences between two "languages" in contact, which he studies when discussing the attitudes of French-Schwyzertütsch bilinguals towards interference, is the fact that one is a "standardized" and the other an "unstandardized" language. Standardized languages, he says, are "applicable in all types of formalized communication (governmental activities, literature, radio, schools, etc.)", i.e. they are languages of "unrestricted functions"; on the contrary, unstandardized languages are predominantly spoken languages, characterized by "functional inferiority" (Weinreich 1953, 88). In this context, Weinreich (*ibid.*, 99) proposes the concept of "language loyalty" as "the state of mind in which the language [...], as an intact entity, and in contrast to other languages, assumes a high position in a scale of values, a position in need of

being ‘defended’”. If the language comes under attack, language loyalty “makes the standardized version of the language a symbol and a cause” (ibid.). This is why language loyalty “ordinarily concentrates on the standardization of the language” (ibid., 102). Subsequently, he (ibid., 103) considers the investigation of “standardization programs (vocabulary, syntax, phonics)” and the evaluation of the “effectiveness of standardization”. Weinreich (1954, 396 = 1968, 314s.) gives a more systematic description of these insights (cf. Joseph 1987, 14):

“[...] it is necessary to distinguish between standardized and non-standardized language. This set of terms is proposed to avoid the use of the ambiguous word, ‘standard,’ which among others has to serve for ‘socially acceptable,’ ‘average,’ ‘typical,’ and so on. On the contrary, STANDARDIZATION could easily be used to denote a process of more or less conscious, planned, and centralized regulation of language. Many European languages have had standardized varieties for centuries; a number of formerly ‘colonial’ tongues are undergoing the process only now. Not all leveling is equivalent to standardization. In the standardization process, there is a division of functions between regulators and followers, a constitution of more or less clear-cut authorities (academies, ministries of education, *Sprachvereine*, etc.) and of channels of control (schools, special publications, etc.)”.

It seems to us quite obvious that Weinreich’s reflections on standardization are central to Ferguson’s concept of “diglossia”, a term modeled after the French *diglossie* (Ferguson 1959, 325; cf. Kremnitz 2004; Kabatek 2016). One of the features that account for the difference between “high” and “low” varieties is standardization (Ferguson 1959, 331s.):

“In all the defining languages there is a strong tradition of grammatical study of the H form of the language [= high variety]. There are grammars, dictionaries, treatises on pronunciation, style, and so on. There is an established norm for pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary which allows variation only within certain limits. The orthography is well established and has little variation. By contrast, descriptive and normative studies of the L form [= low variety] are either non-existent or relatively recent and slight in quantity. Often they have been carried out first or chiefly by scholars OUTSIDE the speech community and are written in other languages. There is no settled orthography and there is wide variation in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary”.

In the 1950s, a third author discussing standardization in the United States is Paul L. Garvin, who positions himself in the tradition of the Prague theories on “language cultivation” (Czech *jazyková kultura*, from Russian *Культура языка* [*Kul’tura jasyka*] and *Культура речи* [*Kul’tura reči*]).⁶ Garvin publishes a Praguean reader (³1964 [1955]) which contains partial English translations of two important theoretical

⁶ Cf. Vinokur (1925). We know of only one translation into a western language of Vinokur’s contributions to the theory of language cultivation, Vinokur (1975 [1923]). In German, the term *Sprachkultur* has been used at least since the late 1920s; in Yiddish, the term *shprakhkultur* is found in the same period, cf. for example Spivak (1931). Weinreich (1953, 84) glosses the expression “language cultivation” with the German compound.

texts: Havránek (³1964 [1955]) and Mukařovský (³1964 [1955]), originally published in Havránek/Weingart (1932).⁷ The editors' original title, *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*, is rendered by “Standard Czech and the Cultivation of Good Language” (Garvin ³1964 [1955], 153), where English *standard* corresponds to Czech *spisovný*, -á, -é ‘literary, standard, written’. Garvin/Mathiot (1960; also 1968), in a paper presented at the 5th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Science in 1956, define the standard as “a codified form of a language, accepted by, and serving as a model to, a larger speech community” (Garvin/Mathiot 1960, 783). The degree of standardization is discussed along three criteria (Garvin/Mathiot 1960, 784; cf. also Garvin 1959):

“1) the intrinsic properties of a standard language, 2) the functions of a standard language within the culture of a speech community, and 3) the attitudes of the speech community towards the standard language”.

Intrinsically, the standard is characterized by “flexible stability” (Mathesius 1932) and “intellectualization” (Havránek ³1964 [1955]); it develops the “unifying”, the “separatist”, the “prestige” as well as the “frame-of-reference function”. Whereas the first three functions do not need any further explanation, the fourth means that the standard serves “as a frame of reference for correction and for the perception and evaluation of poetic speech”. Finally, attitudes are linked to functions, language loyalty (cf. Weinreich 1953, 99) to the unifying and the separatist functions, language pride to the prestige function and awareness of the norm to the frame-of-reference function (Garvin/Mathiot 1960, 784–789). Generally speaking, standardization refers to “continuous, sliding-scale features rather than discrete, yes-no features” (Garvin 1959, 30).

At the 1958 Meetings of the American Anthropological Association – the same meetings where Garvin discusses “the standard language problem” (Garvin 1959) – Einar Haugen presents a paper on “Planning for a Standard Language in Modern Norway” in which he launches the term “language planning”, previously used by Weinreich (cf. Haugen 1966a, 355):

“By language planning I understand the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community. In this practical application of linguistic knowledge we are proceeding beyond descriptive linguistics into an area where judgment must be exercised in the form of choices among available linguistic forms. Planning implies an attempt to guide the development of a language in a direction desired by the planners. It means not only predicting the future on the basis of available knowledge concerning the past, but a deliberate effort to influence it. In most countries such planning has been distributed over a long period and among many individuals, with little conscious direction. It has usually taken place at a period when the number of writers was small and standards of conformity not rigid. It has been shaped by the speech

7 In parallel to Garvin, see also Vachek (1964; 1966).

habits of a social élite which was also a governing class and automatically established its own patterns as normative for the whole nation. The resulting ‘standard’ language has had two mutually supporting aspects, on the one hand a generally accepted orthography, and on the other a prestige dialect imitated by the socially ambitious” (Haugen 1959, 8).

This is more or less what Ferguson, Garvin and Weinreich called “language standardization”. However, Haugen’s well-known case study – “the case of modern Norwegian” – shifts the focus from planning “with little conscious direction” to systematic planning according to political intentions and programs, with examples from 19th- and 20th-century nation building in Europe and elsewhere. Haugen (1966a, 2) admits that the

“ideas and motivations underlying a program of language planning are so remote from the experience of educated Americans or Englishmen that they may find it difficult even to understand them. In our ever-shrinking world the notion that a national language is something worth working at and struggling for may seem merely a piece of inscrutable mysticism”.

The discussion of the planning process leads to a cross-classification (Haugen 1966a, 17s.) that is not presented as such but can be deduced from the text:⁸

Tab. 2: Haugen: Language planning process, first model.

	form (linguistic structure)	function (variety of uses of the linguistic structure)
initiation (proposals)	(1) selection of (a) norm	(3) elaboration of function
implementation	(2) codification of form	(4) acceptance by the community

Whereas the dimension “form vs. function” is quite clear, the dimension “initiation vs. implementation” is less convincing. If “implementation” means “decisions [...] implemented by some kind of social institutions” (cf. Haugen’s text in fn. 12), then the implementation of form cannot be represented by “codification”. In a more general discussion, Haugen (1966b) relabels the planning process as “language development”, leading “from ‘dialect’ to ‘language’, from vernacular to standard”. It uses the same elements as in Haugen (1966a) but rearranges them according to the opposition “society” vs. “language”, replacing “initiation” vs. “implementation” (Haugen 1966b, 933):

⁸ The text reads as follows: “Most of the problems faced may be distinguished into problems of form or function: by the former we mean the linguistic structure in all its ramifications, by the latter the variety of uses to which that structure is put. In any movement for change one may distinguish initiation from implementation: proposals are made, initiatives are taken, but decisions, whether conscious or unconscious, have to be implemented by some kind of social institutions” (Haugen 1966a, 17s.). Subsequently, Haugen (1966a, 18–26) elaborates on the four aspects.

Tab. 3: Haugen: Language planning process, second model.

	form (linguistic structure)	function (variety of uses of the linguistic structure)
society	(1) selection (of norm)	(3) acceptance (by the community)
language	(2) codification (of form)	(4) elaboration (of function)

A third, “revised” model is first proposed in Haugen (1983, 275) and then in Haugen (1987, 627):

Tab. 4: Haugen: Language planning process, third (“revised”) model.

	form (policy planning)	function (cultivation)
society (status planning)	(1) selection (decision procedures) (a) identification of problem (b) allocation of norms	(3) implementation (educational spread) (a) correction procedures (b) feedback and evaluation
language (corpus planning)	(2) codification (standardization procedures) (a) graphization (b) grammatication (c) lexication	(4) elaboration (functional development) (a) terminological modernization (b) stylistic development

The reinterpretation of the dimension “society vs. language” as “status planning vs. corpus planning” introduces the two famous concepts proposed by Heinz Kloss (1969).⁹ We cite his definitions at length:

⁹ Kloss (1952) attracted the interest of North American linguists from the early 1950s on, cf. the review by Birnbaum (1954). Cf. also Weinreich (1953, 102, 108), Ferguson (1959, 325) and Haugen (1966b, 930). Birnbaum (1954, 285) observes that Kloss “advocates a scheme of research that has nothing [!] to do with the German ‘cultural propaganda’ and ‘language politics’, which were the basis of a similar program advocated by him in pre-war years”. Kloss uses the concept “Abstand” not only with reference to linguistic but also to ethnic features and behavior, cf. Kloss (1942, 23). Kloss’s strong commitment to Nazi racist ideology was known in the United States at least since the end of World War II, cf. *Hitler’s Professors*, published by Uriel Weinreich’s father Max Weinreich in 1946; (Max) Weinreich (1999 [1946], 175s.) mentions “Dr. Heinz Kloss” among the “extremely able group of scholars with the Deutsches Auslandsinstitut” who were “specialized in German minority rights abroad and, since the advent of Hitler, as a matter of course justified each of his territorial demands and acquisitions”. On the (dark) “shadow” that Kloss’s activities during the Nazi regime cast over his post-war success, see also Smith (1965) and Weiser (2016, LIII) with more recent bibliography.

“Planning with regard to languages is usually understood to mean that some agency, person, or persons are trying to change the shape or the corpus of a language by proposing or prescribing the introduction of new technical terms, changes in spelling, or the adoption of a new script. Occasionally (as in the case of Norwegian Bokmål) even changes in morphology may be initiated, new endings prescribed and a new gender admitted. These innovations have one thing in common, that they modify the nature of the language itself, changing its corpus as it were. We may thus speak of language corpus planning.

There exists, however, another dimension of planning where one busies oneself not with the structure and form of language but with its standing alongside other languages or vis-a-vis a national government. Those concerned with this type of language planning take the corpus of the language for granted, at least for the time being. They are primarily interested in the status of the language whether it is satisfactory as it is or whether it should be lowered or raised. Here we can speak of language status planning” (Kloss 1969, 81).

The explanation of the form-function dimension by “policy planning vs. (language) cultivation” reactivates the Praguean term *jazyková kultura*. Whereas Mathesius’ “flexible stability” corresponds to “codification”, Havránek’s “intellectualization” may be linked to “elaboration”. However, Haugen (1983, 273) takes elaboration as “an equivalent of Kloss’s German *Ausbau*” (cf. Kloss 1952, 15–37), whose international career begins with Kloss (1967, 29):

“The term *Abstandsprache* is paraphrased best as ‘language by distance’, the reference being of course not to geographical but to intrinsic distance. The term *Ausbausprache* may be defined as ‘language by development’. Languages belonging in this category are recognized as such because of having been shaped or reshaped, molded or remolded – as the case may be – in order to become a standardized tool of literary expression. We might say that an *Ausbausprache* is called a language by virtue of its having been reshaped, i.e., by virtue of its ‘reshapedness’ if there were such a word. Terms such as reshaping or remolding or elaboration, by focusing on deliberate language planning, help us to avoid a misunderstanding that the term development might lead to, namely that ‘*Ausbau*’ might come about by that slow, almost imperceptible and quite uncontrolled growth which we are wont to call natural”.

According to Omdal (2008, 2386), Haugen’s third model, the result of broader forgoing discussions (cf. Rubin/Shuy 1973; Fishman 1974), “still seems to function as an overall model of the L(anguage) P(lanning) process” (cf. its recent discussion in Ayres-Bennett 2019 and del Valle 2019).

It is well known that early US contributions to the theory and practice of language standardization by Ferguson, Garvin and Haugen occasionally refer to Romance languages. It is even true that the basis of Weinreich (1953), his doctoral dissertation *Research Problems in Bilingualism with Special Reference to Switzerland* (1952, first published, 1975; new edition 2011), contains a thorough case study which analyzes “the Romansh language movement in Central Grisons” (Weinreich 2011 [1952], 269–300). Using Haugen’s later concepts, we can effectively say that Weinreich starts with the “identification of a problem” (“Realization of the danger”, Weinreich 2011 [1952], 269), goes on with “codification” (“Standardization of the Sutsilvan dialects”: orthography, grammar, vocabulary, Weinreich 2011 [1952], 271ss.) and finally describes “implementation” (“Putting the standardized language

to use”: literature, church, press, theater, radio, and administration; Weinreich 2011 [1952], 279ss.). However, it seems that Weinreich’s study on Romansh was not used in later works on the standardization of Romansh.

From the very beginning of research on diglossia and bilingualism, scholars specialized in the study and promotion of the standardization of “minor” Romance languages are stimulated by Ferguson’s (1959) and Fishman’s (1967) concepts, in combination with Kloss’s “roofing variety” (German *Dachsprache*, first mentioned in Kloss 1952, 15, elaborated in ²1978, 23–63). Especially in Catalonia and Galicia, but also in France, successful (and also unsuccessful) processes of standardization – “normativization” as an element of “normalization” (Aracil 1976 [1965]; Vallverdú 1979) – are described as the emancipation of dominated, “low” or “roofed” varieties (Kremnitz 1981; cf. Ammon 2004, 279–281). This is also the case for the even more complex situation of French in Canada, where French varieties have to be situated in relation to the English and metropolitan French standards (Chantefort 1976). At that time, Haugen (1983) and Bédard/Maurais (1983) – from the Quebec Conseil (supérieur) de la langue française – focused on Praguean theories. In their volume, Bédard/Maurais (1983) include not only an overview presented by Garvin (1983) but also translations (Havránek 1983; Mathesius 1983) from Havránek/Weingart (1932). In the same volume, we find a contribution on language planning by Fishman (1983) without any explicit reference to Haugen or Kloss (Kloss 1969 was published in Canada!), although some of their concepts are definitely used. The Quebec translators do not completely eliminate the borrowing *planification*. However, they obviously prefer the calque *aménagement* (Fishman 1983, 385):

“Pour la génération qui a ‘rompu avec les traditions’, l’aménagement linguistique constitue toujours une planification du statut de la langue, même si, à ce chapitre, elle a été pleinement victorieuse. Chaque corpus dont la planification est ‘réalisée’ (qu’il soit grammatical, lexical, orthographique ou orthoépique) se voit immédiatement réinterprété en fonction de son impact sur le statut”.

In the same vein, they prefer *normalisation* to *standardisation*, which is used only once (Fishman 1983, 383). At the same time, Hagège (1983, 13) speaks of a “synonymie de principe entre les notions de standardisation et de normalisation”.

Although predominately directed to actual and future linguistic problems, Haugen’s heuristic tool for the analysis of language planning processes has also (cf. above, 2.2) been applied retrospectively as we have already seen in the case of English, i.e. to the history of the standardization of the “major” Romance languages, where, as Haugen (1959, 9) states, “such planning has been distributed over a long period and among many individuals” (cf. above, 2.2). A pioneer work, unfortunately absent from some important recent Hispanic studies, is a well-informed essay by Francisco Marcos Marín, who presents the “elaboration” of Spanish as a series of four “reforms” in the 13th, 16th, 18th and 20th centuries (Marcos Marín 1979, 84; cf. also Marcos Marín 1983). His concept of “*reforma y modernización*” is based on early theories of language planning, yet without any reference to Kloss:

“Los criterios propios de una planificación lingüística (concepto desarrollado, por ejemplo, en Karam: 1974), especificados por distintos investigadores, y que podríamos llamar *decisión política, codificación, elaboración, instrumentación* (Haugen 1966 [c], 1969), *cultivo* (Neustupný: 1970), *orientación* (Fishman: 1974), *evaluación* (Rubin: 1971), se complementan y precisan, para poderse aplicar a un instrumento tan preciso. El punto de partida ha de ser, naturalmente, la *decisión política* (1) de tomar una actitud lingüística determinada, que se plasma en una *codificación* (2), por la elección de un esquema básico, el cual debe sufrir una *elaboración* (3)” (Marcos Marín 1979, 81).

Much more influence has exercised the seminal work of Joseph (1987), whose theoretical chapters give an excellent synthesis of current contemporary concepts of standard and standardization. Though insisting on the “failures of [modern] language planning” (Joseph 1987, 16), i.e. the practice of this activity, exercised by actual language planners, it owes much to the Praguean “insistence on the standard language as an urban CULTURAL manifestation” (Joseph 1987, 19) and discusses at length Kloss’s *Ausbau* theory (Joseph 1987, 76–79). An interesting case study that has received a lot of attention in Romance studies describes the emergence of Modern French in the 16th and 17th centuries (Joseph 1987, 132–159). Only six years later, Anthony Lodge writes a history of French – titled “from dialect to standard”¹⁰ – which is organized around Haugen’s second model:

“[...] the central section [of the book] will examine the development of the French standard, that is the processes of ‘Selection’, ‘Elaboration of function’, ‘Codification’ and ‘Acceptance’; the final chapter will consist of a discussion of the problems of the ‘Maintenance of the standard’ in contemporary France” (Lodge 1993, 27).

Nonetheless, this approach refers much more to a historical heuristics than to the idea that the history of the French standard was a systematically planned process.

According to Joseph, the history of a standard may be compared to a “life cycle” (Joseph 1987, 23). At the end of this cycle, the gap between an established standard and the evolution of linguistic use may grow so deep that a new standard replaces the old one. It “may persist as a classical language or fall from use, surviving only in the many relics assimilated from it by the new standard” (*ibid.*). In the first scenario (“classicism”), Joseph finds no evidence in modern languages. The second case is tantamount to a loss of prestige of the traditional standard and is labeled “destandardization” (*ibid.*, 174); it may be followed by the standardization of varieties which were previously considered sub-standard in relation to the old standard; this phenomenon is called “restandardization” (*ibid.*, following Ferguson 1968, 31). Without any reference to Joseph (1987), processes of this kind are discussed and described predominantly for Germanic languages (cf. the various contributions in Mattheier/Radtke 1997; Kristiansen/Coupland 2011) and they have recently been

¹⁰ Note that the French translation avoids the expression *standard* in its title and prefers, instead, the word *langue* (Lodge 1997).

applied to the emergence of a “new” Italian standard (*italiano neo-standard*; cf. Ceruti/Crocco/Marzo 2017) in Romance studies. In these cases, reference to Mattheier is made (1997; cf. Daneš 2008), who describes “destandardization” as the result of “demotization” (German *Demotisierung*, Mattheier 1997, 7), i.e. the difficult acquisition of a traditional, elitist standard by all the strata of a society (Mattheier 1997, 6). Obviously, different speech communities differ significantly in their capacity to maintain a sufficiently flexible standard (cf. Mathesius 1932), i.e. a normative elasticity that makes it possible to update, reform and modernize the codified norm (cf. Fodor/Hagège 1983–1994) and thus reduce the ever deepening gap between a codification becoming more and more outdated and the development of language use according to the communicative necessities of the speakers. With reference to the Romance-speaking countries, the Spanish speech community notably seems to be open to the modernization of the prescriptive norm (Marcos Marín 1979; Lebsanft 1997). On the other hand, the French-speaking community represents the well-known case of a situation where

“the rigid codification imposed upon the written language and the powerful institutional pressures promoting standard ideology [...] have brought about a greater rigidity in the standard form of French than is to be found in many languages in the modern world” (Lodge 1993, 260).

