Trends in Romance Linguistics and Philology
Volume 5

Trends in Linguistics

Studies and Monographs 71

Editor
Werner Winter

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Trends in Romance Linguistics and Philology

Volume 5: Bilingualism and Linguistic Conflict in Romance

Edited by

Rebecca Posner
John N. Green

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York 1993

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.

∞ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability

Die Deutsche Bibliothek — Cataloging in Publication Data

Trends in Romance linguistics and philology / ed. by Rebecca Posner ; John N. Green. — Berlin ; New York : Mouton de Gruyter.
(Trends in linguistics : Studies and monographs ; ...)
NE: Posner, Rebecca [Hrsg.]

Vol. 5. Bilingualism and linguistic conflict in Romance. — 1993

Bilingualism and linguistic conflict in Romance / ed. by Rebecca Posner, John N. Green. — Berlin ; New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1993
(Trends in Romance linguistics and philology ; Vol. 5)
(Trends in linguistics : Studies and monographs ; 71)
ISBN 3-11-011724-X
NE: Posner, Rebecca [Hrsg.]; Trends in linguistics / Studies and monographs

Typesetting and Printing: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin
Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin
Printed in Germany

Foreword

The first four volumes of *Trends in Romance linguistics and philology* (published between 1980 and 1982 under the imprint of Mouton Publishers, The Hague) were devoted, in turn, to: *Romance comparative and historical linguistics, Synchronic Romance linguistics, Language and philology in Romance*, and *National and regional trends in Romance linguistics and philology*. We had not originally intended to follow up the series with a supplement, despite the encouragement to that effect given in more than one of the generally favourable reviews, whose authors rightly pointed out that evaluative surveys tend to date quickly, and even more so the bibliographic information that underpins them. The idea for the present volume does, nonetheless, derive from a review by Dr Jana Vizmuller-Zocco, who was struck by the lack of discussion of language acquisition in Romance, especially in bilingual contexts. We are grateful to her for the original suggestion, for subsequent helpful comments on design, and for agreeing to contribute a chapter to the volume. In planning this sequel, we wished to link bilingualism with diglossia and language conflict, topics which have grown vastly in importance and resonance since the original project was conceived. An early policy decision, taken in the interests of confining the volume to manageable proportions, was to limit coverage almost exclusively to instances of contact between two or more varieties of Romance. While this limitation has excluded some major external influences on Romance, we hope that it has worked to produce a treatment with greater thematic unity and cohesion than would otherwise have been possible.

Our thanks go to all our contributors, for striving to meet our early requests on content and scope, and for accepting patiently our later editorial suggestions and (sometimes major) stylistic interventions. We are particularly grateful to Alvina Byrne, for her thorough work on the indexes, and to Anthony Grant, for translating one of the articles, and for his unstinting and often ingenious assistance with the bibliographical searches. Thanks are also due to Professor Werner Winter for his readiness to accept a supplementary title into the Trends in Linguistics series and

for his practical advice on our first proposal; and above all to Dr Marie-Louise Liebe-Harkort, Ms Margaret Saunders, and all their colleagues at Mouton de Gruyter head office in Berlin, for their patience with our editorial idiosyncrasies and the long delays that, despite good intentions and well laid plans, have disrupted the production schedule. Kaye Green has been, as ever, an unfailing source of practical help and moral sustenance.

Rebecca Posner
John N. Green

June 1992

Contents

Contributors

Richard Y. Bourhis	Université du Québec à Montréal
John N. Green	University of Bradford
Guy Hazaël-Massieux	Université de Provence à Aix-en-Provence
Fritz G. Hensey	University of Texas, Austin
Dominique Lepicq	McMaster University, Hamilton
John M. Lipski	University of New Mexico, Albuquerque
Georges Lüdi	Universität Basel
Giovanni Meo Zilio	Università degli Studi di Venezia
Henrique Monteagudo	Universidade de Santiago de Compostela
Žarko Muljačić	[Emeritus] Freie Universität Berlin
Rebecca Posner	University of Oxford
Rosita Rindler Schjerve	Universität Wien
Didier de Robillard	Université de Provence à Aix-en-Provence
Kenneth H. Rogers	University of Rhode Island
Marius Sala	Institutul de Lingvistică, Bucureşti
Antón Santamarina	Universidade de Santiago de Compostela
Brigitte Schlieben-Lange	Universität Tübingen
Armin Schwegler	University of California, Irvine
Thomas Stolz	Ruhr Universität, Bochum
Miquel Strubell i Trueta	Inst. de Sociolingüística Catalana, Barcelona
Ghjacumu Thiers	Université de Corse, Corti
John Trumper	Università della Calabria, Cosenza
Jana Vizmuller-Zocco	York University, Ontario

5.1 Overview

JOHN N. GREEN

Representations of Romance: contact, bilingualism and diglossia

1. Introduction

The contributions to this volume share a common concern with the use of language in its socio-cultural context, and its representation in the minds of speakers. As such, they reflect the extraordinary blossoming of sociolinguistics (in the widest sense) witnessed over the past quarter century, and the sheer diversity of theoretical persuasions and practical applications that have now evolved. Some of the chapters below attempt answers to questions that would not, and perhaps could not, have been formulated a generation ago.

Speculating on the factors responsible for both the prodigious level of activity and the shifts of emphasis, Lavandera (1988) suggests, perhaps not too fancifully, that the concentration of interest on sociolinguistic, pragmatic and discourse approaches to language, may be indirectly due to Chomsky – to a reaction, that is, against the abstract modelling of idealized data that characterized the early phase of generative linguistics.[1] As we shall see, she is not alone in her conviction. Nonetheless, within the sphere of European Romance, we must recognize an additional factor, not linguistic in origin, that has proved at least equally influential. The emergence of a new political order and the rise of European federalism have created conditions strongly favouring the resurgence of 'oppressed' minority languages and regional varieties that can now be harnessed as vehicles for autonomist aspirations. Such political movements have sought intellectual underpinning in the rich theoretical seam of conflict sociolinguistics pioneered by Catalan and Occitan linguists (see section 4.1 below, and the chapters by Posner, Schlieben-Lange, Strubell i Trueta, and Thiers). Reciprocally, political prominence has fuelled vigorous debate on the effectiveness of language planning and especially of policies aimed at raising the prestige of varieties whose low social status is now perceived as anomalous.

This introductory chapter (which is designed to be read in conjunction with those of Posner and Muljačić), by surveying some prominent theories of language, bilingualism, diglossia, and contact-induced change, aims to set a frame within which traditional and newly identified problems in Romance can be elucidated, and conversely, the explanatory potential of the theories can be evaluated against the known Romance facts.

2. *Language and lects*

The concept of language as social semiotic goes back at least to Saussure, who seems to have been profoundly influenced in this aspect of his work by Durkheim. For Saussure, language is above all a "fait social" (1965: 29, 30–32), knowledge of which is both a marker and an obligation of community membership. In Saussure's famous dichotomy, it is *langue* which is social and essential, while *parole* is individual and contingent: *langue* is the socially-warranted system learned by individuals and used by them to communicate thought through ephemeral speech acts. Whereas *parole* is multivariate and idiosyncratic, *langue* is represented in identical form in the mind of every adult member of the speech community and, once learned, is immune to conscious modification (1965: 38).