Regardless of this discussion, however, one should not lose sight of the fact that in Romance studies the concept of “destandardization” also applies to the quite different type of situation where one standard language is replaced by another standard language.¹¹ The case of post-medieval Occitan, supplanted by French, has been described in these terms (Bec 1991, 46–48); consequently, in this context “restandardization” describes the 19th-century renaissance of the language (Bec 1991, 48–55).

2.3 Pluri- or polycentric standards

At least since Wyld (1913), linguists have acknowledged the variation of the standard due to diatopic and diastratic factors. Bloomfield (1935 [1933], 48–52) not only distinguishes differences between American English and British English; he develops a variational model that comprehends the levels “literary standard”, “colloquial standard”, “provincial standard”, “sub-standard” and “local dialect”,¹² with significant differences between the United States and Britain. Beyond any doubt, Bloomfield is aware of the already long existing call “for a new and separate American form of the language” (Schneider 2014, 198); however, he still assumes the existence of a

¹¹ Auer (2017, 373), who distinguishes between three senses of *destandardization* – (i) the loss of high prestige, (ii) the integration of sub-standard features, (iii) the dissolution into regional standards –, does not discuss this use of *destandardization*.

¹² Note that Haugen (1959, 9, 19) applies this model to Norwegian.

“most privileged group, whose members are sure of themselves in speech as in all other issues of mannerism; in the English-speaking community, this should be the British upper class, which speaks the ‘public school’ variety of southern English” (Bloomfield 1935 [1933], 497).

An adequate conceptualization of the existence of two (or even more) equal standards within a speech community, which covers different nations, takes shape only later in the context of the “variation paradigm”. Discussing formal standardization as an “attribute” of language types, Stewart introduces the terms “monocentric” vs. “polycentric”:

“The standardization of a given language may be *monocentric*, consisting at any given time of a single set of universally accepted norms, or it may be *polycentric*, where different sets of norms exist simultaneously. When a language has come to be used in more than one country and has, in addition, developed multimodal standardization, the form of standardization prevalent in any one country may be either *endonormative*, when it is base[d] upon models of usage native to that country, or *exonormative*, when it is based upon foreign models of usage” (Stewart 1968 [1962], 534).

Kloss, who explicitly refers to Stewart in 1967, probably on the basis of personal communication (“what William A. Stewart has dubbed the polycentric standard language”,¹³ Kloss 1967, 31; cf. Ammon 1995, 45s.), illustrates polycentrism with Serbo-Croatian, “where we have two variants of the same standard, based on the same dialect or a near-identical dialect” (Kloss 1967, 31). Other examples of polycentric standards are found

“where a language is dominant in two or more geographically separated countries (British and American English; Portuguese in Brazil and Portugal) and in speech communities which are still in the beginning stage of their modernization (Albanians, Basques, Kurds, etc.), or where political circumstances have brought about separated developments for two variants of one single language (Roumanian and Moldavian; Serbian and Croatian)” (Kloss 1967, 31).

Without giving any concrete example, Kloss (1967, 33) also mentions the case of a language with “a single though polycentric standard”. In this case, there exists – in the terms chosen by Stewart – “a single set of universally accepted norms” which stem from different centers. A prescriptive norm built on the basis of a koine meets these conditions.¹⁴ Kloss (1978, 66s.) uses the term “pluricentric” languages for “more than one” variety (“Spielart”) of the standard with equal rights. The difference between pluricentric standards and *ausbau* languages resides in the fact that

¹³ The definitions of Stewart (1968) cannot be found in Stewart (1962).

¹⁴ Cf. Mesthrie (1994, 1864), who identifies as key features of a koine (1) “a new, common variety based on existing dialects”; (2) “its use as a common (or ‘vulgar’) medium of communication between speakers with different first languages or speakers from different dialect areas”; (3) “its use as the standard/official language of a politically unified region”, (4) “changes in its structure on account of its wide use as both first and second language”. On the history of Ancient Greek κοινή διάλεκτος, cf. also Regis (2012).

in the first case the users of the varieties consider themselves as belonging to the same language and the same speech community, whereas in the latter case the elaboration of new languages further fosters the development of new nations. Nonetheless, pluricentricity is not incompatible with nation-building. This is shown by the many cases where pluricentricity is the result of decolonization; in the words of Joseph (1987, 170):

“The unique feature of polycentricity is that a new standard is recognized in spite of an insufficient degree of Abstand for it to be considered a separate language, and in spite of a desire on the part of the speech community to maintain a linguistic-cultural identity with the imperial homeland, even if (as is typical) hostilities with the homeland marked the attainment of independence”.

Joseph’s (1987, 170) starting point is the variety of Standard Englishes, which has received ever increasing attention at least since Trudgill/Hannah (2017 [1982]). With reference to English(es), Schneider (2003) develops an important model for understanding the establishment of new varieties – “dialects” – of English. He distinguishes five phases – foundation, exonormative stabilization, nativization, endonormative stabilization and differentiation; from the perspective of pluricentricity (a term that Schneider does not use), the stages “nativization” and “endonormative stabilization” (a Praguean term!) are crucial. Schneider (2003, 247) describes nativization as follows:

“In the STL strand [i.e. from ‘the settlers’ perspective’], this implies the transition from the acceptance of a distant mother country as the source of both political power and linguistic and cultural guidance to gradual independence – or at least a phase of striving towards it. When the ‘mother country’ is felt to be less and less of a ‘mother’, the offspring will start going their own ways, politically and linguistically – slowly and hesitantly at first, gaining momentum and confidence as time passes”.

Endonormative stabilization, Schneider (2003, 249s.) explains,

“is marked by the gradual adoption and acceptance of an indigenous linguistic norm, supported by a new, locally rooted linguistic self-confidence, prototypically expressed by Gordon and Deverson (1998: 108) in describing the New Zealand attitude: ‘In language now we can and must go alone, creating our own standards’”.

In this context, the codification of the new variety of the standard is decisive because “for a language to gain official recognition requires accepted reference books, that is, dictionaries, grammars, and usage guides” (Schneider 2003, 252).

If we take a step back, we see that Aleksandr D. Švejcer already describes American and British English as “two varieties of Standard English” in the 1960s and 1970s (cf. Švejcer 1978, 5). At the same time, the hispanist Stepanov proposes the study not only of the “norma de ejemplaridad” of European Spanish but also of

the “múltiples normas ejemplares americanas” (Stepanov 1971, 1167),¹⁵ which developed on the basis of a “dialecto colonial” (ibid., 1164).¹⁶ Together, Stepanov and Švejcér coin the term “transplanted languages”¹⁷ in order to describe the colonial expansion of European languages as “national variants” (Stepanov/Švejcér 1981, 219), a frequently used term in Russian sociolinguistics (Fleischer 1984; cf. also Clyne 1992a, 2; Ammon 1995). According to them, the linguistic situation in Latin America is characterized, among other things, by:

“The existence of autonomous national languages within individual states (Spanish as an official language in some twenty countries, Portuguese in Brasil)

[...]

Different forms of relationship with the former ‘mother country’s language’ – from orientation toward cultural unity and linguistic integration to separatist trends, particularly explicit in ‘linguistic nationalism’ (these phenomena are conspicuous in such countries as Argentina, Brasil, etc.)” (Stepanov/Švejcér 1981, 223).

As Stepanov elaborated his theories in terms of “national variants” instead of “pluricentricity”, his highly insightful contributions to the study of Spanish standards were taken into account only by very few though particularly well-informed scholars (especially Zamora Salamanca 1990; 2010; cf. also Ammon 1995, 43s.). Unfortunately, they didn’t earn the attention they deserved (and still deserve) in the developing mainstream research on the variety of Romance standard languages.

In General Comparative Linguistics as well as in “Western” Romance studies, research on pluricentric standard languages definitely starts moving with Clyne (1992c). The important cross-linguistic volume contains contributions to French (Lüdi 1992), Portuguese (Baxter 1992), and Spanish (Thompson 1992), certainly most valuable surveys of language situations but without deeper theoretical claims. In his introduction, Michael Clyne, an Austrian-born Australian Germanist, focuses mainly on the situation of English and German (Clyne 1992a). Among the various issues addressed in his epilogue (Clyne 1992b), we find the gradient problems of (a) power symmetry or asymmetry between the different varieties of the standard, (b) exonormativity and endonormativity, i.e. codification of the standard from centers outside or inside the country under scrutiny, (c) the positive or negative attitude

¹⁵ Stepanov uses “ejemplaridad” for “prescriptive norm” in the same sense as Coseriu (1988, a paper written in the 1950s), who had direct access to Russophone research.

¹⁶ Cf. also Stepánov (2004, 95) – a translation from the Russian original (Stepanov 1979) – who speaks of a “coiné hispanoamericana colonial”. Note that Lüdtke (2014, 48) also uses the concept “colonial dialect” (“Ya que normalmente estos dialectos [sc. secundarios] se forman en el proceso de la colonización, pueden llamarse igualmente *dialectos coloniales*”), however without any reference to Stepanov.

¹⁷ Cf. also Schneider (2003, 241), whose aforementioned model explains processes that operate “whenever a language is transplanted”. In a footnote, Schneider (2003) suggests a comparison of the development of New Englishes not only with the medieval emergence, but also with the colonial expansion of the Romance languages.

toward pluricentricity, i.e. the (non-)acceptance of different standards according to the dominant or dominated position of a country. All these questions have been discussed chiefly with reference to Spanish in highly controversial papers since the 1990s (cf. the overview by Lebsanft/Mihatsch/Polzin-Haumann 2012). The aspect of (a)symmetry is at the center of recent cross-linguistic volumes by Muhr et al. (2013; 2016). Finally, Soares da Silva (2014) addresses problems of pluricentricity from a perspective of cognitive sociolinguistics.

2.4 Polynomic standards

The concept of polynomic standard is applied in the case of some Romance “idioms” that lack a unitary “common language”. Standardization in terms of “polynomy” refers to the codification and teaching of a language composed of two or more geographical varieties without imposing any hierarchy between them. Despite similarities with the concept of pluricentricity outlined above, the concept differs from it in two important aspects: 1) there are no pre-existing formal or informal standard languages (consequently, variation does not regard the standard); 2) the codification of any supra-dialectal, compositional standard is not included. Instead, the creation of a “polynomic norm” entails the codification of various forms for each linguistic feature.

The concept was created in the 1980s in the context of the standardization of Corsican (Marcellesi 1983; Chiorboli 1991; 2002; Thiers 2000; Adrey 2009; Di-Meglio 2009; Giacomo-Marcellesi 2013; Goebel 2015; it is also applied to Occitan, cf. Tacke 2015, 233s.), a language divided into several regional varieties even though speakers assumed the existence of an abstract common language. According to the definition by Marcellesi (1983, 314) polynomic languages are languages

“dont l’unité est abstraite et résulte d’un mouvement dialectique et non de la simple ossification d’une norme unique, et dont l’existence est fondée sur la décision massive de ceux qui la parlent de lui donner un nom particulier et de la déclarer autonome des autres langues reconnues”.

Implementation of the “polynomic norm” not only entails teaching one standard form but is also meant to teach the corresponding regional dialect and to raise awareness of other variants among speakers. The value of this concept of standard resides in the rejection of standardization through hierarchization. It is a concept mostly applied to “lesser-used” not yet standardized languages (or “idioms”). In this sense, Pountain (2016, 638) states:

“It is perhaps not surprising, then, that polynomic standardization has been favoured in situations where language shift is very advanced and the sense of the speech community is principally associated with local cultural heritage, coupled with an academically informed awareness of a written linguistic tradition”.

Nevertheless, if standardization means the formal imposition of hierarchies between variants, the concept of “norme polynomique” is more of a didactic approach to the teaching of non-standardized languages meant to be implemented in school education than a full-fledged concept of standard (cf. Comiti 2009, 166s.). As such, it serves to avoid the typical problems arising from standardization in contexts of “lesser-used”, i.e. regional or minority, languages: while standardization is generally meant to increase prestige and gain recognition, speakers of traditionally spoken idioms often reject the standardized language, which entails the stigmatization of all the other variants (cf. below, 3.4).

3 Comparative standardology of the Romance languages

3.1 State of the art in (Romance) standardology

As we have seen above, standardization is not a recent subject of linguistic research. The study of standardization has received major attention in a whole series of most valuable manuals. In the “Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science” (German series title: “Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft” or HSK), standardization is markedly well treated by Ammon et al.’s (2004–2006) excellent manual *Sociolinguistics*. Standardization in Romance languages has, however, been treated neither in a comprehensive nor a comparative manner. This is not to say that there is no valuable information on the standardization of individual languages and particular aspects thereof. Extensive and useful, diachronic and synchronic information was already provided by Holtus/Metzeltin/Schmitt’s multi-volume (1988–2005) *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* (LRL) and, often but not always more up to date, by Ernst et al.’s (2003–2008) *Romanische Sprachgeschichte* (RSG; cf. Lebsanft 2008). In addition, standardization is also the exclusive subject of some larger handbooks. An excellent cross-linguistic manual with important contributions concerning Romance languages is Janich/Greule’s handbook *Sprachkulturen in Europa* (2002). This also holds true for Fodor/Hagège’s (1983–1994) impressive volumes on *Language Reform*. A manual on the Council of Europe’s *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* contains valuable information on standardization of Romance languages in socially dominated situations (Lebsanft/Wingender 2012). To this picture, some minor contributions like a very short overview by Pountain (2016) – a contribution to Ledgeway/Maiden’s *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages* (2016; cf. Tacke 2018) – must be added. More than 20 years ago, Posner/Green’s (1980–1993) *Trends in Romance Linguistics and Philology* contained a similar though much more extensive state of the art on standardization by Muljačić (1993). Furthermore, some volumes of the new series “Manuals of Romance Linguistics” (MRL; 2014–) edited by Günter Holtus and Fernando Sánchez-Miret, to

which this Manual belongs, treat this subject from a historical and/or a systematic perspective with reference to the different Romance languages and to different theoretical approaches and key issues. See, for example, the recently published *Manual of Romance Sociolinguistics* (Ayres-Bennett/Carruthers 2018). In this respect, an overlap in information with our Manual is inevitable. Likewise, there are important contributions of a more limited scope that focus on specific reference instruments, most notably dictionaries. In this context, see the important conceptual contributions in volume 1 (1989) and especially the articles on Romance dictionaries in volume 2 (1990) of Hausmann et al.'s comprehensive manual *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography* (1989–1990) as well as Haß' (2012) more recent manual on European dictionaries and encyclopedias, which contains articles on the development of the Italian (Schweickard 2012) and Spanish (Lebsanft 2012) lexicographic tradition. In addition, language standardization as a part of the history of linguistics as such is treated in various articles within Auroux et al.'s multi-volume *History of the Language Sciences* (2000–2006) and Haßler/Neis' excellent *Lexikon sprachtheoretischer Grundbegriffe des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (2009).

3.2 Reconceptualizing standardization: the purpose of this Manual

Against this background, the purpose of our Manual is to gather all the given knowledge and to update it by integrating the latest developments in the field of Romance language standardization. In some cases, this endeavor also entails the reconceptualization of standardization processes under new angles. It is our wish that standardization is seen more as a dynamic and constant process which goes way beyond the elaboration and publication of dictionaries and grammar books. In this sense, we have tried to highlight the often-neglected aspect of “modernization” subsumed, in Haugen's theory (cf. above, 2.2), under what he calls “elaboration” or “functional development” of standard languages. In the same spirit, we have integrated more recent concepts and perspectives that have not been considered by former manuals such as “restandardization” (cf. 2.2) and, above all, the notion of “pluricentricity” (cf. 2.3). What is more, the presentation not only considers the traditional objects of formal standardization, the triad consisting of orthography, lexicon and grammar, but also integrates two subjects that have barely been studied in a systematic manner until today: the standardization of pronunciation (orthoepy) and the treatment of linguistic doubts and difficulties within Romance language cultures. Consequently, this Manual is the first to offer a comprehensive presentation of the dynamics of standardization. It comprises all Romance languages, including “minor” ones and Creoles and integrates the most important concepts that govern the creation, elaboration and – in some cases – reconfiguration of today's Romance standard languages.

On account of the fact that most of the aforementioned contributions to Romance standardology are not accessible to scholars who lack multilingual education and in the absence of a scientific *lingua franca* in today's Romance linguistics, we have decided – “with a heavy heart” and against personal preferences – to choose English as the language of description for this Manual even though it represents a foreign language to all of our authors including us. However, in light of our expected readership, we have preferred not to include translations of quotes from Romance languages (at least in the case of Italian, French, Catalan, Spanish and Portuguese). We count on the language competence of our readers.

3.3 A comparative approach: the findings of this Manual

The internal symmetric structure of the language-specific chapters and articles that constitute this Manual is conceived to allow quick access for both readers interested in only one language and scholars doing cross-linguistic research. In what follows, we will present a comparative overview of the findings of this Manual based on the comprehensive presentations provided by our authors within chapters 8 to 14. In this sense, it is meant to offer a resumé that complements our authors' insights in order to identify both the regularities that govern the ongoing standardization of Romance languages and the idiosyncrasies that characterize each of them. According to the overall concept of this Manual, we will not present an (external) linguistic history of Romance languages nor analyze the primarily bottom-up development of “informal” standard languages in pre-modern times. This section will instead deal with the process of “formal” standardization that was initiated in Romance language cultures from the 16th and 17th century onwards, after informal norms governing language use had already emerged (cf. Haßler 2009, 698).

Formal standardization, as defined by Stewart (1968 [1962], 534), comprises above all the top-down process of deliberate standard-setting through codification activities regarding all relevant fields of language use. It encompasses activities meant to give explicit recognition to the linguistic norm or standard. Standardizing language thus means to codify those options that are considered “exemplary” (↗3). Codification might potentially cover all aspects of language regarding both form and content. However, since standardization has traditionally focused on codifying written (literary) language, some aspects of language use might be more subject to explicit regulation than others. Commonly, the domains of orthography, grammar and vocabulary are considered the core aspects of standardization, and languages that “dispose” of corresponding instruments (orthographic treatises, grammars and dictionaries) are usually considered “fully codified”. Nonetheless, there are potentially no limits to standardization: with the emergence of audio-visual mass media, the importance of codifying pronunciation via orthoepies has arisen. Furthermore, while formal standardization has always had the tendency to consider the use of language in formal situations, i.e. the highest register, in recent decades, it has also

taken the usage of educated speakers in more or less informal situations into account. The domains covered by formal standardization might also vary according to specific socio-historical and ideological contexts: take, for instance, the imposition – by law – of the forms of address *tovarășul* ‘comrade’ and *tovarășa* ‘female comrade’ in communist Romania in 1977 (cf. Techtmeier 1980, 67; Dahmen 2002, 225); another example is the more recent tendency to regulate public language use and specifically the forms not only of address but also of reference concerning the representation of women and minorities (“political correctness”; 76). These domains of language use are often regulated through specific usage guides of a more limited scope, e.g. the use of language by journalists or within a specific local or regional administration.

Considering the correspondence between domains (or objects) of standardization and formal reference instruments (like dictionaries), there is however no 1:1-relationship. From a semasiological perspective, codification instruments often serve more than one purpose, contributing thus to the codification of various domains and vice versa, as the following table shows:

Tab. 5: The correspondence between codification instruments and standardization domains.