Chomsky's no less famous dichotomy of *competence* and *performance*, often likened to its forerunner (Lavandera 1988: 1), nevertheless diverges crucially from it in the divorce of the underlying system from the social warrant. For Chomsky, competence is individual, essential, and psychologically validated; while performance is its often imperfect instantiation in social contexts (see, for instance, Chomsky 1980: 201–205).[2] At most, social interaction influences competence during first language acquisition, when the child is steered by its genetic blueprint to infer knowledge of grammar, parameters and specific rule schemata from limited and sometimes degenerate input – the performance of other speakers. Children, it seems, acquire language not through, but in spite of, social interaction. Chomsky, of course, does not deny the existence of ambient linguistic variation, but believes it is best studied, together with other aspects of performance, once real insights have been gained into linguistic universals and mental representations, which in turn can only be approached via idealization (1980: 24–26). Such a research agenda not only downgrades the social functions of language, but also, through its methodological assumption of the "homogeneous speech community", marginalizes bilingualism and seemingly denies the possibility of diglossia (see section 4 below).

Two principal linguistic traditions span the chronological gap between Saussure and Chomsky: anthropological linguistics, typified by Boas and Sapir, and Bloomfieldian structuralism. Bloomfield himself, trained in the comparative method and practised in the recording of hitherto undescribed Amerindian languages, was acutely aware of spatial variation and temporal change, but, perhaps inhibited by allegiance to a mechanistic, behaviourist theory of psychology, paid little regard to the systematic social functions of language. 'Language' was a convenient abstraction, studied by induction from the linguistic behaviour of a speech community, defined as "a group of people who interact by means of speech" (Bloomfield 1935: 42) and admitting a certain degree of internal complexity, manifested as dialects and levels of formality (1935: 52). Later Bloomfieldians, finding the concept of speech community problematic and certainly too fluid to serve as the chief component of a definition of language, came to rely instead on the *idiolect*, the linguistic behaviour of a single (but typical) individual. From this perspective, a language is simply "a collection of more or less similar idiolects" (Hockett 1958: 322), and a dialect is a sub-collection with greater overlap of linguistic features and correspondingly enhanced mutual intelligibility. (For a general critique of the notion of speech community, see Romaine 1982.) Similarly, and as if to guard against both reification and higher-level abstraction, Hall admonishes that language "has its place of existence only in the individual idiolect" (1964: 395).

Although the structuralist and anthropological traditions within American linguistics subscribed to almost identical descriptive techniques (and, incidentally, agreed on the urgency of recording the diversity of languages threatened with extinction), they differed sharply in their view of the social and cultural role of language. Whereas Hockett (1958: 322) is content to note the practical impossibility of observing directly the speech habits of a whole community, most anthropological linguists and ethnographers believe that not to attempt this (however difficult the undertaking) denies the centrality of language and risks falsifying its nature. For instance, Hymes, one of the anthropologically-trained linguists credited by Lavandera (1988) with the successful development of an alternative to the Chomskyan paradigm, envisages: "a science that would approach language neither as abstracted form nor as an abstract correlate of a community, but as situated in the flux and pattern of communicative events" (Hymes 1974: 5). In this scheme, individuals must learn not only the structural properties of a linguistic system, but also how to drive the system to produce speech acts that will themselves be interpreted as

socially significant within the community to which they relate. In Hymes's memorable phrase, individuals strive to acquire and display *communicative competence.*

Despite their manifold differences, the approaches to language sketched above share the assumption that the natural and predominant locus of first language acquisition is within a monolingual community with a well focused image of its language. To be sure, the community language may be internally complex, and there will always be individual instances of bilingualism as a result of exogamy or migration, but these special circumstances serve only to underscore the dominance of the monolingual pattern. This view has been forcefully challenged by Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985), on the basis of studies of children growing up in multilingual Creole communities where the competing codes are ill-focused and where language learners, through their selection and combination of socially-valued features, create not only a language but, in a very real sense, their own social identity. Within this framework, individuals are seen as accommodating their linguistic behaviour to that of groups with which they wish to be identified – subject to the usual limitations of access to the target group, learning capacity, and motivation.[3] If, as Le Page contends, multilingualism is the norm outside the relatively few (but successful) western societies with highly focused standard languages and near-universal literacy, Chomsky's concept of competence is seriously undermined, and fatally so if the competing codes in multilingual settings happen to be relatively diffuse (Le Page 1973). In such circumstances, even Hymes's communicative competence requires redefinition, since individuals must negotiate not only the communicative content of their speech acts, but also that part of the system of social values that accredits them as communicatively competent.

The particular blend of ethnography and social psychology favoured by Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, tempered by extensive fieldwork, leads them to postulate an elaborate, fourfold definition of 'language' (1985: 188–193). Sense (1), about which they are openly sceptical, corresponds to the native language or mother tongue, allegedly a fundamental property of the individual members of a particular society and often appealed to for emotional or political ends. Sense (2) refers to the observable linguistic behaviour of individuals seen in its totality or subsets. Sense (3) denotes descriptions made by linguists from observed behaviour (that is, from Sense 2 data), with the proviso that no two descriptions are generatively equivalent and that the objectivity linguists bring to the task is conditioned by their theoretical preferences and methodological train-

ing. Sense (4), probably the most familiar, is that of the language perceived from outside as a single entity (as in 'the French language'), and nowadays most probably referring to a standardized language, serving a community where it constitutes both a norm and a yardstick for prescriptivism. This schema, as will be immediately apparent, has few points of direct contact with the dichotomous definitions of language discussed above – an inevitable consequence, its authors would maintain, of their recognition of the pervasiveness of multilingualism and the need for multivariate modelling.

2.1 Languages, lects and roofs in Romance

Romanists wishing to test the applicability of the hypotheses sketched above will be particularly concerned with: the number of languages (in Le Page's Sense 4) to be recognized, whether or not standardization or adoption for national or other official purposes is a necessary precondition for language status, and – more contentiously – under what 'roof' (see below, and the chapter by Muljačić) the varieties denied language status should be grouped. Since issues of language status and recognition arise, directly or by implication, virtually throughout this volume, it is perhaps also worth asking whether the views of Romance specialists accord with those expressed in reference works intended for a wider audience, and whether political action designed to enhance or 'normalize' the status of any particular variety (see Strubell i Trueta, this volume) has had an impact on popular perceptions outside its claimed territory.[4]

There can be no doubt about the status of the five standardized languages, of which Portuguese, (Castilian) Spanish, French and Italian form what is sometimes called *Romania continua* to the west and centre of the territory, while Rumanian lies to the east, insulated from the others by a wide band of Hungarian and Slavonic. The five standards clearly qualify for language status on such criteria as: long association with a territory, where they are recognized as official and symbolic of national unity; accessibility to large populations as both first and second languages; endowment with a substantial written corpus of literary and cultural merit; codification by grammarians; and external recognition of their distinctness from contiguous lects. It should be borne in mind that for Rumanian, fulfilment of the criterion of widespread external recognition dates back only a little over a century, following the Ardilean reforms leading, among other things, to the adoption of a romanized orthography. Italian, on the other hand, has enjoyed a much longer if perhaps spurious recognition based on foreign misconceptions about the pervasiveness of

the Tuscan written standard, whereas in fact linguistic unification through bidialectalism in a Milanese-inspired koine is a very recent phenomenon, postdating the Second World War (see Foresti et al. 1989; Muljačić 1989 c; and Posner and Trumper, this volume). An interesting commentary on the hierarchy of internal and external criteria for language status is offered by the case of Spanish and Portuguese, which are contiguous, structurally very close, and virtually intercomprehensible once a salient but regular group of phonological divergences have been surmounted; nevertheless, on political and cultural grounds, their separation has been effective since the 14th century and formally recognized outside the peninsula since at least the Treaty of Tordesillas of 1494. It seems, then, that the precedence accorded to the five Romance standards flows first and foremost from their symbolic role, closely followed by the mere fact of their standardization, and no doubt bolstered by the relative numbers of speakers (for statistics, see Fleischman 1992). The impression is confirmed by important reference works: *The world's major languages* (Comrie 1987) devotes individual chapters to all and only these five, as does the *Oxford international encyclopedia of linguistics* (Bright 1992), though in each case a brief overview of the whole Romance group is also provided. More surprisingly, the treatment is mirrored in a number of recent Romance manuals (Agard 1984, for instance), which pay at best scant attention to other synchronic varieties.