Reference instrument	Domains codified (<i>primary object</i>, <i>secondary object</i>, [optional objects])
Orthographic treatises	<i>orthography</i> , [orthoepy]
Normative grammars	<i>grammar</i> [orthography], [orthoepy]
Normative dictionaries	<i>vocabulary</i> , (word) orthography, [orthoepy], (word) grammar
Dictionaries of language difficulties	<i>language use (speech)</i> , all domains

Unlike the development of standard language(s) in the English-speaking world, which might be considered a perfect example of what Stewart (1968 [1962], 534; cf. Schneider 2003; 2014) called “informal” standardization, faithful to Robert A. Hall’s (1950) “Leave your language alone!”, two core aspects become obvious. First, that the very idea of formal standardization, i.e. the purposeful, deliberate act of forging a standard language, is firmly anchored in all Romance language cultures – this is to say: language is never left alone! Second, the cultivation of Romance languages is – for historical reasons – typically conceived as an institutionalized activity that aims at stipulating formal standards and is strongly tied to institutional actors (statal, parastatal, private corporations), namely language academies. Under these specific circumstances, which originated, as we will see, in the Early Modern period, the question of the actors of standardization is essential to the understand-

ing of how today's Romance standard languages have been shaped. Generally, the actors of standardization can be classified as follows:

- 1) According to their status as supranational, (para-)statal or private actors depending on their linkage (or not) to governmental authority;
- 2) According to their corresponding areas of competence and the type of standard (supranational, national, regional) their norm-setting activity applies to.

The following table, adapted from Lebsanft (1998, 259; cf. also 1997, 93s.), represents these distinctions in a structured way:

Tab. 6: Actors, status and areas of competence in the field of language cultivation.

status		supra-(para-)national	(para-)statal	private
area of competence		cultivation of a supranational standard	cultivation of a regional/national standard	cultivation of standards of all scopes
actor	individual	–	–	[persons]
	institutional	<i>international associations of language institutions</i>	<i>national language institutions</i>	<i>corporate actors (e.g. news agencies, broadcasting stations, publishing houses)</i>

Not all language cultures dispose of actors on all levels. In fact, this scheme is originally based on the Spanish language culture, which offers a complete picture of possible actors. All the same, it could easily be used to describe French and Portuguese language cultures.

Standardization, like any activities that pertain to the broader field of language cultivation, does not happen in a vacuum; put in context, this is particularly true for Romance language cultures, which have, from early on, exerted much influence on one another. In this sense, the conception and most activities of formal standardization in Romance languages follow the way paved by Italian, French and, most notably, Spanish in the Early Modern period. In these languages, long-lasting informal activities had already resulted in the awareness of what was the “good use” (*bon usage*) of language and thus more or less informal language standards. The invention of the printing press, the rise of Humanism and the emergence of early modern nationalism increasingly called for formally standardized written languages. This quest for the codification of prestigious models of language use can be observed, above all, in the foundation of language academies, i.e. literary and/or philological societies with public authority: first, the Accademia della Crusca, founded in Florence in 1583, then the Académie française, founded in Paris in 1635, and finally, the Real Academia Española, established in Madrid in 1713 for the pur-

pose of catching up with the Italian and French academies. The first activities of these institutions consisted in the formal activity of creating dictionaries in order to codify the “good” language that had presumably arrived at its “golden age” and was closely tied to literary usage. The codification of vocabulary served, in this specific historical context, a twofold purpose: first, to conserve a vocabulary and an exemplary (written) language used by prestigious authors; second, to create a prestigious symbol of “the” language in order to defend cultural and linguistic superiority in a kind of “language competition” (Lat. *contentio de primatu linguarum*, Ger. *Sprachwettstreit*) between early modern nations. Other codification tasks like the standardization of orthography and grammar were secondary to that goal and only followed the lexicographic work or accompanied it for practical reasons (a dictionary requiring a consistent spelling).

While all three institutions still exist today, their status as authorities in questions of linguistic norm and standardization varies greatly. Only one of them, the Spanish academy, living up to its founding spirit of Enlightenment, has managed to maintain its role in the process of constant formal codification and elaboration. It was able to adapt its premises to a modern notion of standardization and standard language by integrating, systematically, the notion of pluricentricity (cf. above, 2.3) and by democratizing – at least discursively – its work and decision processes. In contrast, the Italian and French academies’ importance has considerably diminished over time. In the field of formal standardization, the Accademia della Crusca never went beyond the publication of dictionaries, the last of which appeared – unfinished – in 1923. The Académie française, in turn, didn’t abandon the task of standardizing the lexicon but has hardly made any progress in the 9th edition of its dictionary. Its grammaticographic mission was abandoned after the long awaited *Grammaire de l’Académie française*, finally published in 1932, was judged to be of poor quality (cf. Brunot 1932; Baum 1983; 1986). Dictionaries being the only common denominator, a comparison of their publication history might serve as an indicator of the codification activity of the three academies:

Tab. 7: Publication history of the Italian, French and Spanish language academies (dictionaries).

Accademia della Crusca	Académie française	Real Academia Española
<i>Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de l’Académie française/française</i>	[“ <i>Diccionario de autoridades</i> ”, <i>Diccionario de la lengua castellana/española</i>]
¹ 1612, ² 1623, ³ 1691, ⁴ 1729–1738, ⁵ 1863–1923 [unfinished]	¹ 1694, ² 1718, ³ 1740, ⁴ 1762, ⁵ 1798, ⁶ 1835, ⁷ 1878, ⁸ 1932–1935, ⁹ 1992– [not yet finished]	[1726–1739], ¹ 1780, ² 1783, ³ 1791, ⁴ 1803, ⁵ 1817, ⁶ 1822, ⁷ 1832, ⁸ 1837, ⁹ 1843, ¹⁰ 1852, ¹¹ 1869, ¹² 1884, ¹³ 1899, ¹⁴ 1914, ¹⁵ 1925, ¹⁶ 1936–1939, ¹⁷ 1947, ¹⁸ 1956, ¹⁹ 1970, ²⁰ 1984, ²¹ 1992, ²² 2001, ²³ 2014, (^{23.1/online} 2018, ^{23.2/online} 2019, ^{23.3/online} 2019)

Even though the Spanish academy is the only one to exhibit such influence on the ongoing standardization, the importance at least in symbolic terms of language academies is typical for almost all major Romance language cultures. In the spirit of the aforementioned academies, it is from the 19th century onwards that standardization became institutionalized in other Romance language cultures, too. In 1866, the Societatea Literară Română was founded in Bucharest (rebaptized *Academia Română* in 1879). The academy has the status of an officially regulatory institution for Romanian. In the Lusophone world there are two language academies to be considered: one of them is the Academia de Ciências de Lisboa, which was established in 1779 in the same spirit of Enlightenment as the Spanish academy, and the other the Academia Brasileira de Letras, founded following the example of the French academy in Rio de Janeiro in 1897. In the case of Catalan, the corresponding language academy, the Institut d'Estudis Catalans (IEC), was founded in Barcelona in 1907. In 1911, the Secció Filològica was established as a part of it in order to create and implement a formal standard in all Catalan-speaking regions and countries. Yet, despite its ambition to represent all Catalan-speaking areas, the IEC has not stayed the only relevant authority in this field since the Valencian Community created its own academy, the Acadèmia Valenciana de la Llengua, in 1998.

The influence that language academies exert in their respective countries and the overall societal status differs greatly. Of the aforementioned institutions (not considering those of “minor” Romance languages), only the Spanish, the Catalan and the Valencian language academies can be considered, as of today, major players in the domain of ongoing codification and modernization. In contrast, the importance of the other institutions is rather symbolic (the French academy sees its role rather in preventing any modernization) or has shifted towards the domain of recommendation-giving (the Italian). Various factors can be identified that explain the different standing of central language academies in the Romance-speaking countries:

- a) the historical role and legislative backing of language academies,
- b) their “human” resources, i.e. the role that linguists play within these institutions,
- c) the relative importance and the quality of reference instruments elaborated by language academies as opposed to the (normative) works divulged by other actors like competing language academies and private sector actors,
- d) their financial and technical resources and
- e) the openness of these institutions to reform and adaptation.

This latter aspect should not be underestimated. The openness to reform regards, first and foremost, the willingness and the ability to constantly modernize its codification in order to keep up with the communicative needs of the speakers and overall societal changes that impact language use. Take, for instance, the debates in nearly all Western language cultures about “sexist language” and “gender-neutral” or “in-

clusive” forms of expression. It regards, in other words, what Haugen (cf. above, 2.2) subsumes under the notion of “elaboration”, i.e. the functional development of the standard language. Rather than a mere additional aspect of standardization, elaboration is of utmost importance. In this sense, the Praguean concept of “elastic stability” (↗) has not lost any of its topicality. This is true especially under the (post-)modern conditions of globalization, the emergence first of mass media (radio, TV, internet) then of social media and, correspondingly, of both written and oral “media standards”. Consequently, language academies either adapt their concept of standard, away from the ideal of purified literary standards that still prevailed at the beginning of the 20th century, or they inevitably become less important in terms of actual actors of standardization and shift to a more symbolic role.

Nonetheless, even when central institutions are lacking or existing academies only contribute partially to standardization, language is never “left alone” but codified through dictionaries and grammars elaborated by individual scholars and private sector actors. Although these reference works might not always be explicitly published for the purpose of setting language standards, they assume that function by the way speech communities use and perceive them. In this sense, regardless of their approach – descriptive or prescriptive –, it is the most widely divulged and consulted dictionaries and grammars that tend to be taken as “references” of good language use, representing “the standard”. Therefore, it is essential to take private and private corporate actors into account when studying the field of formal standardization in the Romance languages. In an emergent process during the last decades, these actors have gained considerable influence on language use, particularly within the domain of post-school language education. Consequently, standard languages can no longer be conceived as “elitist literary standards”. In this sense, dictionaries of language difficulties that address linguistic topics in an accessible way, as well as style books and corresponding (online) consultation services, constitute important tools by which standards are not only dynamically set but also effectively implemented.

In accordance with the structure of chapters 8 to 13, the following comparative overview will take the objects of standardization as its point of departure: orthography and orthoepy (3.3.1), normative grammars (3.3.2), normative dictionaries (3.3.3) and dictionaries of language difficulties (3.3.4). In each case, the comparison will point out the main actors implicated, the specific instruments that fulfill this purpose within the respective language cultures as well as the underlying concepts and cultural influences. The “minor” Romance languages and Creoles (3.3.5) will only briefly be mentioned since the expositions in chapter 14 are already conceived as comparative overviews. Bibliographical references will only be given when the information results from the applied comparative approach and refers to texts not mentioned within the corresponding articles. In order not to disturb the readability of the text, cross-references will only scarcely be used.

3.3.1 Orthography and orthoepy

The problems arising first from putting the Romance languages to writing and later from standardizing their graphic representation into orthographic codes were essentially the same for all major languages: after centuries of Latin constituting the only written code for distance communication, scribes were confronted with the difficulty of representing newly evolved sounds that did not exist in Latin phonology with the limited inventory of letters that constitute the Latin alphabet. The diversity of letters (graphs and digraphs) that represent these sounds throughout today's Romance orthographies (cf., e.g., the representation of /ɲ/ or /ʎ/) is a mere reflection of the diversity of solutions that coexisted during the Middle Ages and beyond within each Romance language and their different writing traditions (also called *scriptae*). In this context, only Romanian stands out: appearing, as a written language, as late as the 16th century, it was not the Latin but the Cyrillic alphabet that was used until the 19th century. The problems of representation of certain characteristics of the Romanian phonology were, however, quite similar. Subsequently, the processes of informal standardization conceived as the bottom-up emergence of regularities in what is considered the “good” use of language (in this case writing) had culminated in the consolidation of writing traditions that allowed for much variation. In this situation, Humanism had great impact since the rediscovery of Ancient rhetoric and grammar (↗1) prompted a new kind of linguistic consciousness and resulted in a multitude of proposals to formally standardize orthography. At the same time, the invention of the printing press contributed to this rather new assessment that there was a need for an *orthography*, i.e. that variability should be eliminated. Consequently, the scholars participating in these debates in Italy, France and Spain evaluated the coexistence of graphic variants mostly as “chaotic”.

Since then and even today, the proposals to standardize or to “reform” established writing traditions have oscillated between two basic concepts: on the one hand, there is the idea, often referred to as “Quintilian’s principle”, that orthography should represent phonology – preferably in a 1 : 1-relationship between sounds and letters. On the other hand, through orthography, there is the desire to reflect the Ancient (i.e. Latin and Greek) roots of Romance languages called the “etymological principle”, i.e. to conceive and preserve a symbolic, sometimes called “true”, representation of words (cf., e.g., the French “*guerre du nénufar*” in the 1990s, ↗10.1). Italian and French best represent these two extremes: based on the Florentine and Roman model of pronunciation, Italian undeniably constitutes the most phonological orthography of all Romance languages, whereas the French orthography perpetuates a conservative, etymological, spelling system that was already in place by the 16th century and has barely been modified since. The other Romance languages are generally more inclined to the phonological principal although the closeness between orthography and phonology depends, of course, on the pronunciation model in question (for a comparative study of several Romance languages according to the underlying principles, cf. Meisenburg 1996).

Formal standardization of orthography, i.e. the codification of guidelines that would constitute the model to follow, began with the publication of the first dictionaries of the newly founded language academies in Italy, France and Spain. Beyond individual word orthography, which is a necessary side effect of lexicography, the Real Academia Española's dictionary also included an extensive exposition of the orthographic rule-set applied, the "Discurso proemial de la orthographía de la lengua castellana" (RAE 1726). The Spanish academy stands out in this regard because it has continued to treat orthography as a proper object of codification through the publication of dedicated treatises ever since. Only the Catalan language institution, the Institut d'Estudis Catalans, has followed since its *Normes ortogràfiques* were first published in 1913. By contrast, the most common way of codifying orthography in the Romance languages is through general dictionaries and sometimes through dedicated orthographic dictionaries as is the case in Romanian and Portuguese language culture. In France, where orthography is especially difficult to learn and considered a sign of social distinction, orthographic dictionaries and guidelines are published by all relevant publishing houses and complement the field of general reference dictionaries.

Among Romance language cultures, Portuguese is a special case in orthographic matters: not only did the first codification of orthography take place as late as 1911, but Portuguese does not dispose, as of today, of a unified orthography. Attempts to apply a unified spelling could not be accomplished and orthographic differences between national varieties are codified in a pluricentric manner through an online instrument, the *Vocabulário Ortográfico Comum da Língua Portuguesa* (VOC) (it shows the different variants according to the Lusophone country in question). Today, the orthographic codes of the Romance languages are quite stable and have not changed much in a long time. This does not only regard French orthography where an attempt to introduce some minor simplifications to its conservative code through a non-obligatory reform (the so-called *Rectifications* published in the State Gazette in 1990) was prevented, not least by the actions of the French academy. The constantly updated Spanish orthography has not introduced any changes to its system of sound-letter correspondences since 1815 either: as in Catalan and Portuguese, modifications mostly concern graphic accentuation, word division rules and punctuation. Hence, challenges of word orthography regard, above all, the difficulty of integrating foreign loanwords, especially Anglicisms (712.1).

Whereas orthography counts among the most regulated aspects of human speech, orthoepy, i.e. the definition and promulgation of a model of "good" pronunciation, is a rather neglected object of formal standardization by central institutions. Among them, only the Romanian academy has published dedicated instruments including an orthoepic dictionary. In other countries, orthoepy (more often called *orthology*) has been treated mostly in less influential treatises published by individual scholars. This means that historically, orthoepy has been subject to rather informal standardization in Romance language cultures: the diction of the highest

social group (the king, aristocracy and educated speakers) of certain political and cultural centers came to represent the “good” pronunciation and served as a model for other social groups. These centers are Bucharest for Romanian, Rome for Italian (or rather the “lingua toscana in bocca romana”, ↗9.1), Paris for French and Barcelona for Catalan. In the case of Spanish, the speech of the educated speakers of Castile traditionally constituted the model of pronunciation, but during the last century, independent pronunciation models evolved in Latin America. The same is true for Portuguese where various Brazilian and African pronunciation standards, quite different from European Portuguese, have been emerging for quite some time.

All Romance language cultures, especially those provided with predominantly phonologically based spelling systems, are marked by the dialectics between spoken and written language. Not only do Romance orthographies tend to be shaped phonologically by the pronunciation of educated speakers, but orthography has also had great influence on the evolution of pronunciation. The latter phenomenon is generally described as “spelling pronunciation”. In this sense, the maintenance, in French standard pronunciation, of /l/ in *il* [il] and *table* [tablə] or the almost general restitution of learned consonant groups in Spanish (e.g. DIGNUS > *dino* > *digno*) is due to a remodeling based on written language (↗10.1; ↗12.1).

Two phases regarding both the codification and the implementation of pronunciation models can be divided historically: the first took place in most Romance language cultures of the 19th and early 20th century when compulsory education was being introduced throughout Europe and led to the propagation of a “reading pronunciation” that disseminated learned pronunciation among all social classes. The second phase began with the appearance and spread of audio-visual mass media in the 1920s. Pronunciation was first propagated by professionals, later by all kinds of speakers through broadcasting stations, and entertainment media in general have facilitated the emergence of “oral” or “media” standards that are much less rigid than traditional models. It is in this domain, the articles of this Manual show, that formal standardization activities have been pursued by corporate media actors, drama schools and universities, sometimes building on the respective traditions of stage diction. These standardization activities are aimed at training professional speakers but undeniably have great impact on the whole speech community. Alongside the case of Italian, the most striking example might be the contribution of Brazil’s most influential broadcasting station, TV Globo, which creates and disseminates a pronunciation standard throughout the country (sometimes called “Globês”) by training its professional speakers in a supposedly neutral Brazilian exempt of regional characteristics (↗13.1).

3.3.2 Normative grammars

The first grammars describing Romance languages arose in the late 15th and 16th century. Beginning with Leon Battista Alberti’s *Grammatica della lingua toscana*

(or *Grammatichetta*, ca. 1438–1441) and Antonio de Nebrija's *Gramática sobre la lengua castellana* (2011 [1492]), it is a shared feature of all grammatical descriptions to be based on the Greco-Roman grammatical model, also called “traditional grammar” that has only partially been renovated until today through the influence of linguistic grammar models (71). This process of “grammatization” (Auroux 1992) can be considered the beginning of formal standardization. Out of the coexistence of different forms of (grammatical) expression for each linguistic feature, grammaticization entails the selection and generalization of forms and the stigmatization (often labelled as “errors”) of linguistic deviations. In this sense, any grammar formulates linguistic norms and can be considered “normative” even though some grammars tend to follow a more descriptive approach while others are discursively more openly selective and thus “prescriptive”. In taking up the Greco-Roman legacy of grammaticography, the normative grammars of Romance languages continued the normative conception of grammar right from the start, with the *ars bene/recte loquendi et scribendi* placing emphasis on the latter: the notion of correctness underlying this conception is based, first and foremost, on the written language of literary authors. Like Latin grammaticography, each Romance language had its own literature considered “classical” and representing the respective “golden age”. Accordingly, deviation from the usage pertaining to this literary canon – and thus change in general – received negative assessment. In this context, the notion of purism has been most relevant in all language cultures. In Catalan grammaticography, it means primarily purity (and purification) from Castilian influences. Regarding Romanian, grammaticography was defined by the rejection of any Balkan influences and the preference for Latin and Romance forms in what was denominated “westernization”, “re-Latinization” and “re-romanization” throughout the 19th century. Conversely, in Italian, French and Spanish grammaticography, purism was rather directed against anything deviating from the codified literary language and, of course, geographical varieties other than the cultural center: non-Florentine, non-Parisian (and non-hexagonal) and non-Peninsular forms.

Considering this as the common ground of Romance grammaticography, the relationship between the more or less rigidly grammatized, i.e. standardized, language and the more dynamic norms (in the Coserian sense; 73) defining the speech of educated speakers has varied both throughout time and from culture to culture. The codified literary norms of Romance languages have been modernized gradually since the 20th century by adopting a more description-driven grammar model based on a notion of standard oriented towards language use (the same is true in the field of lexicography, see below, 3.3.3).