The astonishing omission from this list is Catalan, which one would have expected to merit inclusion on the grounds of its cultural and literary pedigree alone, though, as Goebl (1986) reminds us, neither Diez nor Meyer-Lübke accorded it separate status in their comparative grammars. Meyer-Lübke changed his mind in the early 1920s and Entwistle's still-influential survey of the Hispanic languages (1936 [1962]), whether consequentially or by earlier conviction, treats Catalan as a language in its own right without even a suggestion that the status might be problematic. Matching recognition has been claimed on behalf of Occitan by its contemporary activists, though in fact the two cases are not fully parallel, since the varieties now grouped under the label 'Occitan' are not coterminous with the language of the medieval troubadours – whose separate existence was acknowledged by Raynouard even before Diez and Meyer-Lübke – nor with the 19th-century poetic revival of Provençal championed by Mistral and his fellow *félibres* (see Schlieben-Lange, this volume). Nonetheless, some measure of Occitan success can be gauged from the fact that a large-scale reference work for the general reader, the *Compendium of the world's languages* (Campbell 1991), has entries for seven

Romance languages, with Catalan and Occitan included exactly on a par with the five national standards.

If the existence of a distinguished medieval literary tradition were of itself a guarantee of present-day language status, Galician and Sicilian would surely be included alongside Provençal, for not only do they boast substantial bodies of extant lyric poetry, but, ironically perhaps, they were quite explicitly acknowledged as foreign idioms at the height of their renown, by the non-native poets who, like Alfonso The Wise, strove to take advantage of their evocative qualities. But Galician (whose revival is debated at length by Posner and Monteagudo – Santamarina, this volume), despite acceding to the legal status of regional language in Spain, and despite the great strides its advocates have taken in both corpus and status planning, has yet to achieve significant international recognition.

Leaving aside the Romance languages that have become extinct (Dalmatian and Mozarabic),[5] the remaining varieties for which language status has been, or may be, claimed all pose problems of a different order. Sardinian, Sicilian, and the lects of southern Italy sometimes grouped together as 'Calabrian', might all be considered eligible on the twin grounds of structural distance from northern Italian and difficulty of mutual intelligibility; but their internal diversity is such that both linguists and, it seems, their own speakers entertain doubts as to their unity and status (see Trumper, this volume). Sardinian was nevertheless included in the Romance canon by Meyer-Lübke, and few specialist manuals have ventured to excise it since (a separate article on Sardinian is, for instance, included in Harris–Vincent 1988). Romansh is an official cantonal language in Switzerland, where it serves a small and diminishing population, but official status has never been accorded to the wider grouping of Rhaeto-Romance which, from this standpoint, suffers the disadvantage of straddling three national frontiers. The fundamental unity ascribed by Ascoli to Rhaeto-Romance has recently been endorsed by Haiman (1988: 351), despite the well-founded objections of Francescato (1982) to the inclusion of Friulian (echoed even more forcibly by Pellegrini 1991), and the scepticism of Posner (1980) as to the justification of the entire grouping. In a few other cases within European Romance, notably Corsican (see Marcellesi 1984, and Thiers, this volume), the aspiration to independent language status is fuelled by a desire to be rid of a dominating 'roof' which is judged to lack both linguistic and politico-cultural legitimacy.