Grammaticography was officially assumed as a task by most Romance language academies. Nevertheless, the Spanish academy is the only one to accomplish this task beginning with its *Gramática* of 1771 (RAE 1771) and updating its grammatical codification rather continuously until its recent *Nueva gramática de la lengua española* in 2009/2011 (NGLE). The Crusca, on the other side, never produced a reference

grammar and the French academy abandoned its grammaticographic mission after publishing its long awaited *Grammaire de l'Académie française* in 1932 (cf. above, 3.3; ↗10.2). The younger Lisboan academy, as well as the Brazilian one, did not produce any reference grammar either. The Catalan reference grammar published in Spanish by Pompeu Fabra in 1917 was assumed by the Barcelonese Institut d'Estudis Catalans and republished in Catalan in 1918 (Fabra 1918); most recently, the Institut d'Estudis Catalans published a new ambitious grammar in 2016 (GIEC). The Valencian academy also published its own normative grammar describing Valencian Catalan in 2006 (AVL 2006). The Romanian academy's first reference grammar is a collective work published in 2005 (²2008), coordinated by Valeria Guțu Romalo. The comparison shows that only the Spanish and the Catalan language culture have a long tradition of "official" grammars defining the codification and proliferation of grammatical rules. More often than not, the renowned reference grammars are the works of individual scholars such as *Le Bon Usage*, first published in 1936 by the Belgian linguist Maurice Grevisse and taken over after his death by André Goosse (currently in its 16th edition: Grevisse/Goosse ¹⁶2016). In Italy and the Lusophone countries, no single most important reference grammar can be identified, and several grammars share this (informal) status that comes from general diffusion, prestige and influence in terms of language education.

The comparison of the concept of standard applied in Romance reference grammars and the normative discourse (in the sense of Berrendonner 1982) has shown an interesting development since the late 20th century: a shift towards codifying a norm no longer based exclusively on literary language through an ever more descriptive discourse. Standard languages are increasingly based not only on written but also on spoken language, not only on literary texts but also on the language used by the mass media and educated speakers in general (often by relying on big linguistic corpora). Instead of ahistoric literary norms, variation and change are embraced and form part of the codification. Hence, sociolinguistics has entered grammaticography: grammatical forms are assessed in terms of their social evaluation. This descriptive-normative attitude entails a certain democratization of the standard through the approximation of the codified grammatical code to actual language use. This development is observable in both official normative grammars and individual scholars' publications. Especially significant in this context are the recently published grammars of the Spanish and the Barcelonese academies. Here, the notion of standard language, formerly marked by purism, has been conceptually reoriented towards a pluricentric concept (called "compositional model" by the IEC) that no longer stigmatizes but integrates the different geographical standard varieties which have emerged throughout the 19th and 20th century. The modification of criteria as part of the modernization of the concept of standard also means the return to both Quintilian's notion of *consuetudo*, that is, the consensus of what constitutes the good use of language according to educated speakers (presenting less variation than the speech of other social groups), and to the rhetorical notion of

aptum. This entails that linguistic variants are assessed in terms of their status among educated speakers and in terms of their adequacy or appropriateness according to the degree of formality required by the speech situation. However, the development of Romance languages, especially those most characterized today by pluricentricism, shows that complexity does not end here: not only does the use of educated speakers vary according to the formality of the situation but it also differs geographically – particularly in speech communities of such vast geographical and political extension like the Spanish and the Portuguese one. Meanwhile, Italian grammaticography has also “restandardized” (cf. above, 2.2) its grammatical code leaving behind its insistence on the Florentine literary canon, even though school grammars are still marked by normative conservatism and “entirely outdated prescriptions” (79.2). Portuguese reference grammars, on the other hand, are in effect – despite calling themselves “contemporary” or “modern” – still mostly built on literary language (713.2). Even the French codification, criticized ever since for its rigid and ahistoric concept of *bon usage*, is being modernized, although in a more prudent fashion and avoiding to look beyond hexagonal French.

Turning the inherent complexity of geographical, social and situational variation into a normative discourse that is still effective in terms of orientation is a major challenge of modern-day normative grammars. All grammars applying the concepts of variation and pluricentricity tend to be both descriptive and normative (cf. Tacke 2011). This is not a contradiction since there is no purely descriptive, “objective” discourse. Even the most descriptive grammars and dictionaries are inherently prescriptive for being perceived and used as such. However, the requirement of “normative orientation” is difficult to meet not only in the case of pluricentric codifications that describe – for each linguistic feature or variable – a multitude of variants. In this context, a comparison of the criticism directed at contemporary grammars (see the respective contributions) shows interesting parallels.

The lack of normative orientation is addressed in various ways:

- 1) by producing reduced, i.e. simplified, versions of the same grammar (by omitting part or all of the sub-standard variation like in the case of the Spanish academy’s grammar);
- 2) by complementing the normative grammar by other, more accessible and orienting types of reference tools like, for instance, dictionaries of language difficulties (see below, 3.3.4);
- 3) by offering language-advice through other kinds of publication and online services (cf. “La Crusca per voi”) (see below, 3.3.4).

This clearly illustrates that today, more than ever, the standardization of grammar, traditionally carried out by grammar books that followed the Greco-Roman model, is being taken over and implemented through a variety of instruments that complement each other.

3.3.3 Normative dictionaries

Generally, dictionaries exhibit highly social and symbolic value in any language culture. For this reason, among the three core instruments of formal standardization, lexicography is undeniably the most publicly outstanding codifying activity. In Italy, France and Spain the publication of great dictionaries constituted the first major endeavor of the newly founded academies (see above, 3.3). In their beginnings, these dictionaries were not strictly meant to standardize language use but to demonstrate the cultural greatness, wealth and significance of their respective language. Nonetheless, these were normative dictionaries right from the start in the sense that they codified, through the mechanisms of word selection and exclusion, what was considered the “good use” of language in lexical terms. The comparison of Romance lexicography shows that formal standardization in lexicography was mostly restricted to literary language up until the 19th and in some cases even well into the 20th century. Differences between the three major dictionaries, the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*, the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie française/française* and the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana/española*, concerned the openness of the respective literary canon, the reference to a more or less defined geographical variety and the acceptance or exclusion of sub-standard forms. The most striking example of restrictiveness is perhaps the Italian case. Following the pattern of Pietro Bembo’s *Prose della volgar lingua* (2001 [1525]), the presence or lack of writings of the great Florentine authors of the 14th century determined the selection of lexical means. In this context, the codification of the lexicon could only be modernized in all three languages to the extent that the literary canon was extended to authors of more recent centuries and other geographical provenience. A key concept governing the exclusion of vocabulary is purism. In Italian language culture, it was directed against authors from other regions and only in more recent centuries against foreign borrowings. In France, it was meant to restrict the canon to Parisian *bon usage* and in Spain, purism was directed against both American Spanish forms and foreign borrowings up until the 20th century.

Following the example of Italian, French and Spanish and according to the same premises (literary language, purism), the formal standardization of the Catalan lexicon was initiated at the beginning of the 20th century with Pompeu Fabra’s *Diccionari ortogràfic* (1917) and especially the *Diccionari general de la llengua catalana* (1932). Purism meant – and still regards today – the stigmatization of Castilianisms. In the case of Romanian, academic lexicography followed the way paved by purist dictionaries in the 19th century when the first official dictionaries were published starting in the 1950s. The last of the major Romance languages to receive official instruments is Portuguese. In 1988, the Brazilian academy officialized the dictionary first published by Antenor Nascentes between 1961 and 1967. In 2001, the Lisboan academy accomplished the publication of its first complete dictionary, the *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa Contemporânea* (DLPC). However, these dictionar-

ies were no longer based primarily on literary language but already represent a newer type of normative lexicography based on a much wider notion of (written) standard language.

Beginning in the middle of the 19th century, a conceptual reorientation of (normative) lexicography took place and both the restriction of selection criteria to literary language and purism have slowly been given up in a process of “destandardization” (cf. above, 2.2). Since then, the selection criteria have been opened up to neologisms and scientific vocabulary, and most importantly, to everyday (written) language usage and geographical varieties previously regarded as sub-standard. In this context of restandardization (cf. above, 2.2), dictionaries became usable instruments for any educated speakers and the academies’ multi-volume dictionaries (the Spanish DRAE is an exception since 1780) gave place to single-volume dictionaries rather devoid of literary *exempla*. Again, the Italian situation is a particularly good illustration of this development. As a result of the political unification of Italy (1861–1871), the age-old limitation to the literary Florentine language became obsolete and gave place to the creation of a whole series of non-academic dictionaries adapted to “the new linguistic scenarios” (↗9.3) beginning with the *Dizionario della lingua italiana* by Niccolò Tommaseo and Bernardo Bellini (1865–1879). At the same time, the Crusca’s inability to adapt explains why the fifth edition of its *Vocabolario* remained unfinished and was abandoned in 1923. Since then, the reference in terms of lexicographic standardization is set by dictionaries “dell’uso” published by individual actors. The French academy’s lexicographic activity, while officially still ongoing, seems to be meeting the same fate. Whereas it symbolically maintains its status as “the” norm-defining actor, the publishing houses Hachette, Robert¹⁸ and Larousse have come to be the “big players” (↗10.3) when it comes to defining and constantly modernizing the lexicographic standard. A similar situation defines Catalan language culture (cf. Kailuweit 2002; Tacke 2017): although the Institut d’Estudis Catalans has recently recognized the necessity for reorienting Fabra’s archaizing literature-based codification towards a concept of standard language (cf. above, 3.3.2) that takes into account actual usage, it has not applied it to its dictionary yet. Against this backdrop, more pragmatic entities like the Catalan Media Corporation (Corporació Catalana de Mitjans Audiovisuals) have been establishing their own more flexible “media standard”, more adapted to the communicative needs of modern society (↗11.3; ↗11.4). Meanwhile, in Portuguese language culture, the aforementioned recent publication of academic dictionaries entered a lexicographic landscape already occupied by important reference-setting dictionaries like those of the publisher Porto Editora in Portugal, and the Brazilian “dictionary families” popularly dubbed *Michaelis*, *Aurélio* and *Houaiss* (↗13.3). The Spanish academy’s dictionary stands out in this context: on the one hand, it has constantly been modernized

¹⁸ The Robert dictionaries are based on the model of Émile Littré’s dictionary, the most important French dictionary of the 19th century (↗10.3).

in order to keep up with the increasing competition from individual actors since the 19th century; on the other hand, the Spanish academy has successfully managed to replace its concept of purism for a modern and pluricentric concept of standard that embraces geographical variation (↗12.3). Alongside excellent dictionaries “de uso” and despite all criticism, it thus remains the most important dictionary in the Spanish-speaking world.

The recent notion of pluricentrism (cf. above, 2.3) could also be most relevant regarding French and Portuguese. While the French academy rejects considering non-hexagonal forms and private dictionaries like those of Robert, who applied it rather cautiously, pan-Portuguese endeavors to embrace it have not yet completely materialized. It remains to be seen if the recent creation of a common orthographic dictionary (*Vocabulário Ortográfico Comum da Língua Portuguesa* [VOC]) can constitute the grounds for future projects (↗13.3).

In recent years, the rhythm in terms of lexicographic standardization and modernization has increased and the way dictionaries are consulted has changed. On the one side we see how private publishers have adopted a policy of annual new editions starting with the *Zingarelli* (since 1994), the *Petit Robert* (PR) (since 2002), and, most recently, even the Spanish academy’s dictionary (since 2017). On the other side, modern language users prefer online consultation and access via smartphone applications. The information provided by our contributors demonstrates that dictionaries are among the first codification instruments to benefit from the advantages of digitalization.

3.3.4 Dictionaries of language difficulties

One of the consequences of formal standardization and the implementation of the standard through school education is the imposition of hierarchies between linguistic variants, i.e. between those forms considered “good use” and those stigmatized as sub-standard (colloquial, vulgar, etc.). This is not just an “objective” fact but also a mental reality for speakers: the implementation of standard languages raises awareness among speakers about the value judgements tied to the use of these variants (cf. Joseph 1987, 16). Since the prescriptive (written) norm of a language constitutes an arbitrary social convention, which is not necessarily based on actual usage or only on the use of a social elite, it “forms a kind of second language” whose acquisition is “comparable in some respects to the acquisition of a foreign language” (↗12.4). Consequently, the implementation of linguistic norms through the constant enforcement of “the good use” and the sanctioning of deviating variants creates linguistic doubts among speakers who wish (and need) to speak and write “correctly”, i.e. according to the standardized linguistic model. What is more, in each language culture, there are specific domains of the standard (concerning all types of linguistic structure not only prescriptive grammar rules) that appear

particularly difficult. These doubts and difficulties regarding the acquisition and use of the standard lead to what is called “linguistic insecurity” (Labov 1972; cf. Francard 1997). The scope of linguistic insecurity is, however, not limited to school education, where the standard is effectively implemented but also extends to post-school education.

Against this backdrop, it comes as no surprise that during the Early Modern period, in parallel to the beginning of formal standardization activities in the Romance languages, specific tools addressing both doubts and difficulties emerged. These instruments have evoked and followed up on an ancient textual tradition most famously represented by the *Appendix Probi* and its rhetorical formula “*x*, non *y*” (cf. Lausberg ³1990, § 784, 791; Joseph 1987, 16), also called *Antibarbarus* since the Early Modern period. Hausmann (1977, 139) calls them “dianormative dictionaries” for the general characteristic of discussing and marking variants according to their status. The first of its kind in Romance languages is probably Vaugelas’ *Remarques* from 1647. The expression “doutes et difficultez” used by Vaugelas (2009 [1647], 70) was later taken up and is, as of today, quite common within Romance language cultures. For the purpose of this Manual, instead of the English term *usage guide*, we prefer the term *dictionaries of language difficulties*, although, the tools and instruments considered and treated in this Manual under this heading might be known under different names.

Comparing the development of this kind of dianormative instruments, the roots of the present-day dictionaries of difficulties can be traced back to the 19th century in all Romance language cultures. This is especially true in the case of Italian, where the centuries-old Florentine standard “as a non-native and almost only literary grapholect” (↗9.4) was quite unknown to most Italians. By contrast, it is only in the 20th century, when Catalan was first formally standardized by Fabra and the Institut d’Estudis Catalans, that such dictionaries emerged. In their title, most of these works refer to the concepts of doubt or difficulty, either by naming them explicitly or by other terms that address the speakers’ linguistic insecurity: by evoking the idea of (in)correctness, speaking well, by referring to barbarisms, “traps” or “subtleties”. These instruments vary from one language culture to another regarding their degree of openness towards modernization. In Italian language culture, the “constancy of tradition” (↗9.4) prevails over the acknowledgement of linguistic dynamics. The same is true in French and mostly in Portuguese language culture, while the Spanish case has adopted a more forward-looking normative attitude in consonance with the policy adopted by the Spanish language academies. Again, the Catalan case is special. Due to its sociolinguistic situation within Spain, the official codification with its dictionaries of language difficulties is characterized by a strong puristic attitude against any interferences from Castilian and continues, in this sense, a centuries-old tradition of *tractats de barbarismes* (↗11.4).

Another textual tradition aimed at the resolution of linguistic uncertainties emerged in the 1970s in Spain when newspapers and press agencies created linguis-

tic consultation services in order to cultivate their “product”. Spanish *libros de estilo*, first described systematically by Lebsanft (1993; 1997), merged the aforementioned tradition of dianormative dictionaries with American *style books* and have since been adopted as a reference instrument in other Romance language cultures, too. Aimed at the language used by mass media, style books have a special role to play when it comes to modernizing and implementing the given prescriptive norm. While language academies and other actors rarely dispose of the resources necessary to modernize its codification in such a dynamic way as media practices demand (take, for instance, the integration of foreign words), style books and consulting services are much more flexible and adapted for the continuous activity of standardizing and modernizing. It is especially the more recent emergence of online consultation services that extend the scope of printed style books. These are often accessible by the general public as is the case of the Spanish press agency EFE’s *Fundación de Español Urgente* (Fundéu) or the Catalan *Optimot* and the CCMA’s *ésAdir*, which have even gone so far as to incorporate Twitter and Instagram as viable dissemination tools in recent years. Following the example of these corporations, language academies have been trying to keep up and impose themselves as major players in the field of recommendation giving: the Italian and the Spanish academies have similar offers and even the French academy has a Twitter account through which it occasionally publishes “On dit ... On ne dit pas ...”-recommendations. *Ciberdúvidas da língua portuguesa* offers a comparable consultation service for all Lusophone countries since 1997.

In sum, instruments like the above-mentioned are becoming increasingly important in Romance language cultures. This is not only due to the general necessity of implementing standard languages through post-school education but can also be explained by the general shift, exposed above, in section 3.3.2, from a prescriptive normative discourse towards descriptivism and variational complexity in (normative) grammaticography. Where speakers do not feel oriented by traditional instruments, they turn to more easily accessible and normatively explicit tools.

3.3.5 “Minor” Romance languages and Creoles

The long tradition of institutionalization in the field of formal standardization that characterizes the cultivation of “major” Romance languages explains why language planning, especially regarding corpus planning and the elaboration of formal instruments, can be considered a matter of course in Romance-speaking cultures. “Minor” Romance languages, most notably Creoles, are, in most cases, languages that dispose of neither a long and continuous tradition of written literature nor a unitary “common language” and informal standard languages. Nevertheless, it comes as no surprise that during the rather recent emergence of “lesser-used” minority or regional languages initiatives to standardize them often tend to follow the way paved by

their already “fully” standardized sisters. This concerns both the creation of similar institutions and instruments. In this sense, in order to affirm an idiom’s status as a “full-fledged language”, it has to be named. That means, it needs an institution and it needs to dispose of at least an orthography. This is particularly true for the Iberian Peninsula, where (royal) academies and institutes were founded for those languages that are labelled today “las demás lenguas españolas” in article 3 of the Spanish Constitution: the Real Academia Galega and the Instituto da Lingua Galega in 1906 and 1971 respectively, the Real Academia de la Lengua Vasca-Euskaltzaindia in 1918 (for the only non-Romance language), the Academia de la Llingua Asturiana in 1980/1981, the Academia de l’Aragonés in 2006 and – following the establishment by the Catalan government of a commission to standardize Aranese, the variety of Gascon spoken in Spain – the Institut d’Estudis Aranés in 2014. Since orthography is the most symbolic instrument, and at the same time paramount to status planning, all these institutions have at least proposed spelling norms. While the implementation of those norms is often difficult due to the existence of competing proposals, the authority of the Galician and the Asturian institutions is quite consolidated nowadays and standardization also comprises dictionaries and grammars of high quality. By contrast, the Aragonese academy lacks official status and legislative backing. Besides other associations that claim authority like the Societat de Lingüística Aragonesa, founded in 2004, it is the regional government that assumed official authority through its Dirección General de Política Lingüística in 2015 and intends to codify spelling in cooperation with the aforementioned institutions. In the absence of a continuous writing tradition and thus informal standards, the codification of these languages, as well as other “intermediate” idioms (e.g. Mirandese and Galician-Asturian), is often difficult. Critical aspects concern the pursuit of *abstand* (cf. above, 2.2) both to Castilian and to neighbouring languages and varieties as well as the finding of a compromise between diatopical varieties. These compromises often oscillate between polynomic, pluricentric and supra-dialectal approaches (↗14.3). Moreover, the subsequent implementation of codified standards is sometimes more difficult to achieve than codification itself.

In France, Switzerland and Italy, institutionalized language academies with para-statal status and legislative backing are somewhat less common. However, many regions are politically committed to the promotion of “their” languages as is the case of the Osservatorio linguistico per la cultura e la lingua sarda, which is a public entity of the regional government of Sardinia. More often, standardization relies on the initiatives of individuals and private language associations, as was the case with Francoprovençal and Corsican. Among the other “minor” Romance languages, the Institut d’Estudis Occitans, founded in 1945 and named after its Catalan counterpart, resembles the above-mentioned academies more by name than by its activities, which are mostly limited to cultural events. In 2011, a new institution, Lo Congrès permanent de la lenga occitana, was founded in order to promote a unitary Occitan standard language. It provides various reference tools, most notably dictionaries and databases (↗14.2).

Concerning the Rhaeto-Romance languages, the standardization of Ladin is coordinated through the *Servisc de Planificazion y Eleborazion dl Lingaz Ladin* which has been publishing both a reference grammar and dictionaries that enforce the newly created *Ladin Dolomitan* standard since its foundation in 1994. As of Romansh, a similar concept of a written supra-dialectal standard, *Rumantsch Grischun*, was created and codified through dictionaries, databases and grammars. The association *Lia Rumantscha*, founded in 1928 as an umbrella organization, constitutes the most important institution in all aspects of its promotions. In the case of Friulan, the *Società Filologica Friulana*, founded in 1919, is the most important actor (↗14.1). Generally when looking at standardization, it is difficult to cross the line between these institutions and the codification work of individuals. In many cases, orthographic proposals, dictionaries and grammars elaborated by individuals are simply assumed and published by or implemented through these associations.