The notion of a linguistic roof is less novel than its name. Rather as the technique of phonemic analysis creates a requirement of allophonic membership and single loyalty, so the process of language standardization may be seen to exert pressure on neighbouring lects to group themselves under the protective umbrella of the emergent standard. Lects either not attracted to this tutelage, or repelled by it, were described by Kloss as *dachlos* 'roofless', a metaphor refined and applied rigorously to Romance by Muljačić (see, especially, Kloss 1976, 1987; Muljačić 1989 a and this volume). While the image has protective connotations, the relationship of the lects to the standard can as easily be one of annexation and subservience, in which the 'roofed' varieties risk loss of identity through gradual assimilation, or abandonment following the erosion of what little remains of their social prestige. This all-too-predictable decline leads conflict theorists such as Marcellesi to reject the comfortable roofing metaphor in favour of *satellization*, defined as the tendency of a dominant ideology to "«rattacher» un système linguistique à un autre auquel on le compare et dont on affirme qu'il est une «déformation» ou «une forme subordonnée»" (Marcellesi 1981 a: 9; see also section 4.1 below). Such reservations aside, valuable new insights have been gained into Romance relationships by the application of the standardological model as developed by Muljačić (1980, 1989 b, and this volume), especially on the vexed historical question of whether standard languages emerge, consensually as it were, from dialect constellations, or whether speakers of an ascendant lect annex and derive grudging support from the ambient dialects of their choosing. This, above all else, has been the cause of friction between Creole nationalists and speakers of the lexifier language, when the latter group have unthinkingly assumed that the Creole is a variety 'of' their language and have consequently judged it to be debased and inferior – with all the colonialist associations that the judgement inevitably evokes.[6]

3. Bilingualism and contact

Bilingualism, rather like synonymy, is a concept at the mercy of its definition. Cast the net too widely ('the ability to convey a simple message in more than one language') and the result is banal; cast it too narrowly ('native command of two languages in all functional domains') and most of the interesting cases are excluded – much as 'synonymy' becomes useless if equated with total substitutability in all contexts. Notable linguists have, in fact, espoused definitions not far removed from these two extremes: Bloomfield (1935: 55–56) favoured the strict requirement of "native-like control of two languages", while apparently believing that

the attainment is not particularly rare and is, in principle, open to the exceptional second-language learner; whereas Haugen (1953: 7), probably in a conscious bid to shift the research paradigm, set the ability to produce "complete meaningful utterances" as the first benchmark of bilingualism.[7] (For discussion of maximalist, minimalist and intermediate stances on this issue, see Hoffmann 1991: 21–22.) In this context, it is worth noting that the popular image of the bilingual as someone who has learned two languages from infancy and is equally at home in both – an image which stresses the natural acquisition of bilingualism and its balanced outcome – is more in tune with Bloomfield than with his more liberal successors.[8]

The balance of the two codes, or alternatively the degree of dominance of one of them, constitutes only one of the dimensions of bilingualism identified in the increasingly elaborate typologies now advocated. Baetens Beardsmore (1986), for instance, distinguishes over thirty types of bilingualism on the basis of different combinations of productive and receptive skills, while Hamers and Blanc (1989: 8–11) offer a simpler schema of variables, recognizing "relative competence, cognitive organization, age of acquisition, exogeneity, social cultural status and cultural identity", and Hoffmann (1991: 16–27) favours the profiling of individuals and communities using nine parameters of variation – with the twin aims of dispensing with preconceived labels and emphasizing the relativity of all aspects of bilingualism. The increasing sophistication of the field seems to have outpaced its terminology. The terms 'bilingual' and 'bilingualism' themselves remain in widespread use in the technical literature, despite their polyvalency, and researchers needing greater precision are usually content to add a prequalifying adjective (such as 'compound', 'coordinate', 'societal' bilingualism) rather than resorting to wholesale neologism. The modest innovation proposed by Hamers and Blanc (1989 [1983]), for instance, to distinguish 'bilinguality' as the psychological attribute of the bilingual individual, from 'bilingualism' in its social-psychological and societal aspects, has won little approval and fewer imitators (Hoffmann 1991: 10).[9]