In the case of Romance-based Creoles, the question of relevant actors is even more complicated. In many cases, dictionaries and grammars have been elaborated by (foreign) researchers in attempts to document, not codify, them. Apart from that, problems like competing norms often resemble those observed in the above-mentioned “minor” Romance languages since consensus on which spelling system and linguistic forms are to be considered “standard” are hard to find in environments of traditionally spoken languages that are characterized by high internal variation (↗14.4).

4 About the structure of this Manual

The focus of the first part of this Manual is on theoretical approaches to standard and standardization, from Antiquity to new trends in linguistics. Some of the first seven chapters on (prescriptive) linguistic norm may perhaps be more expectable than others. Nonetheless, we assume that all are necessary to cover the study of “formal” standardization not only as the result of normative activities but also as ongoing processes that lead to codified standards. The key issues of standardization are already addressed by Ancient grammar and rhetoric. Only in the 20th century, after a long period of disinterest, did the theory of linguistic cultivation of the Prague Circle of Linguistics reopen the debate on standardization as an object of descriptive linguistics. Coseriu’s comprehensive, multi-layered model of linguistic competence shows that the “exemplary” usage of language is the vanishing point of any categorization of linguistic variation. This is also true for sociolinguistics since its focus on “non-” or “substandard” varieties presupposes the existence of a standard. Pragmatic and Cognitive Linguistics focus on interactional aspects of normative activities, however with quite different frames of explanation. Finally, Discourse Linguistics privileges a metanormative approach that looks behind the scene on which the play of “Standardization” is performed.

The second part of our Manual describes the instruments of codification and modernization of the prescriptive norm in a second set of seven chapters (8–13), corresponding to Romanian, Italian, French, Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese. Furthermore, and this decision may be a controversial one, another chapter (14) is dedicated to “minor” Romance languages as well as Romance-based Creoles. It offers surveys on corresponding activities of formal standardization activities. The focus on reference books of orthography and orthoepy, grammar, and lexicon, as well as on usage guides (the “dictionaries of language difficulties”), is certainly only one among many other possibilities to structure the field of standardization. However, the answers that our authors give to the question “quibus auxiliis?” (“By what means?”) show that they don’t exclude the other elements of the famous medieval heuristic hexameter “quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando?” (“Who says what, where, by what means, why, how, when?”), which is frequently used in the study of standardization (cf., for example, the bibliography in Lebsanft 1997, 82; ↗7). Since the domains of standardization and codification instruments do not correspond with each other in a 1:1-relationship as we have shown above (cf. section 3.3), each author has been given the liberty of discussing their subject by adding an onomasiological perspective to their article. Beyond normative grammars and dictionaries, the question of “By which means?”, or here: “Through which instruments?”, is particularly interesting regarding the domain of orthography and orthoepy, the latter often lacking dedicated codification instruments. Finally, as of today and against the backdrop of what might be called a “descriptive turn” in normative grammaticography, the standardization of grammar is increasingly codified through usage guides – a tradition of texts providing normative orientation that have many different names within Romance language cultures and constitute an interesting, yet – in our opinion – overly neglected object of study.

All chapters follow a roughly similar structure: After an introduction that outlines the basic theoretical premises, information is given on the normative traditions in which contemporary instruments and reference tools are embedded. Even though the focus of this Manual is on contemporary codification instruments and reference tools, these are almost always the result of long historical processes and embedded in normative traditions. Therefore, in order to highlight these traditions and to identify both continuities and discontinuities or even ruptures with previous instruments, all articles include at least a brief historical section.

Finally, this Manual provides an index of subjects that allows the reader easy access to both to theoretical notions and to secondary subjects.

5 Bibliography

Académie française, *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française/française*, Paris, [different publishing houses], ¹1694, ²1718, ³1740, ⁴1762, ⁵1798, ⁶1835, ⁷1878, ⁸1932–1935, ⁹1992–[not yet finished].

- Académie française (1932), *Grammaire de l'Académie française*, Paris, Firmin-Didot.
- Accademia della Crusca, *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*, ¹1612, ²1623, ³1691, ⁴1729–1738, ⁵1863–1923 [unfinished].
- Adrey, Jean-Bernard (2009), *Discourse and Struggle in Minority Language Policy Formation. Corsican Language Policy in the EU Context of Governance*, Basingstoke (Hampshire), Palgrave McMillan.
- Alberti, Leon Battista (1996 [1438–1441]), *Grammatichetta e altri scritti sul volgare*, ed. Giuseppe Patota, Roma, Salerno.
- Ammon, Ulrich (1995), *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz. Das Problem der nationalen Varietäten*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Ammon, Ulrich (2004), *Standard Variety/Standardvarietät*, in: Ulrich Ammon et al. (edd.), *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, 2nd completely revised and extended edition, vol. 1, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 273–283.
- Ammon, Ulrich, et al. (edd.) (2004–2006; online 2008), *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, 2nd completely revised and extended edition, 3 vol., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- AND online = William Rothwell et al. (2005–), *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, London, Maney/MHRA, <<http://www.anglo-norman.net/>>.
- Aracil, Lluís Vicent (1976 [1965]), *Conflit linguistique et normalisation linguistique dans l'Europe nouvelle*, Perpignan, Centre universitaire.
- Auer, Anita (2012), *Late Modern English: Standardization*, in: Alexander Bergs/Laurel J. Brinton (edd.), *English Historical Linguistics*, vol. 1.2, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 939–952.
- Auer, Peter (2017), *The Neo-Standard of Italy and Elsewhere in Europe*, in: Massimo Cerruti/Claudia Crocco/Stefania Marzo (edd.), *Towards a New Standard. Theoretical and Empirical Studies on the Restandardization of Italian*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 365–374.
- Auroux, Sylvain (1992), *Introduction. Le processus de grammatisation et ses enjeux*, in: Sylvain Auroux (ed.), *Histoire des idées linguistiques*, vol. 2: *Le développement de la grammaire occidentale*, Liège, Mardaga, 11–64.
- Auroux, Sylvain, et al. (edd.) (2000–2006), *History of the Language Sciences. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present*, 3 vol., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- AVL 2006 = Acadèmia Valenciana de la Llengua (2006), *Gramàtica normativa valenciana*, València, Publicacions de l'Acadèmia Valenciana de la Llengua.
- Ayres-Bennett, Wendy (2019), *From Haugen's codification to Thomas's purism: assessing the role of description and prescription, prescriptivism and purism in linguistic standardisation*, *Language Policy*, 1–31.
- Ayres-Bennett, Wendy/Carruthers, Janice (edd.) (2018), *Manual of Romance Sociolinguistics*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter.
- Baum, Richard (1983), *Zum Problem der Norm im Französischen der Gegenwart*, in: Franz Josef Hausmann (ed.), *Die französische Sprache heute*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 366–410.
- Baum, Richard (1986), *Akademiegrammatik und "Bon Usage"*, in: Alberto Barrera-Vidal/Hartmut Kleineidam/Manfred Raupach (edd.), *Französische Sprachlehre und "bon usage"*, München, Hueber, 33–50.
- Baxter, Alan N. (1992), *Portuguese as a Pluricentric Language*, in: Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 11–43.
- Bec, Pierre (1991), *Okzitanisch: Sprachnormierung und Standardsprache*, in: Günter Holtus/Michael Metzeltin/Christian Schmitt (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik (LRL)*, vol. 5.2: *Okzitanisch, Katalanisch*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 45–58.
- Bédard, Édith/Maurais, Jacques (edd.) (1983), *La norme linguistique*, Québec, Direction générale des publications gouvernementales du ministère des Communications.

- Bembo, Pietro (2001 [1525]), *Prose della volgar lingua. L'editio princeps del 1525 riscontrata con l'autografo Vaticano latino 3210*, ed. Claudio Vela, Bologna, CLUEB.
- Bergs, Alexander/Brinton, Laurel J. (edd.) (2012), *English Historical Linguistics*, vol. 1.2, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Berrendonner, Alain (1982), *L'éternel grammairien. Étude du discours normatif*, Bern/Frankfurt a. M., Lang.
- Berruto, Gaetano (2012 [1987]), *Sociolinguistica dell'italiano contemporaneo*, Roma, Carocci.
- Birnbaum, Solomon A. (1954), *Review of Kloss (1952)*, *The Slavonic and East European Review* 33, 285–286.
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1933), *Language*, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston (US edition).
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1935 [1933]), *Language*, London, Allen & Unwin (British edition).
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1964), *Lenguaje*, Lima, Universidad de San Marcos.
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1970), *Le langage*, Paris, Payot.
- Bloomfield, Leonard (1974), *Il linguaggio*, Milano, Il Saggiatore.
- Bradbury, Jim (2005), *The Routledge Companion to Medieval Warfare*, London/New York, Routledge.
- Brunot, Ferdinand (1932), *Observations sur la Grammaire de l'Académie française*, Paris, Droz.
- Cerruti, Massimo/Crocco, Claudia/Marzo, Stefania (2017), *On the Development of a New Standard Norm in Italian*, in: Massimo Cerruti/Claudia Crocco/Stefania Marzo (edd.), *Towards a New Standard. Theoretical and Empirical Studies on the Restandardization of Italian*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 3–28.
- Chantefort Pierre (1976), *Diglossie au Québec, limites et tendances actuelles*, *Langue française* 31, 91–104.
- Chesterfield, Lord (1754), *Two Letters on Fixing a Standard of the English Language, relative to Mr. Johnson's Dictionary*, *The Magazine of Magazines* 8, 588–593.
- Chiorboli, Jean (ed.) (1991), *Les langues polynomiques. Actes du colloque international des langues polynomiques*, Corte, Université de Corse.
- Chiorboli, Jean (2002), *La codification des langues polynomiques: L'orthographe du corse*, in: Dominique Caubet/Salem Chaker/Jean Sibille (edd.), *Codification des langues de France*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 140–153.
- Clyne, Michael (1992a), *Pluricentric Languages – Introduction*, in: Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 1–9.
- Clyne, Michael (1992b), *Epilogue*, in: Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 455–465.
- Clyne, Michael (ed.) (1992c), *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Comiti, Jean-Marie (2009), *Pour une pédagogie des langues minorées: l'exemple de la Corse*, in: Patrick Sauzet/François Pic (edd.), *Politique linguistique et enseignement des "Langues de France"*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 165–171.
- Coseriu, Eugenio (1988), *Die Ebenen des sprachlichen Wissens. Der Ort des "Korrekten" in der Bewertungsskala des Gesprochenen*, in: Jörn Albrecht/Jens Lüdtke/Harald Thun (edd.), *Energeia und Ergon. Sprachvariation – Sprachgeschichte – Sprachtypologie. Studia in honorem Eugenio Coseriu*, vol. 1: *Schriften von Eugenio Coseriu (1965–1978)*, eingeleitet und herausgegeben von Jörn Albrecht, Tübingen, Narr, 327–364.
- Crowley, Tony (1989), *The Politics of Discourse. The Standard Language Question in British Cultural Debates*, Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Dahmen, Wolfgang (2002), *Rumänisch*, in: Nina Janich/Albrecht Greule (edd.), *Sprachkulturen in Europa. Ein internationales Handbuch*, Tübingen, Narr, 220–231.
- Daneš, František (2008), *Herausbildung und Reform von Standardsprachen und Destandardisierung*, in: Ulrich Ammon et al. (edd.), *Sociolinguistics. An International*

- Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, 2nd completely revised and extended edition, vol. 3.3, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 2197–2209.
- del Valle, José (2019), *Language planning and its discontents: lines of flight in Haugen's view of the politics of standardization*, *Language Policy*, 1–17.
- Di-Meglio, Alain (2009), *La langue corse dans l'enseignement: données objectives et sens sociétal*, *Tréma* 31 [L'enseignement des langues régionales en France aujourd'hui: état des lieux et perspectives, <<http://trema.revues.org/975>> (07/24/2018)], 85–94.
- DLPC = Academia das Ciências de Lisboa (2001), *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa Contemporânea*, 2 vol., Lisboa, Verbo.
- DMLBS online = Richard Ashdowne/David Howlett/Ronald Edward Latham (1975–2013), *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, 17 vol., London, Oxford University Press.
- DPD = Real Academia Española/Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2005), *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*, Madrid, Santillana.
- Dubois, Jean, et al. (1973), *Dictionnaire de linguistique*, Paris, Larousse.
- Dubois, Jean, et al. (1978), *Dicionário de lingüística*, São Paulo, Cultrix.
- Dubois, Jean, et al. (1979a), *Dizionario di linguistica*, Bologna, Zanichelli.
- Dubois, Jean, et al. (1979b), *Diccionario de lingüística*, Madrid, Alianza.
- Du Cange = Charles du Fresne, Sieur du Cange (1954 [1883–1887]), *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis* [...], editio nova aucta pluribus verbis aliorum scriptorum a Leopold Favre, 10 in 5 vol., Graz, Ak. Druck.
- Fabra, Pompeu (1917), *Diccionari ortogràfic. Precedit d'una exposició de l'ortografia catalana segons el sistema de l'IEC*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- Fabra, Pompeu (1918), *Gramàtica Catalana*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- Fabra, Pompeu (1932), *Diccionari general de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona, Llibreria Catalònia.
- Ferguson, Charles A. (1959), *Diglossia*, *Word* 15, 325–340.
- Ferguson, Charles A. (1968), *Language Development*, in: Joshua A. Fishman/Charles A. Ferguson/Jyotirindra Das Gupta (edd.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 27–35.
- FEW = Walther von Wartburg (1928ss.), *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*, 25 vol., Tübingen, Mohr/Basel, Helbing und Lichtenhahn; Zbinden.
- Fishman, Joshua (1967), *Bilingualism with and without Diglossia; Diglossia with and without Bilingualism*, *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (2), 29–38.
- Fishman, Joshua (ed.) (1974), *Advances in Language Planning*, The Hague/Paris, Mouton.
- Fishman, Joshua (1983), *Aménagement et norme linguistiques en milieux linguistiques récemment conscientisés*, in: Édith Bédard/Jacques Maurais (edd.), *La norme linguistique*, Québec, Direction générale des publications gouvernementales du ministère des Communications, 383–394.
- Fleischer, Wolfgang (1984), *Zum Begriff "nationale Variante einer Sprache" in der sowjetischen Soziolinguistik*, *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte der Karl-Marx-Universität, Leipzig, Sektion Theoretische und angewandte Sprachwissenschaft*, 43, 63–72.
- Fodor, István/Hagège, Claude (edd.) (1983–1994), *Language Reform, History and Future*, 6 vol., Hamburg, Buske.
- Francard, Michel (1997), *Insécurité linguistique*, in: Marie-Louise Moreau (ed.), *Sociolinguistique. Concepts de base*, Liège, Mardaga, 170–176.
- Garvin, Paul L. (1959), *The Standard Language Problem: Concepts and Methods*, *Anthropological Linguistics* 1, 28–31.
- Garvin, Paul L. (ed.) (1964 [1955]), *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*, selected and translated from the original Czech by Paul L. Garvin, Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press (1955: Washington Linguistic Club).

- Garvin, Paul L. (1983), *Le rôle des linguistes de l'École de Prague dans le développement de la norme linguistique tchèque*, in: Édith Bédard/Jacques Maurais (edd.), *La norme linguistique*, Québec, Direction générale des publications gouvernementales du ministère des Communications, 141–152.
- Garvin, Paul L./Mathiot, Madeleine (1960), *The Urbanization of the Guaraní Language – A Problem in Language and Culture*, in: Anthony F. C. Wallace (ed.), *Men and Cultures. Selected Papers of the 5th International Congress, Philadelphia, Sept. 1–9, 1956*, Philadelphia, Philadelphia University Press, 783–790 [republished in: Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) (1968), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague/Paris, Mouton, 365–374].
- Giacomo-Marcellesi, Mathée (2013), *Le corse*, in: Georg Kremnitz (ed.), *Histoire sociale des langues de France*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 465–473.
- GIEC = Institut d'Estudis Catalans (2016), *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- Goebel, Hans (2015), *Sprach- und wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zum Problem der "Entstehung" des Korsischen*, *Quo vadis Romania?* 45, 23–53.
- Gordon, Elizabeth/Deverson, Tony (1998), *New Zealand English and English in New Zealand*, Auckland, New House.
- Grevisse, Maurice (¹1936), *Le bon usage. Cours de grammaire française et de langage français*, Gembloux, Duculot.
- Grevisse, Maurice/Goosse, André (¹⁶2016), *Le bon usage*, Louvain-la-Neuve, De Boeck Supérieur.
- Grundstrom, Allan/Léon, Pierre Roger (1973), *Interrogation et intonation en français standard et en français canadien*, Montréal et al., Didier.
- Guțu Romalo, Valeria (ed.) (²2008 [2005]), *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. I: *Cuvântul*; vol. II: *Enunțul*, tiraj nou, revizuit, București, Editura Academiei Române.
- Hackert, Stephanie (2012), *The Emergence of the English Native Speaker: A Chapter in Nineteenth-Century Linguistic Thought*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter.
- Hagège, Claude (1983), *Voies et destins de l'action humaine sur les langues*, in: István Fodor/Claude Hagège (edd.), *Language Reform: History and Future*, vol. 1, Hamburg, Buske, 11–68.
- Hall, Robert A. (1950), *Leave Your Language Alone!*, Ithaca, NY, Linguistica.
- Haß, Ulrike (ed.) (2012), *Große Lexika und Wörterbücher Europas. Europäische Enzyklopädien und Wörterbücher in historischen Porträts*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter.
- Haßler, Gerda (2009), *Normierung*, in: Gerda Haßler/Cordula Neis, *Lexikon sprachtheoretischer Grundbegriffe des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 1, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 674–718.
- Haßler, Gerda/Neis, Cordula (2009), *Lexikon sprachtheoretischer Grundbegriffe des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vol., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Haugen, Einar (1959), *Planning for a Standard Language in Modern Norway*, *Anthropological Linguistics* 1, 8–21.
- Haugen, Einar (1966a), *Language Conflict and Language Planning. The Case of Modern Norwegian*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, Einar (1966b), *Dialect, Language, Nation*, *American Anthropologist* 68, 922–935.
- Haugen, Einar (1966c), *Linguistics and Language Planning*, in: William Bright (ed.), *Sociolinguistics. Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference*, The Hague/Paris, Mouton, 50–71.
- Haugen, Einar (1969), *Language Planning, Theory and Practice*, in: Alexandru Graur (ed.), *Actes du X^e Congrès International des Linguistes, Bucarest, 28 août–2 septembre 1967*, vol. 1, Bucarest, Académie de la République Socialiste de Roumanie, 701–711.
- Haugen, Einar (1983), *The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice*, in: Juan Cobarrubias/Joshua A. Fishman (edd.), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 269–289.