Research on bilingualism has tended to split into two traditions each with its own goals and methodology, one concerned with psycholinguistic processes within the individual, and the other with the social-psychological repercussions for individuals and groups. The second tradition has laid emphasis on the factors determining language choice in particular interactions and language loyalty in the long term (Appel–Muysken 1987); on the educational implications of bilingualism and biculturalism (see Agar 1991; Hoffmann 1991: 118–135; Romaine 1989: chapter 6;

and the articles by Lüdi and Posner below); and on the sometimes hazy boundary between societal bilingualism and diglossia (see Laforge–Péronnet 1989; Martinet 1982; Tabouret-Keller 1982; and section 4 below). Within individual bilingualism, investigations have concentrated on the measurement of attainment in the two languages (surveyed in Baetens Beardsmore 1986: chapter 3; and more sceptically in Hamers–Blanc 1989: 14–29; and in Hoffmann 1991: 148–153); on whether bilingualism once attained remains constant or is liable to decay under unfavourable conditions (Hyltenstam–Obler 1989); and on psycholinguistic aspects of processing, with particular reference to modularity theory (Bialystok 1991 a, 1991 b; Sharwood Smith 1991). One object of fascination, precisely because it is so elusive and difficult to test, continues to be the mental representation, or set of representations, corresponding to 'coordinate' and 'compound' bilingualism (terms coined in Ervin–Osgood 1954 to designate respectively dual or single cognitive systems underlying the two linguistic codes). Here, as elsewhere in empirical investigations of psycholinguistic constructs, the findings are open to multiple and contradictory interpretations, either because experiments based on large samples fail to hold the many variables constant or because individual case studies, however meticulously observed, raise doubts as to their typicality. For instance, a recent longitudinal study of bilingual acquisition in a small child (Houwer 1990) uses the observed low level of mutual interference between morphosyntactic systems to argue in favour of the hypothesis that the two codes develop separately; but it is impossible for an observer to judge how far the child's performance is shaped by the well-focused nature of the input from the two standard languages in contact, or indeed constrained by the intensity of the monitoring.

3.1 Contact as a cause of change

In his now-classic account of contact-induced change, Weinreich (1953: 1) defined the bilingual individual as the locus of contact and, by implication, the agent of transfer. Bilingualism can thus lead to change in two ways: either by percolation of linguistic features from one system to the other (usually known as *interference*) or by increasing the speaker's opportunities for choice of language and thereby making possible a long-term shift in preference for one language, to the detriment and perhaps ultimate abandonment of the other. Since Weinreich's goal was to elucidate the general mechanisms of change that are potentially activated whenever two distinguishable codes are in contact, he felt able to disregard the question of their sociolinguistic status: whether the varieties in contact

are usually classified as languages or dialects is immaterial to mechanisms of interference, though he did concede that the normal sense ascribed to bilingualism would not extend to speakers 'merely' adept in closely-related dialects (1953: 2).

In a more recent account of the effects of contact between related systems, Trudgill (1986: 40) envisages change taking place through linguistic accommodation in face-to-face interaction (see section 2 above). This leads him to challenge Weinreich's disregard for the status of the codes in contact. Assuming that 'languages' are by definition not mutually intelligible, Trudgill contends that bilingual transfer between language systems can be prompted by communicative needs, whereas interference between mutually comprehensible dialects, though certainly not unknown, lacks communicative motivation. His model thus invites the assumption that bilingual transfer between languages will be deliberate, memorable and sustainable, whereas bidialectal transfer is likely to be adventitious and transient. Weinreich, on the other hand, considered all interference between codes to be unintentional, so that the issue of speaker motivation simply did not arise. In practice, this fundamental divergence of view does not prevent Trudgill and Weinreich from making similar predictions as to the outcome of contact, as can be seen in Weinreich's assertion that "The greater the difference between the systems, ... the greater is the learning problem and the potential area of interference" (1953: 1), with the obvious corollary that there is less scope for interference between closely related dialects.

Abstract potential, however, is not the same as realization, which implies choice and opportunity. We may legitimately ask whether speakers of neighbouring dialects, who would normally have more opportunities for bidialectal exchange than they would for properly bilingual interaction, might have quite different motives for keeping their linguistic systems distinct. This brings us back to the Le Pagean concept of identity (see section 2 above): well-disposed speakers accommodate to the linguistic usage of their interlocutors to the extent that the modification does not undermine their own chosen identity or bring them too close to the linguistic behaviour of a social group from which they have intentionally distanced themselves. This, as Labov has demonstrated in a long series of illuminating studies (see especially 1963, 1972 b, 1992), constitutes the social brake on change, or even the motive for reversing a change in mid diffusion.

3.2 Bidialectalism and convergent change in Romance

While of course it is not to be expected that the psycholinguistic processes involved in the bilingual storage and production of varieties of Romance will differ from putative universal patterns, or that the processes themselves will change over measurable time, Romance does offer a challenging testbed for theories of bilingual acquisition, performance, and contact-based change. In particular, the rich diversity of linguistic forms across lects which still maintain a high degree of structural overlap and intelligibility, throws into sharp relief the problem of distinguishing between bilingualism, conceived as the mastery of two quite distinct linguistic codes, and various shades of bidialectalism.

If bidialectalism is to be used as a tool for the analysis of accommodation between individuals and groups of speakers, a precondition of its application is the ability to measure linguistic distance and to locate dialect boundaries. Both are problematic within European Romance, where the dialect continua and catenate intelligibility produced by gradual historical divergence are criss-crossed by countervailing (re-)convergent trends particularly evident in the present century (see Sanga 1981; and Posner, Monteagudo – Santamarina, and Trumper, this volume). Since Romance attempts to elaborate a theory of dialectometry grew out of classic dialect geography and the wish to make the best use of linguistic atlases, it was natural that the structural divergence of systems located in Euclidean space should be seen as directly correlated with geographical distance (Goebl 1991; Walter 1990). This was the premise underlying the pioneering work of Jean Séguy, and it has borne valuable fruit in the hands of his associates and successors, notably in the triangulation technique developed by Guiter under the title of *méthode globale* (see, among many revealing applications, Guiter 1991 on dialect frontiers in southern France and northern Spain, and Lazard 1985 on the delimitation of Friulian).[10] However valuable in their own right, approaches predicated on geographical distribution do not address the issue of comprehensibility and its limits across non-contiguous lects. A promising alternative approach, based on multivariate analysis and normal-distribution testing, is now being developed by Belgian researchers seeking a statistical validation of 'supralocal' dialects, a construct which they believe is particularly revealing for patterns of morphological divergence (see Melis et al. 1984; and Verlinde – Derinck 1991).[11]

Though dialect and language boundaries can, of course, subsist without bilingualism, the history of Romance has been one of almost continuous permeability to outside influences, and within Romance linguistics there

has been a strong tendency to view language contact as a powerful cause of change. In the context of linguistic geography and the cartographical representation of variation, 'contact' is perhaps an unfortunate term, implying friction along the interfaces between discrete zones. Contact in this limited sense might amount to the importing of culture-specific vocabulary by adventurous individuals who had crossed to the other side (in much the same way as early transatlantic explorers brought back previously unknown plants and fruits together with their names in Arawak, Nahuatl and other Amerindian langages); such contact does involve language learning and transfer within the individual, but on a far smaller scale than implied by any standard definition of bilingualism (see section 3 above). Transfer without significant bilingualism could also occur along a dialectal interface if speakers on one side became aware of a regular and salient pronunciation – such as the substitution of a uvular [R] for an apical trill – which they chose to imitate, originally perhaps in a spirit of parody. The need to distinguish different kinds of contact has led Dardel (1991) to refer to isoglosses representing the limits of structural innovations as 'inorganic', in contrast to the organic ones where there is regular interchange in the minds of bilingual individuals. In Dardel's view, the latter type now predominates, many inorganic frontiers having developed during the period of Common Romance and become fixed shortly afterwards.

Contact in Weinreich's (1953) sense, and