- Haugen, Einar (1987), *Language Planning*, in: Ulrich Ammon/Norbert Dittmar/Klaus Mattheier (edd.), *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, vol. 1, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 626–637.
- Hausmann, Franz Josef (1977), *Einführung in die Benutzung der neufranzösischen Wörterbücher*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Hausmann, Franz Josef, et al. (edd.) (1989–1990), *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 2 vol., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Havránek, Bohuslav (1932), *Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura*, in: Bohuslav Havránek/Miloš Weingart (edd.), *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*, Prague, Melantrich, 32–84.
- Havránek, Bohuslav (1964 [1955]), *The Functional Differentiation of the Standard Language*, in: Paul L. Garvin (ed.), *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*, selected and translated from the original Czech by Paul L. Garvin, Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press (1955: Washington Linguistic Club), 3–16 [partial translation of Havránek 1932].
- Havránek, Bohuslav (1983), *Emploi et culture de la langue standard*, in: Édith Bédard/Jacques Maurais (edd.), *La norme linguistique*, Québec, Direction générale des publications gouvernementales du ministère des Communications, 815–833 [translation of Havránek 1932].
- Havránek, Bohuslav/Weingart, Miloš (edd.) (1932), *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*, Prague, Melantrich.
- Holtus, Günter/Radtke, Edgar (edd.) (1986), *Sprachlicher Substandard*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Holtus, Günter/Radtke, Edgar (edd.) (1989), *Sprachlicher Substandard*, vol. II: *Standard und Substandard in der Sprachgeschichte und in der Grammatik*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Holtus, Günter/Radtke, Edgar (edd.) (1990), *Sprachlicher Substandard*, vol. III: *Standard, Substandard und Varietätenlinguistik*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Hope, Jonathan (2000), *Rats, Bats, Sparrows and Dogs: Biology, Linguistics and the Nature of Standard English*, in: Laura Wright (ed.), *The Development of Standard English 1300–1800. Theories, Descriptions, Conflicts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 49–56.
- HSK = Gerold Ungeheuer/Herbert Ernst Wiegand (edd.) (1982–), *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, Berlin/New York/Boston, De Gruyter.
- Institut d'Estudis Catalans (1913), *Normes ortogràfiques*, Barcelona, L'Avenç.
- Janich, Nina/Greule, Albrecht (edd.) (2002), *Sprachkulturen in Europa. Ein internationales Handbuch*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Johnson, Samuel (1755), *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vol., London, Strahan.
- Jones, Daniel (1909 [1909]), *The Pronunciation of English*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, John Earl (1987), *Eloquence and Power. The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages*, London, Frances Pinter.
- Kabatek, Johannes (2016), *Diglossia*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 624–633.
- Kailuweit, Rolf (2002), *Català heavy – català light: una problemàtica de la “lingüística de profans”*, *Zeitschrift für Katalanistik* 15, 169–182.
- Karam, Francis X. (1974), *Toward a Definition of Language Planning*, in: Joshua Fishman (ed.), *Advances in Language Planning*, The Hague/Paris, Mouton, 103–124.
- Kloss, Heinz (1942), *Brüder vor den Toren des Reichs. Vom volksdeutschen Schicksal*, Berlin, Hochmuth.
- Kloss, Heinz (1952), *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen von 1800 bis 1950*, München, Pohl.
- Kloss, Heinz (1967), “*Abstand Languages*” and “*Ausbau Languages*”, *Anthropological Linguistics* 9 (7), 29–41.

- Kloss, Heinz (1969), *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism. A Report*, Québec, Centre International de recherches sur le bilinguisme.
- Kloss, Heinz (²1978), *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800*, 2., erweiterte Auflage, Düsseldorf, Schwann.
- Kornexl, Lucia (2012), *Old English: Standardization*, in: Alexander Bergs/Laurel J. Brinton (edd.), *English Historical Linguistics*, vol. 1.2, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 373–385.
- Krefeld, Thomas (2011), *Sag mir, wo der Standard ist, wo ist er (in der Varietätenlinguistik) geblieben?*, in: Sarah Dessi Schmid et al. (edd.), *Rahmen des Sprechens. Beiträge zu Valenztheorie, Varietätenlinguistik, Kreolistik, Kognitiver und Historischer Semantik. Peter Koch zum 60. Geburtstag*, Tübingen, Narr, 101–110.
- Kremnitz, Georg (1981), *Du "bilinguisme" au "conflit linguistique"*. *Cheminement de termes et de concepts*, *Langages* 15 (61), 63–74.
- Kremnitz, Georg (2004), *Diglossie – Polyglossie/Diglossia – Polyglossia*, in: Ulrich Ammon et al. (edd.), *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, 2nd completely revised and extended edition, vol. 1, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 158–164.
- Kristiansen, Tore/Coupland, Nikolas (edd.) (2011), *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*, Oslo, Novus.
- Labov, William (1964), *Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English*, in: Roger W. Shuy (ed.), *Social Dialects and Language Learning*, Champaign, IL, National Council of Teachers of English, 77–104 (with discussion).
- Labov, William (1972), *Language in the Inner City: Studies in Black English Vernacular*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.
- Labov, William (²2006 [1966]), *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Lausberg, Heinrich (²1990), *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, Stuttgart, Steiner.
- Lebsanft, Franz (1993), "Cazadores de gazapos". *Die "dianormativen" Wörterbücher zum Spanischen im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert*, in: Christoph Strosetzki (ed.), *Akten des Deutschen Hispanistentages Göttingen, 28. 2.–3. 1991*, Frankfurt a. M., Vervuert, 251–269.
- Lebsanft, Franz (1997), *Spanische Sprachkultur. Studien zur Bewertung und Pflege des öffentlichen Sprachgebrauchs im heutigen Spanien*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Lebsanft, Franz (1998), *Spanische Sprachkultur: Monozentrisch oder plurizentrisch?*, in: Albrecht Greule/Franz Lebsanft (edd.), *Europäische Sprachkultur und Sprachpflege. Akten des Regensburger Kolloquiums, Oktober 1996*, Tübingen, Narr, 255–276.
- Lebsanft, Franz (2008), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte*, *Romanische Forschungen* 120, 166–181.
- Lebsanft, Franz (2012), *Der "Diccionario de la lengua española" der Real Academia Española*, in: Ulrike Haß (ed.), *Große Lexika und Wörterbücher Europas. Europäische Enzyklopädien und Wörterbücher in historischen Porträts*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 65–75.
- Lebsanft, Franz/Mihatsch, Wiltrud/Polzin-Haumann, Claudia (edd.) (2012), *El español, ¿desde las variedades a la lengua pluricéntrica?*, Madrid/Frankfurt a. M., Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Lebsanft, Franz/Wingender, Monika (edd.) (2012), *Europäische Charta der Regional- oder Minderheitensprachen. Ein Handbuch zur Sprachpolitik des Europarats*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter.
- Ledgeway, Adam/Maiden, Martin (edd.) (2016), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Léon, Monique (1972), *L'accentuation des pronoms personnels en français standard*, Montréal et al., Didier.
- Léon, Pierre Roger (²1969 [1966]), *Prononciation du français standard. Aide-mémoire d'orthoépie à l'Usage des étudiants étrangers*, Montréal et al., Didier.
- Lodge, R. Anthony (1993), *French: From Dialect to Standard*, London/New York, Routledge.

- Lodge, R. Anthony (1997), *Le français. Histoire d'un dialecte devenu langue*, Paris, Fayard.
- Lounsbury, Thomas Raynesford (1904), *The Standard of Pronunciation in English*, New York, Harper.
- LRL = Günter Holtus/Michael Metzeltin/Christian Schmitt (edd.) (1988–2005), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik (LRL)*, 8 vol. in 12 parts, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Lüdi, Georges (1992), *French as a Pluricentric Language*, in: Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 149–178.
- Lüdtke, Jens (2014), *Los orígenes de la lengua española en América. Los primeros cambios en las Islas Canarias, las Antillas y Castilla del Oro*, Madrid/Frankfurt a. M., Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Marcellesi, Jean-Baptiste (1983), *La définition des langues en domaine roman: les enseignements à tirer de la situation corse*, in: *Actes du XVII^{ème} Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, vol. 5: *Sociolinguistique des langues romanes*, Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence et al., 309–314.
- Marcos Marín, Francisco (1979), *Reforma y modernización del español. Ensayo de sociolingüística histórica*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- Marcos Marín, Francisco (1983), *Reforma y modernización del español*, in: István Fodor/Claude Hagège (edd.), *Language Reform: History and Future*, vol. 2, Hamburg, Buske, 419–447.
- Mathesius, Vilém (1932), *O požadavku stability ve spisovném jazyce* [The Requirement of Stability for a Standard Language], in: Bohuslav Havránek/Miloš Weingart (edd.), *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*, Prague, Melantrich, 14–31.
- Mathesius, Vilém (1983), *Sur la nécessité de stabilité d'une langue standard*, in: Édith Bédard/Jacques Maurais (edd.), *La norme linguistique*, Québec, Direction générale des publications gouvernementales du ministère des Communications, 809–813 [translation of Mathesius 1932].
- Mattheier, Klaus J. (1997), *Über Destandardisierung, Umstandardisierung und Standardisierung in modernen europäischen Standardsprachen*, in: Klaus J. Mattheier/Edgar Radtke (edd.), *Standardisierung und Destandardisierung europäischer Nationalsprachen*, Frankfurt a. M., Lang, 1–9.
- Mattheier, Klaus J./Radtke, Edgar (edd.) (1997), *Standardisierung und Destandardisierung europäischer Nationalsprachen*, Frankfurt a. M., Lang.
- MED online = Hans Kurath et al. (1952–2001), *Middle English Dictionary*, Ann Arbor, Michigan University Press.
- Meisenburg, Trudel (1996), *Romanische Schriftsysteme im Vergleich. Eine diachrone Studie*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Mesthrie, Rajend (1994), *Koinés*, in: Ronald E. Asher (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Oxford, Pergamon, 1864–1867.
- Milroy, James (1999), *The Consequences of Standardization in Descriptive Linguistics*, in: Tony Bex/Richard J. Watts (edd.), *Standard English. The Widening Debate*, London/New York, Routledge, 16–39.
- Milroy, James/Milroy, Lesley (1999 [1985]), *Authority in Language. Investigating Standard English*, London, Routledge.
- Moessner, Lilo (2012), *Early Modern English: Standardization*, in: Alexander Bergs/Laurel J. Brinton (edd.), *English Historical Linguistics*, vol. 1.2, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 698–714.
- MRL = Günter Holtus/Fernando Sánchez-Miret (edd.) (2014–), *Manuals of Romance Linguistics*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter.
- Muhr, Rudolf, et al. (edd.) (2013), *Exploring Linguistic Standards in Non-Dominant Varieties of Pluricentric Languages*, Frankfurt a. M., Lang.
- Muhr, Rudolf, et al. (edd.) (2016), *Pluricentric Languages and Non-Dominant Varieties Worldwide*, Frankfurt a. M., Lang.

- Mukařovský, Jan (c1964 [1955]), *Standard Language and Poetic Language*, in: Paul L. Garvin (ed.), *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*, selected and translated from the original Czech by Paul L. Garvin, Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press (1955: Washington Linguistic Club), 17–30.
- Muljačić, Žarko (1993), *Standardization in Romance*, in: Rebecca Posner/John N. Green (edd.), *Trends in Romance Linguistics and Philology*, vol. 5: *Bilingualism and Linguistic Conflict in Romance*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 77–114.
- Nebrija, Antonio de (2011 [1492]), *Gramática sobre la lengua castellana*, ed. Carmen Lozano, [Madrid]/Barcelona, Real Academia Española/Círculo de Lectores – Galaxia Gutenberg.
- Neustupný, Jiří V. (1970), *Basic Types of Treatment of Language Problems*, *Linguistic Communications* 1, 77–98.
- NGLE 2009 = Real Academia Española/Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2009), *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*, 2 vol., Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- NGLE 2011 = Real Academia Española/Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2011), *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*, vol. 3: *Fonética y fonología*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- Nichols 1865 = Britton, *The French Text Carefully Revised with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes*, ed. Francis Morgan Nichols, 2 vol., Oxford 1865.
- OED = *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1989– [also online: <<http://www.oed.com>>]
- Omdal, Helge (2008), *Language Planning: Standardization/Sprachplanung: Standardisierung*, in: Ulrich Ammon et al. (edd.), *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, 2nd completely revised and extended edition, vol. 3, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 2384–2394.
- Pöll, Bernhard (2001), *Essai de standardologie comparée: quelques éléments pour une comparaison de l'espagnol et du portugais européens et américains*, *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 79, 907–930.
- Posner, Rebecca/Green, John N. (edd.) (1980–1993), *Trends in Romance Linguistics and Philology*, 5 vol., The Hague, Mouton; Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Pountain, Christopher (2016), *Standardization*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 634–643.
- PR = Paul Robert/Alain Rey/Josette Rey-Debove (2016), *Le Petit Robert. Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française*, Paris, Le Robert.
- RAE 1726 = *Discurso proemial de la orthographía de la lengua castellana*, in: Real Academia Española (1726), *Diccionario de la lengua castellana, en que se explica el verdadero sentido de las voces, su naturaleza y calidad, con frases y modos de hablar, los proverbios o refranes, y otras cosas convenientes al uso de la lengua [Diccionario de Autoridades]*, vol. 1, Madrid, Francisco del Hierro, LXI–LXXXV.
- RAE 1771 = Real Academia Española (1771), *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, Madrid, Ibarra.
- Real Academia Española (1726–1739), *Diccionario de la lengua castellana, en que se explica el verdadero sentido de las voces, su naturaleza y calidad, con las frases o modos de hablar, los proverbios o refranes, y otras cosas convenientes al uso de la lengua*, 6 vol., Madrid, Francisco del Hierro [generally known as “Diccionario de Autoridades”].
- Real Academia Española, *Diccionario de la lengua castellana/española*, Madrid, [different publishing houses], ¹1780, ²1783, ³1791, ⁴1803, ⁵1817, ⁶1822, ⁷1832, ⁸1837, ⁹1843, ¹⁰1852, ¹¹1869, ¹²1884, ¹³1899, ¹⁴1914, ¹⁵1925, ¹⁶1936–1939, ¹⁷1947, ¹⁸1956, ¹⁹1970, ²⁰1984, ²¹1992, ²²2001, ²³2014, (^{23.1}online2018).
- Regis, Riccardo (2012), *Note su koinè*, *Romanische Forschungen* 124, 3–16.
- Renzi, Lorenzo/Salvi, Giampaolo/Cardinaletti, Anna (²2001), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, 3 vol., Bologna, il Mulino.

- Richard of Hexham (1884–1889 [1135–1138]), *De gestis Regis Stephani et de bello standardii*, in: *Chronicles of the reign of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, 4 vol., Rolls Series 82 (1884–1889), vol. 3, 139–178.
- Riegel, Martin/Pellat, Jean-Christophe/Rioul, René (2016), *Grammaire méthodique du français*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- RSG = Gerhard Ernst et al. (edd.) (2003–2008; online 2008), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen*, 3 vol., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Rubin, Joan (1971), *Evaluation and Language Planning*, in: Joan Rubin/Björn H. Jernudd (edd.), *Can Languages be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*, Honolulu, The University Press of Hawaii, 217–252.
- Rubin, Joan/Shuy, Roger (edd.) (1973), *Language Planning. Current Issues and Research*, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Schaefer, Ursula (2012), *Middle English: Standardization*, in: Alexander Bergs/Laurel J. Brinton (edd.), *English Historical Linguistics*, vol. 1.2, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 519–533.
- Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte (1991 [1973]), *Soziolinguistik. Eine Einführung*, Stuttgart et al., Kohlhammer.
- Schneider, Edgar W. (2003), *The Dynamics of New Englishes: From Identity Construction to Dialect Birth*, *Language* 79, 233–281.
- Schneider, Edgar W. (2014), *Global Diffusion, Regional Attraction, Local Roots? Sociocognitive Perspectives on the Pluricentricity of English*, in: Augusto Soares da Silva (ed.), *Pluricentricity. Language Variation and Sociocognitive Dimensions*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 191–226.
- Schweickard, Wolfgang (2012), *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*, in: Ulrike Haß (ed.), *Große Lexika und Wörterbücher Europas. Europäische Enzyklopädien und Wörterbücher in historischen Porträts*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 53–64.
- Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper of (1711), *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, vol. 3., s.l.
- Smith, Arthur L. (1965), *The Deutschtum of Nazi Germany and the United States*, The Hague, Nijhoff.
- Soares da Silva, Augusto (ed.) (2014), *Pluricentricity: Language Variation and Sociocognitive Dimensions*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter.
- Spivak, Elye (1931), *Shprakhkultur*, Kharkov/Kiev, Zentralfarlag.
- Stepanov, Georgij Vladimirovic (1971), *Algunas cuestiones metodológicas del español americano*, in: Alexandru Rosetti/Sanda Reinheimer-Rîpeanu (edd.), *Actele celui de-al XII-lea Congres International de Lingvistică și Filologie Romanică*, vol. 2, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1165–1167.
- Stepanov, Georgij Vladimirovic/Švejcer, Aleksandr Davidovic (1981), *Toward a Study of Transplanted Languages*, in: Horst Geckeler et al. (edd.), *Logos semantikos. Studia linguistica in honorem Eugenio Coseriu 1921–1981*, vol. 5, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter; Madrid, Gredos, 219–225.
- Stepánov, Gueorguii Vladimírovich (2004 [1979]), *La lengua española de España y América Latina*, Munich, LINCOM [Spanish translation of *К проблеме языкового варьирования: испанский язык Испании и Америки = К проблеме языкового вар'ирования: испанский язык Испании и Америки*, Moscow, Nauka].
- Stewart, William A. (1968 [1962]), *A Sociolinguistic Typology for Describing National Multilingualism*, in: Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague/Paris, Mouton, 531–545 [revised version of: *Outline of Linguistic Typology for Describing Multilingualism*, in: Frank A. Rice (ed.), *Study of the Role of Second Languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*, Washington D.C., Center of Applied Linguistics, 15–25].

- Švejcer, Aleksandr Davidovic (1978), *Standard English in the United States and England*, The Hague/Paris/New York, Mouton.
- Sweet, Henry (1908), *The Sounds of English. An Introduction to Phonetics*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Swift, Jonathan (1712), *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue in a Letter to the Most Honorable Robert Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, Lord High Treasurer of Great Britain*, London, Tooke.
- Tacke, Felix (2011), *Plurizentrik und normativer Diskurs in der "Nueva gramática de la lengua española"*, *Romanische Forschungen* 123, 145–166.
- Tacke, Felix (2015), *Aménagement linguistique et défense institutionnalisée de la langue: les français régionaux et les langues des minorités*, in: Claudia Polzin-Haumann/Wolfgang Schweickard (edd.), *Manuel de linguistique française*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 216–241.
- Tacke, Felix (2017), *Die katalanische Sprachkultur am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts. Abgrenzungsdiskurs und moderne Sprachkritik*, in: Wolfgang Dahmen et al. (edd.), *Sprachkritik und Sprachberatung in der Romania*, Tübingen, Narr/Francke/Attempo, 119–153.
- Tacke, Felix (2018), *Romanische Sprachen und romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, *Romanische Forschungen* 130, 190–206.
- Techtmeier, Bärbel (1980), *Das Problem sprachlich-kommunikativer Normen und seine Widerspiegelung in den aktuellen Diskussionen um die Sprachkultur in der SR Rumänien*, in: Klaus Bochmann (ed.), *Soziolinguistische Aspekte der rumänischen Sprache*, Leipzig, Enzyklopädie, 52–72.
- Thiers, Ghjacumu (2000), *Quelques réflexions sur la polynomie corse (1980–2000)*, *Grenzgänge* 7, 49–55.
- Thompson, Robert W. (1992), *Spanish as a Pluricentric Language*, in: Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 45–70.
- TL = Adolf Tobler/Erhard Lommatzsch (1925–2008), *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, 12 vol. (vol. 11 + 12 by Hans Helmut Christmann/Richard Baum et al.), Berlin, Weidmann; Stuttgart, Steiner.
- TLF = *Trésor de la langue française* = Paul Imbs/Bernard Quemada (1971–1994), *Trésor de la Langue Française. Dictionnaire de la langue du XIX^e et XX^e siècle (1789–1960)*, 16 vol., Paris, Editions du CNRS (vol. 1–10)/Gallimard (vol. 11–16). Online edition as *Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé* (2002–), Paris/Nancy, CNRS/Université de Nancy 2/ATILF, <<http://atilf.atilf.fr/tlf.htm>>.
- Tommaso, Nicolò/Bellini, Bernardo (1865–1879), *Dizionario della lingua italiana*, 8 vol., Torino, Unione tipografico-editrice.
- Trudgill, Peter/Hannah, Jean (2017 [1982]), *International English. A Guide to the Varieties of Standard English*, London, Routledge (1982: Arnold).
- Vachek, Josef (ed.) (1964), *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Vachek, Josef (1966), *The Linguistic School of Prague. An Introduction to its Theory and Practice*, Bloomington/London, Indiana University Press.
- Vallverdú, Francesc (1979), *La normalització a Catalunya*, Barcelona, Laia.
- Vaugelas, Claude Favre de (2009 [1647]), *Remarques sur la langue française*, ed. Zygmunt Marzys, Genève, Droz.
- Vinokur, Grigorii Osipovich (1925), *Культура языка. Очерки лингвистической технологии* [Kultura jazyka. Očerki lingvističeskoj tehnologij = Language Cultivation. Essays on Linguistic Technology], Moscow, Izd. Rabočnik prosveščernija.

- Vinokur, Grigorii Osipovich (1975 [1923]), *Sprachkultur*, in: Wolfgang Girke/Helmut Jachnow (edd.), *Sprache und Gesellschaft in der Sowjetunion. 31 Dokumente ins Deutsche übersetzt und kritisch eingeleitet*, München, Fink, 89–95.
- VOC = Instituto Internacional da Língua Portuguesa, *Vocabulário Ortográfico Comum da Língua Portuguesa*, <<http://voc.iilp.clp.org/>>.
- Weinreich, Max (1999 [1946]), *Hitler's Professors. The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes against the Jewish People*, New Haven/London, Yale University Press (originally New York, Yiddish Scientific Institute – YIVO).
- Weinreich, Uriel (1953), *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*, New York, Linguistic Circle.
- Weinreich, Uriel (1954), *Is a Structural Dialectology Possible?*, *Word*, 10, 388–400 [republished in: Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) (1968), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague/Paris, Mouton, 305–319].
- Weinreich, Uriel (1975 [1952]), *Research Problems in Bilingualism with Special Reference to Switzerland*, Ann Arbor, MI, Xerox Microfilms.
- Weinreich, Uriel (2011 [1952]), *Languages in Contact. French, German and Romansh in Twentieth-Century Switzerland*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Weiser, Kalman (2016), *Yiddish: "A Survey and a Grammar" in its Historical and Cultural Context*, in: Solomon A. Birnbaum, *Yiddish. A Survey and a Grammar*, Toronto et al., University of Toronto Press, XXIV–LVII.
- Wyld, Henry Cecil (1913), *Standard English and its Varieties*, *Modern Language Teaching* 9 (8) 249–264.
- Wyld, Henry Cecil (1920), *A History of Modern Colloquial English*, London, Fisher Unwin.
- Wyld, Henry Cecil (1934), *The Best English. A Claim for the Superiority of Received Standard English; together with Notes on Mr. Gladstone's Pronunciation*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Zamora Salamanca, Francisco José (1990), *The Standardization of the "National Variants" of Spanish. Problems and Goals of a Language Policy in the Spanish-speaking Countries*, in: Werner Bahner/Joachim Schildt/Dieter Viehweger (edd.), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Linguists Berlin/GDR, August 10–August 15, 1987*, vol. 2, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1681–1685.
- Zamora Salamanca, Francisco José (2010), *Variedades nacionales del español estándar (con algunas reflexiones sobre los casos de Argentina y Chile)*, in: Maria Iliescu/Heidi Sillerrunggaldier/Paul Danler (edd.), *Actes du XXV^e Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes (Innsbruck, 3–8 septembre 2007)*, vol. 3, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 737–746.
- Zingarelli = Nicola Zingarelli (1994–), *Lo Zingarelli. Vocabolario della lingua italiana*, Bologna, Zanichelli.

Theories of Linguistic Norm

Ludwig Fesenmeier

1 Linguistic Norm in Classical Grammar and Rhetoric

Abstract: The chapter addresses the concept of linguistic norm in the tradition of classical grammar and rhetoric, paying special attention to activities concerning standardization processes in the Romance languages. Since a clear distinction between a *prescriptive* and a *descriptive* point of view is not given in “traditional grammar”, the latter is manifested in the form of grammatical treatises which often also aimed at offering norms for “correct” language use. As a consequence thereof, our contribution will be concerned with aspects relating to the realm of the history of language sciences and, at least partially, to the history of rhetoric. The period taken into consideration ranges from Latin antiquity (Cicero, Quintilian) to the middle of the 17th century (Vaugelas). The topics to be discussed were selected with regard to the significance of the respective protagonists in the history of ideas in (Latin and) Romance language standardization.

Keywords: traditional grammar, rhetoric, *latinitas*, *consuetudo*, *sermo humilis/rusticus*, Carolingian Renaissance, Humanism, Quintilian, Alberti, Nebrija, Dante Alighieri, Old Occitan, *bon usage*, *Questione della lingua*

1 Introduction

In line with the overall structure of the present volume, this chapter elucidates the concept of linguistic norm as it appears in the tradition of classical grammar and rhetoric. The structure of the article depends, therefore, on the selection of issues which can be considered of (particular) relevance against this background (cf. below) and meet the criterion of relating to activities concerning the standardization process in the Romance languages.

Although concepts and criteria such as *puritas/latinitas*, *ratio*, *vetustas*, *auctoritas* or *consuetudo* can shine through in even recent prescriptivist discourses (cf. the examples mentioned in Kraus 2007, 1132), in their original context they are endowed with both grammatical and rhetorical aspects. Nevertheless, this double-faceted character has diminished over the course of time: since the departure of grammar (and logic) from rhetoric can be considered as having been accomplished in 1660 at the latest (obviously, in Spain, France and Italy it occurred at varying times in history; cf. Eggs 1996, 1081–1087 for further information) with the publication of Antoine Arnauld’s (1612–1694) and Claude Lancelot’s (ca. 1615–1695) *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* (the so-called *Grammaire de Port-Royal*), we have chosen Vaugelas’ *Remarques sur la langue française* (1647) as the endpoint of the period covered

here (Vaugelas still acts as the antagonist in the *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*, cf. Arnould/Lancelot 1966 [1660], 79–87 and passim; cf. Marzys 2009, 14). With regard to a suitable starting point, Latin antiquity shall serve this function here, since, for a long time, any attempt at linguistic description/standardization concerning the Romance languages has relied on (some version of the) Latin doctrines (for the dependency of Latin thought on Greek models, cf. e.g. Siebenborn 1976).

The development of linguistics – more precisely the approach to languages as the object of scientific analysis in their own right – has resulted in a clear distinction between the *prescriptive* and the *descriptive* point of view. Such a distinction is of course alien to what is generally termed “traditional grammar”, but nevertheless, the latter is part of the history of language sciences (and, to a certain degree, the history of [applied] rhetoric as well). This manifests in the form of grammatical treatises which indeed aimed at offering norms for “correct” language use. Apart from that, one should bear in mind that “le grammatiche antiche non potevano essere prescrittive senza essere prima descrittive” (Renzi 2001, 360; cf. also, with reference to sixteenth-century France, the “ordnende Bestandsaufnahme” [comprehensive and systematic inventory] in Winkelmann 1990, 338).

The present article is thus concerned with aspects which also belong to the realm of the history of language sciences or even to (one part of) what has been called “grammatisation”, i.e. “le processus qui conduit à *décrire* et à *outiller* une langue sur la base des deux technologies, qui sont encore aujourd’hui les piliers de notre savoir métalinguistique: la grammaire et le dictionnaire” (Auroux 1992, 28; cf. also Auroux 1994, 109–127; Swiggers 2001, 37 and passim, speaks of “mise en grammaire”).¹ However, for reasons of space aside, a presentation, analysis and evaluation of theories regarding linguistic norm in the classical “paradigm” cannot be intended to describe comprehensively how norm(s) developed in a period ranging from Latin antiquity to the 17th century.² In order to give a coherent account of the most important approaches, a selection has been done according to the signifi-

1 The modern prescriptive dictionary “n’est pas antérieur à l’imprimerie” (Auroux 1994, 117). Cf. Quondam (1978, 581s.) for the situation in sixteenth-century Italy, e.g. Niccolò Liburnio’s (ca. 1474–1557) *Le tre fontane* (1526) and Francesco Alunno’s (ca. 1485–1556) *La Fabrica del mondo* (1548). Later, the *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (1612) became a (direct or indirect) reference point for the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie française* (1694) and the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana* (known as “Diccionario de autoridades”; 1726–1739), published by the Real Academia Española; cf. Schweickard (2012, 54).

2 A historical-chronological approach similar to the present one can be found in Bédard/Maurais (1983, “Première partie: La tradition de la norme”). Comprehensive presentations can be found e.g. in Gómez Asencio (2006–2011) for Spain, Settekorn (1988) and Lodge (1993) for France, and Vitale (1984) for Italy. Furthermore, the compendia LRL and RSG are naturally worth mentioning, in particular the articles dedicated to the history of grammaticography/lexicography, language evaluation, language standardization and the external history of the Romance languages (cf. the survey articles no. 1b, 17a, 57, 59 and those concerning Italian, French, Occitan and Spanish in LRL as well as the respectively relevant articles in sections II, VII, X, XI in RSG).

cance attached to certain protagonists in the history of ideas in (Latin and) Romance language standardization, i.e., at least in part, independently of the effective impact these ideas had at their time. We will therefore start with an overview of the concept of *latinitas* in Latin antiquity (section 2) and the question of norm in texts written by Christian authors (section 3); subsequently, we will present the efforts made with regard to norms in Romance vernaculars in the Middle Ages (section 4) and during the age of Humanism (section 5). Special attention will then be paid to the so-called *Questione della lingua* in Renaissance Italy (section 6) and the rise of the concept of *bon usage* in seventeenth-century France (section 7).

At this point, we would like to note a methodological issue: wherever it seems reasonable and adequate to facilitate understanding, our presentation relies directly on primary sources, since, in our opinion, it is crucial to give a voice to the protagonists themselves.

2 The concept of *latinitas*

As is well known, in Classical antiquity, rhetoric plays a crucial role in political, legal and social practices (cf. Porter 2008 and Landfester 2008). According to rhetoric doctrine, every *orator* has to pass through five stages when preparing his speech, the so-called *officia oratoris* or, as Quintilian (ca. 35–100) called them, the *rethorices partes* (cf. *Inst.* 3, 3, 11): *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, *pronuntiatio/actio* (cf. *Inst.* 3, 3, 1). Naturally, aspects concerning the linguistic form in general come into play at the stage of the *elocutio*, the *elocutionis virtutes* being *latinitas*, *perspicuitas*, *ornatus* and *aptum*, first mentioned by Cicero (106–43) in *De oratore*:³ “primum, ut pure et latine loquamur; deinde ut plane et dilucide; tum ut ornate; post ad rerum dignitatem apte et quasi decore” [we must speak, in the first place, pure and correct Latin, secondly with simple lucidity, thirdly with elegance, lastly in a manner befitting the dignity of our topics and with a certain grace] (1, 144; cf. also Quintilian, *Inst.* 11, 3, 30: “[oratio] emendata dilucida ornata apta esse debet” [speech must be correct, lucid, ornate, and appropriate]; cf. Lausberg ²1973, §§ 453–1082 for a detailed presentation). As far as linguistic correctness in particular is concerned, the crucial *virtus* is *latinitas*, since it represents the necessary condition for achieving the other *virtutes*.⁴

³ Unless otherwise indicated, the quotations (both Latin and English) in this section are taken from LCL.

⁴ This becomes apparent when considering Cicero’s use of the adverb *latine* and the adjective *latinus*: in rather identical contexts, the use of both *latine* and *latinus* confirms that they do not have a glottonym reading, but the normative one of “correct, elegant”, which can likely be dated back to the 3rd century BC. For a more detailed discussion of *latinitas*, cf. e.g. Uhl (1998, 21–40) and Müller (2001, 249–258).

The expression *latinitas* itself, a calque on the Greek ἑλληνισμός (however, for fundamental differences between the concept of ἑλληνισμός and that of *latinitas*, cf. Uhl 1998, 25–27 and references mentioned there), is first attested in the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (8th decade of the 1st century BC), where it is defined in the following way: “*Latinitas est quae sermonem purum conservat, ab omni vitio remotum*” [It is Correct Latinity which keeps the language pure, and free of any fault] (4, 17, 3).

Latinitas as a necessary condition for achieving the other *virtutes* depends, however, on rules which are applicable to any type of speech, so that “[s]’intéresser [...] à la *latinitas*, c’est s’intéresser à ce qui, dans un énoncé, est indépendant des circonstances où il est émis ou de la personne qui l’emploie” (Baratin 1989, 302). Unsurprisingly so, Cicero speaks somewhat dismissively of the “*praecepta Latine loquendi, quae puerilis doctrina tradit*” [the rules of correct Latin style, which are imparted by education in boyhood] (*De orat.* 3, 48).

Over time, *latinitas* in the sense of idiomatic correctness continues to gain more and more autonomy from the realm of rhetoric and increasingly becomes a subject of interest within the domain of grammar. The first attestation of *ars grammatica* can be once again found in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, whose author, in fact, makes the promise – despite breaking it in the end – that “[h]aec qua ratione vitare possimus in arte grammatica dilucide dicemus” [how to avoid these faults I shall clearly explain in my tract on Grammar] (4, 17, 6).⁵ In the 1st century BC, thus, “[l]inguistic correctness belongs to the domain of grammar rather than rhetoric” (Anderesen 2008, 31) or, as Lausberg (²1973, § 456) put it,

“[d]a die *elocutio* also die sprachliche Formulierung betrifft, hat sie Verwandtschaft mit der *grammatica* [...]. Der Unterschied zwischen beiden liegt im Grad der angestrebten *virtutes* [...]: die Grammatik zielt als *ars recte dicendi* [...] auf die sprachliche Korrektheit (*recte*), die Rhetorik zielt als *ars bene dicendi* [...] auf (redeszweckentsprechende) höhere Vollkommenheit (*bene*), auch im Hinblick auf die sprachliche Formulierung (*elocutio*)”.

[s]ince *elocutio* is concerned with linguistic formulation it is related to *grammatica* [...]. The difference between the two lies in the level of the *virtutes* striven for [...]: grammar as the *ars recte dicendi* [...] aims at linguistic correctness (*recte*), whereas rhetoric as the *ars bene dicendi* [...] seeks higher perfection (*bene*) (in relation to the purpose of the speech) even with regard to linguistic formulation (*elocutio*.)

The decision of whether a somehow unusual grammatical element is reconcilable with the virtue of *latinitas* or whether a linguistically correct *sermo* has been ob-

⁵ But cf. Baratin (2000, 459): “Cette indication ne garantit nullement qu’il y ait eu à Rome à l’époque de ce texte une grammaire latine du genre des *artes* tardives. L’auteur de la *Rhétorique à Hérénnius*, qui suivait selon toute vraisemblance un modèle grec, peut s’être ici simplement conformé aux indications de ce modèle sur la répartition des tâches entre rhétorique et grammaire, et avoir transposé littéralement en latin le projet purement grec de rédiger une *tékhnē grammatiké* [...]”.

tained essentially depends on four criteria according to Quintilian (cf. Ax 2011, 230–233 for a detailed commentary; for varying approaches to compiling the criteria, cf. Siebenborn 1976, esp. 53–55; for further details, cf. also Lausberg ²1973, §§ 464–469; Baratin 1989, 345–350; Eggs 1996, 1042s.; Uhl 1998, 27–32; Pagani 2015, 832–848):

“Sermo constat ratione vetustate auctoritate consuetudine. Rationem praestat praecipue analogia, nonnumquam etymologia. Vetera maiestas quaedam et, ut sic dixerim, religio commendat. Auctoritas ab oratoribus vel historicis peti solet [...]. Consuetudo vero certissima loquendi magistra, utendumque plane sermone, ut nummo, cui publica forma est. Omnia tamen haec exigunt acre iudicium [...]” (*Inst.* 1, 6, 1–3).

[Language is based on Reason, Antiquity, Authority, and Usage. Reason is grounded principally on Analogy, but sometimes also on Etymology. Antiquity is commended to us by a certain majesty and, I might almost say, religious awe. Authority is generally sought from orators and historians. [...] Finally, Usage is the surest teacher of speaking, and we should treat language like money marked with the public stamp. But all these criteria need keen judgement [...].]

Since meeting all four of these criteria can give rise to situations of conflict and the application of only *ratio*, *vetustas* or *auctoritas* can lead to mistakes, applying *acre iudicium* becomes indispensable. Nevertheless, “[d]ie wichtigste und letztlich entscheidende Richtlinie ist die *consuetudo*” [the most important and ultimately decisive guideline is *consuetudo*] (Lausberg ²1973, § 465; cf. also § 469; for a detailed discussion, cf. Müller 2001, 183–207, 324s.), which must be read exclusively in the sense of the “consensu[s] eruditorum” [consensus of the educated] (*Inst.* 1, 6, 45; with regard to the relation between *consuetudo* and its near-synonym *usus* cf. below, 3.3).

These guidelines of linguistic correctness found use in normative descriptions of “good” Latin (grammars of the “*de latinitate* type”, cf. Ax 2005, 123, 133), in which problematic instances of language use, divided into the different parts of speech to which they belong, were discussed and resolved. Among the authors of this type of grammar, one can mention (cf. Siebenborn 1976, 33s.) Gniphio (*De sermone latino*, 2nd/1st century BC), Caesar (*De analogia*, 54 BC), Varro (*De sermone latino*; books VIII–X of *De lingua latina*; both 4th decade of the 1st century BC), Crassicius Pasicles/Pansa (*De latinitate*, end of the 1st century BC), Pliny the Elder (*Dubii sermonis libri octo*, before 68) and Caper (*De latinitate*, ca. 200). However, while most of these texts are no longer extant, they became part of the grammars of late antiquity, which in turn established the basis for Latin grammars in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (for an overview of the “developing model of *grammatica* in the Roman and early medieval world”, cf. Irvine 1994, 49–87).

Still, there is also another type of grammar treatises, the “*ars* type” (cf. Ax 2005, 123, 132s.), a rather didactically inspired presentation of linguistic elements. This was first and foremost designed with the intent to clarify certain language structures in a given text, not to provide normative judgements; this genre can be further subdivided (cf. Ax 2005, 123) in the tripartite “Donatus type” (*elementa, partes ora-*

tionis and *virtutes et vitia orationis*) and the bipartite “Priscianus type” (*partes orationis*, syntax). The most important texts of this type are those of Donatus (*Ars minor* and *Ars maior*, ca. 350) and Priscian (*Institutiones grammaticae*, 526/527), who serve as models for both further developed Latin and, subsequently, vernacular grammatography (cf. below, section 4ss.).

As far as grammars dating from the 3rd to the 5th centuries are concerned, Law (2003, 63s.) proposes another distinction, based on their writers’ motivation: grammars “of a predominantly semantic orientation [...] reflect the needs of native speakers” (e.g. Donatus, Priscian’s *Institutiones grammaticae*; cf. Law 2003, 63–80), “whereas those which concentrate on form [...] are geared to foreign students of Latin” (e.g. Priscian’s *Institutio de nomine et pronomine et verbo*; cf. Law 2003, 83–88). This difference with regard to the target groups is closely intertwined with the evolution of the overall socio-linguistic situation in late antiquity, which contributed to the appearance of the so-called *Appendix Probi* (second half of the 5th century), a “heterogeneous assemblage” (Law 1986, 374). It consists of eight sections, rather different in nature, concerning phonetic, morphological, orthographic/orthoepic and semantic/lexical aspects.⁶

3 The question of norm with Christian authors

The rise of Christianity from a small sect to the state religion of the Roman Empire (and beyond) had far-reaching repercussions on the question of the rhetorical and linguistic norms that had to be observed in the relevant texts. This can easily be illustrated by the selection of statements below, ranging from the end of the 4th to the end of the 8th century (cf. Auernheimer 2003, 16) since they offer insight into

⁶ We cannot enter the complex field of what is traditionally termed “de orthographia” here, but questions of orthoepy and morphology as well as the discussion of *differentiae verborum* eventually come into play (for an overview cf. Desbordes 1990; Brugnoli 1955; Codoñer 1985; De Paolis 2010 and the references mentioned in these four sources).

As far as the *Appendix Probi* is concerned, it has become famous in historical Romance linguistics due to its antibarbarus (“x non y”). It should be born in mind that what is often referred to with the label “Appendix Probi” is merely this section (but cf. e.g. Reutner 2014, 206, as opposed to the correct presentation in Iliescu/Slusanski 1991, 103), which must be considered in the context of the other *appendices*. Recently, the (entire) *Appendix Probi* has been the object of profound reassessment on historical, philological and linguistic grounds, cf. Stok (1997); Quirk (2005; 2006); Lo Monaco/Molinelli (2007); Powell (2007); Asperti/Passalacqua (2014); De Paolis (2015); Di Giovine (2015) and the respective references mentioned therein. As far as the structure “x non y” of this antibarbarus is concerned, this “formula rigidamente prescrittiva, che *pour cause* non ricorre nei trattatisti più antichi come Terenzio Scauro e Velio Longo, è indizio di un rigido atteggiamento normativo all’interno di [...] un tipo di grammatica che [...] cominciò a diffondersi allorché flussi sempre maggiori di alloglotti si accostarono con fatica all’appendimento della lingua latina” (Mancini 2007, 75).

certain conflicting views on language norms of those periods. These statements show that there were proponents of “functional” language use, prioritizing the successful transmission of the Christian faith over formal aspects, and later, advocates of only “correct” Latin, i.e. Latin used strictly in conformity with the authorities’ expectations:⁷

“NON EST ABSCONDITUM OS MEUM A TE, QUOD FECISTI IN ABSCONDITO. Os suum dicit; quod vulgo dicitur ossum, latine os dicitur. [...] Nam possemus hic putare os esse, ab eo quod sunt ora; non os correpte, ab eo quod sunt ossa. NON EST ERGO ABSCONDITUM, INQUIT, OS MEUM A TE, QUOD FECISTI IN ABSCONDITO. Habeo in abscondito quoddam ossum. Sic enim potius loquamur: *melius est reprehendant nos grammatici, quam non intellegant populi*” (Augustine, *In psalm.* 138, 20; italics added).

[*My bone is not hidden from you, for it was you who created it in that secret place.* He speaks of his bone, *os*, another form of which in popular Latin is *ossum*. [...] we might have thought he meant *os* [...], of which the plural is *ora*, rather that [*sic*] *os* [...]. *My bone is not hidden from you*, he says, *for it was you who created it in that secret place.* I have a certain *ossum* hidden within me (we prefer to use the word *ossum*; better that linguistic experts should find fault with us than that people should not understand) (III-20, 272).]

“Quaeso autem ut huius operis dicta percurrens, in his verborum folia non requiras, quia per sacra eloquia ab eorum tractatoribus infructuosae loquacitatis levitas studiose compscitur [...]. [...] Unde et ipsam loquendi artem, quam magisteria disciplinae exterioris insinuant, servare despexi. Nam sicut huius quoque epistolae tenor enuntiat, non metacismi collisionem fugio, non barbarismi confusionem devito, situs modosque etiam et praepositionum casus servare contemno, quia *indignum vehementer existimo, ut verba caelestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati*” (Gregory the Great, *Epist.* 5, 53a; 601; italics added).

[I beg you not to expect a great deal of eloquence as you read over the work, for the Word of God carefully restrains easy, fruitless talkativeness in its interpreters [...]. [...] Therefore I have refused to be a slave to the art of rhetoric taught by the masters of external excellence. As the movement of this letter already shows, I do not avoid collisions of metacism or the confusion of barbarisms; I disdain word order and tenses of verbs as well as the rules governing the use of prepositions. I consider it highly unworthy of the words of heavenly revelation to subject them to the rules of Donatus (Gregory the Great 2014, 55).]

“Psalmos, notas, cantus, compotum, grammaticam per singula monasteria vel episcopia et libros catholicos bene emendate; quia saepe, *dum bene aliqui Deum rogare cupiunt, sed per inemendatos libros malo rogant.* Et pueros vestros non sinite eos vel legendo vel scribendo corrumpere; et si opus est evangelium, psalterium et missale scribere, perfectae aetatis homines scribant cum omni diligentia” (*Admonitio generalis*; 789; italics added).

[Correct, we command you, with due care the copies of the psalms, the written signs, the chants, the calendar, the grammar in each monastery and diocese, and the Catholic books,

⁷ Unless otherwise indicated, the quotations in this section are taken from the following sources: LLT-A (Augustine, Gregory the Great, Jerome), eMGH (*Admonitio generalis*, *Epistola de litteris colendis*, Gregory of Tours, Council of Tours) and LCL (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero, Horace, Quintilian) for Latin; the English translations of Augustine’s texts are taken from Augustine (1990ss.), quoted by part, volume and page.

because often people wish to pray to the Lord, but do so badly, because the books are at fault. And do not allow your boys to corrupt the books by their own reading or writing. If a copy be needed, of the Gospel, or Psalter or Missal, let men of ripe age write it out with all diligence (Duckett 1965, 122).]

While Augustine (354–430) does not challenge the validity of grammatical norms as such, since they are irrelevant only in view of the effect to be achieved, Gregory the Great (ca. 540–604) outright places the *verba caelestis oraculi* above the *regulae Donati*; for Charlemagne (747/748–814), praying correctly implies praying linguistically correctly.

Early Christian authors therefore mark an important change in their attitude towards Latin norms, distancing themselves from “classical” positions and giving priority to ideas such as *humilitas* and *rusticitas* (3.1); but this development was not crowned with success (3.2).

3.1 *Sermo humilis* and *sermo rusticus*

3.1.1 *Sermo humilis*

A profound shift with regard to the stance towards the *sermo humilis* occurs due to Christian authors, first of all Augustine – Müller (2001, 111) speaks of the “Augustinische Wende” [Augustinian turn] (Auerbach 1958a remains essential as insight into Augustine’s relevance for the *sermo humilis*). According to this Church Father, rhetoric can be well commissioned to serve *veritas* instead of *falsitas*:

“Cum ergo sit in medio posita facultas eloquii, quae ad persuadenda seu prava seu recta valet plurimum, cur non bonorum studio comparatur, ut militet veritati, si eam mali ad obtinendas perversas vanasque causas in usus iniquitatis et erroris usurpant?” (*Doctr. christ.* 4, 2, 3).

[So since facilities are available for learning to speak well, which is of the greatest value in leading people either along straight or along crooked ways, why should good men not study to acquire the art, so that it may fight for the truth, if bad men can prostitute it to the winning of their vain and misguided cases in the service of iniquity and error? (I-11, 202).]

Thus, “Christianizing” Cicero’s doctrine of styles in the fourth book of *De doctrina christiana*, Augustine states, paraphrasing the *Romani auctor eloquii* himself:

“Qui ergo nititur dicendo persuadere quod bonum est, nihil illorum trium spernens – ut scilicet doceat, ut delectet, ut flectat –, oret atque agat ut, quemadmodum supra diximus, intellegenter, libenter, oboedienterque audiatur. Quod cum apte et convenienter facit, non immerito eloquens dici potest, etsi non eum sequatur auditoris assensus. Ad haec enim tria, id est ut doceat, ut delectet, ut flectat, etiam illa tria videtur pertinere voluisse idem ipse Romani auctor eloquii, cum itidem dixit: ‘Is erit igitur eloquens, qui poterit parva summis, modica temperate, magna granditer dicere’ [cf. Cicero, *Orat.* 101; cf. also 100], tamquam si adderet illa etiam tria, et sic explicaret unam eandemque sententiam, dicens: Is erit igitur eloquens, qui ut doceat poterit parva summis, ut delectet modica temperate, ut flectat magna granditer dicere” (4, 17, 34).

[The man, therefore, who is striving by speaking to persuade people to do what is good, bearing in mind each of those three things, namely that he is meant to be teaching, delighting and swaying them, should pray, and take pains to ensure, as we said above, that he is listened to with understanding, with enjoyment, and with obedience. When he does this in a fitting and suitable manner, he can be not undeservedly called eloquent, even if he does not win the assent of his audience. For to these three things, that is teaching, delighting and swaying, that other trio seems to have been attached, according to the mind of the great founder of Roman eloquence himself, when he said in similar vein, “That man therefore will be eloquent, who can talk about minor matters calmly, about middling ones moderately, about great matters grandly.” It’s as if, were he to add those other three as well, he could set it all out in one and the same judgment by saying, “That man therefore will be eloquent who, in order to teach, can talk about minor matters calmly; in order to delight, about middling matters moderately; in order to sway, about great matters grandly” (I-11, 220).]

Yet, while the tripartite system with its differentiation in *genus grande*, *genus mediocre* and *genus humile* is appropriate “in causis forensibus” [in instances taken from the law courts], the same does not hold true “in ecclesiasticis quaestionibus” [on ecclesiastical occasions], where “omnia sunt magna quae dicimus” [everything we say is a great matter] (*Doctr. christ.* 4, 18, 35 [I-11, 220s.]), but where attention must be paid rather to the communicative circumstances, cf. e.g.: “cum doctor iste debeat rerum dictor esse magnarum, non semper eas debet granditer dicere, sed summis cum aliquid docetur, temperate cum aliquid vituperatur sive laudatur” [while this teacher should always be setting forth great matters, he does not always have to say them in the grand manner. But he should do it calmly when he is teaching, moderately when he has something to blame or praise] (*Doctr. christ.* 4, 19, 38 [I-11, 222]; cf. also Auerbach 1958a, 30–34). Augustine thus suspends the rule of *aptum*, aesthetic concerns becoming subordinate to pragmatic ones.

Speaking of the “Scripturarum mirabili[s] altitud[o] et mirabili[s] humilita[s]” [the marvelous heights and equally marvelous lowliness and humility of those scriptures] (*Doctr. christ.* 2, 42, 63 [I-11, 162]) in order to demonstrate the seemingly paradoxical relation between content and form, Augustine reframes *humilis/humilitas* in a clearly rhetorical sense (cf. *Confess.* 6, 5, 8 [I-1, 142]: “humillimo genere loquendi” [in very humble modes of speech]). The *sermo humilis*, in Horace’s (65–8) poetics and Quintilian’s rhetoric relegated to the realm of substandard (cf. Müller 2001, 99–104, 104s., 319),⁸ now specifically covers the ideational realm of Christian speech

⁸ Cf. e.g. *Ars*, 225–230: “Verum ita risores, ita commendare dicaces / conveniet Satyros, ita vertere seria ludo, / ne quicumque deus, quicumque adhibebitur heros, / regali conspectus in auro nuper et ostro, / migret in obscuras humili sermone tabernas, / aut, dum vitat humum, nubes et inania captet” [But it will be fitting so to seek favour for your laughing, bantering Satyrs, so to pass from grave to gay, that no god, no hero, who shall be brought upon the stage, and whom we have just beheld in royal gold and purple, shall shift with vulgar speech into dingy hovels, or, while shunning the ground, catch at clouds and emptiness]; *Inst.* 11, 1, 6: “neque humile atque cotidianum sermonis genus et compositione ipsa dissolutum epilogis dabimus” [nor again shall we employ low or colloquial language, without rhythmical structure, in the Epilogue].

(but cf. nevertheless what he says in his *Retractationum libri duo* 2, 3 [I-2, 112]: “Liber *De agone christiano* fratribus in eloquio Latino ineruditus humili sermone conscriptus est” [The book on the Christian combat was composed in simple language for brothers who were not educated in Latin]).

With the rise of Christianity, the “commun[is] loquendi consuetude[o]” [usual common way of talking] (Augustine, *Gen. c. Manich.* 1, 1, 1 [I-13, 39]) emerges from the shadows and emancipates itself from exemplary Latin in literary, rhetorical and grammatical respects (cf. Müller 2001, 193s., 321–324), becoming an alternative norm for contact between the *docti* and the *indocti*: “Hunc enim sermonem usitatum et simplicem etiam docti intellegunt, illum autem indocti non intellegunt” [The learned too, after all, can understand this ordinary and simple language while the unlearned cannot understand that other sort] (*Gen. c. Manich.* 1, 1, 1 [I-13, 39]). The rupture of tradition with the *consuetudo* in Quintilian’s sense of “consensu[s] eruditorum” [consensus of the educated] (*Inst.* 1, 6, 45) becomes evident from Augustine’s statement in *De doctrina christiana* 2, 13, 19 (italics added; cf. also below, 3.3):

“Nam non solum verba singula, sed etiam locutiones saepe transferuntur, quae omnino in latinae linguae usum, si quis *consuetudinem veterum* qui latine locuti sunt tenere voluerit, transire non possint. Nam soloecismus qui dicitur, nihil est aliud quam cum verba non ea lege coaptantur qua coaptaverunt qui *priores nobis* non sine auctoritate aliqua locuti sunt. Utrum enim ‘inter homines’ an ‘inter hominibus’ dicatur, ad rerum non pertinet cognitorem. Item barbarismus quid aliud est nisi verbum non eis litteris vel sono enuntiatum, quo ab *eis qui ante nos latine locuti sunt* enuntiarī solet? [...] Quid est ergo integritas locutionis nisi *alienae consuetudinis conservatio, loquentium veterum auctoritate firmatae?*”.

[It is often the case, after all, that not only single words but also whole phrases are transposed which simply cannot go into correct Latin [...] usage, if one wishes to stick to the standards of the old classical authors who spoke the language. [...] What are called solecisms, after all, are simply cases where words are put together without observing the rules followed by our predecessors, whose manner of writing and speaking was not without authority. I mean, whether you say in Latin *inter homines* or *inter hominibus* [...] makes no difference to our ability to get the meaning. Again, what else is a barbarism but the spelling or pronunciation of a word in a way which was not accepted by received authors of the past? [...] What else then is correctness of speech but the observation of a manner that is foreign to one, which has been established by the authority of past speakers? (I-11, 138).]

3.1.2 *Sermo rusticus*

Until Augustine and Jerome (347–420), the qualification of *rusticus/rusticitas* had born a clearly pejorative connotation, but it became a neutral one. The verse of the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (cf. 2 Cor. 11,6), to which Jerome alludes in his dictum “nisi forte rusticum Petrum, rusticum dicimus et Iohannem, quorum uterque dicere poterat: etsi inperitus sermone, non tamen scientia” [but perhaps we ought to call Peter and John ignorant, both of whom could say of themselves, “though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge”] (*Epist.* 53, 4 [Wace/Schaff 1893, 98]), turned at first into a general permission and then became a programmatic imperative (cf. Müller

2001, 68) – even if there could be some resistance on behalf of the church attendees, as Gregory of Tours (538–594) tells us and immediately rejects such claims:

“[...] uni presbiterorum gloriosa solemnna caelebrare praecepi. Sed cum presbiter ille nescio quid *rustice* festiva verba depromeret, multi eum de nostris inridere coeperunt, dicentes: ‘Melius fuisset tacere, quam sic *inculte* loqui’. Nocte autem insecuta, vidi virum dicentem mihi: ‘De mysteriis Dei nequaquam disputandum’. [...] Unde, dilectissimi, nullus de hoc mysterio, etiamsi *rustice* videatur dici, disputare praesumat, quia apud Dei maiestatem magis simplicitas pura quam philosophorum valet argutia” (*Mart.* 2, 1; italics added).

[I ordered one of the priests to celebrate the glorious ceremony. But when that priest for some reason pronounced the words of the liturgy incorrectly, many members of my congregation began to laugh at him and said: “It would have been better to be silent than to speak so incorrectly.” During the following night I saw a man who said to me: “There must never be any disagreement about the mysteries of God.” [...] Therefore, most beloved people, let no one dare to disagree about this mystery, even if it seems to be recited in an uncouth fashion, because in the presence of God’s majesty pure simplicity is more effective than philosophical cleverness (van Dam 1993, 229).]

Precisely because of his frequent emphasis on his poor language skills, which thus appears somewhat unconvincing and rather potentially instantiates the modesty topos (cf. Müller 2001, 73–76 for examples and discussion; cf. also Berschin 1986, 299–302; Heinzelmänn 1994, 84–90), Gregory of Tours arguably intended to legitimate the *sermo rusticus* as a new, forward-looking variety able to fulfil the communicative needs of the broader public (cf. Auerbach 1958b, 83; Berschin 1986, 302; Fuhrmann 1994, 346; Müller 2001, 74). The advanced stage of this process, despite being doomed to failure in the course of the 7th century due to the extinction of literary life in Gaul (and Italy) (cf. Auerbach 1958b, 83, 88s.; Fuhrmann 1994, 346, 349), can easily be inferred from Gregory the Great first using the term *lingua rustica*. This expression became famous by the well-known decision made during the Council of Tours (813), which prescribed the use of the *rustica romana lingua* in homilies: “Visum est unanimitati nostrae, ut quilibet episcopus habeat omelias continentes necessarias ammonitiones [...]. Et ut easdem omelias quisque aperte transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam aut Thiotiscam, quo facilius cuncti possint intellegere quae dicuntur” [We were unanimous in deciding that every bishop should have at hand homilies containing the necessary admonitions [...] and that these homilies should be translated in a straightforward way [...] by each one of them into the rustic Roman speech or into Germanic, so that people may more easily understand what is said]⁹ (cf. also below, 3.2).

⁹ The translation is taken from Herman (2006, 200). It seems noteworthy that in translations of this canon, the expression “in rusticam Romanam linguam” is often maintained as such, probably because of the notoriously thorny problem with its “correct” interpretation (cf. e.g. Ledgeway 2012, 1, n. 2: “‘rustic Roman(ce?) speech’”). For this and other questions concerning the canon quoted, cf. Asperti (2006, 124–129); cf. Kramer (1998, 163) for the relation between *latinus* and *romanus* in the Middle Ages; cf. also Herman (2006, 200–203); Selig (2011, 263–268).

3.2 The impact of Carolingian Renaissance

Gregory of Tours' experiment, which could have resulted in a new kind of prose style (cf. Fuhrmann 1994, 346), was not crowned with success because of the general decline in cultural life in Gaul (and Italy) from the 7th century onwards (cf. above, 3.1.2). By the end of the 8th century, this situation would be countered with measures that led to the so-called "Carolingian Renaissance", i.e. the overall cultural revival of which Charlemagne and his court, in particular the Irish monk Alcuin (735–804), were the impetus (cf., among others, Brown 1994; Irvine 1994, 298–313; Law 1994; Auernheimer 2003, 103–127; Lüdtkke 2005, 618–644).

Aside from the requests expressed in the *Admonitio generalis* (cf. above, section 3), the other important manifesto is the programmatic *Epistola de litteris colendis* (cf. Martin 1985; Berschin 1991, 101–113), where, audaciously reinterpreting the verse 12,37 of the *Gospel according to Matthew*, it is stated unambiguously (italics added):

"[...] sicut regularis norma honestatem morum, ita quoque docendi et discendi instantia ordinet et ornet seriem verborum, ut, *qui deo placere appetunt recte vivendo, ei etiam placere non negligant recte loquendo*. Scriptum est enim: 'Aut ex verbis tuis iustificaberis, aut ex verbis tuis condemnaberis'. [...] Debet ergo quisque discere quod optat implere, ut tanto uberius quid agere debeat intellegat anima, quanto in omnipotentis Dei laudibus sine mendaciorum offendiculis cucurrerit lingua".

[...] just as the observance of the rule imparts order and grace to honesty of morals, so also zeal in teaching and learning may do the same for sentences, so that those who desire to please God by living rightly should not neglect to please him also by speaking correctly. For it is written: "Either from thy words thou shalt be justified or from thy words thou shalt be condemned." [...] Therefore, each one ought to study what he desires to accomplish, so that so much the more fully the mind may know what ought to be done, as the tongue hastens in the praises of omnipotent God without the hindrances of errors (DHUP, no. 5, 12s.).]

As long as correct pronunciation was guaranteed "automatically" by a standard traced back to the upper class (Cicero) or the educational elite (Quintilian), orthoepy did not need to preoccupy Latin rhetoricians and grammarians. This changed, however, during the 2nd and 4th century, whereby orthoepy did indeed gain considerable attention (cf. Müller 2001, 327–329; cf. also above, n. 6). Nevertheless, Origen's (185–ca. 254) early dictum "καὶ ὁ πάσης διαλέκτου κύριος τῶν ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου εὐχομένων ἀκούει ὡς μᾶς, ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω, φωνῆς τῆς κατὰ τὰ σημαινόμενα ἀκούων, δηλουμένης ἐκ τῶν ποικίλων διαλέκτων" [And the Lord of every language hears those who pray in every language as though He were hearing one utterance, so to speak, the same meaning being expressed by the various languages] (Origenes 2001 [248], 552 [Origen 1980 (248), 479]) had made the quality of spoken expression an affair of little importance for Christians. That *recte loqui* had become a "problem" is in this way, among others, due to the increased distance between the spoken and the written expression of Latin (cf. Berschin 1991, 144s.), a development Alcuin intended to antagonize taking recourse to the *auctoritas veterum*: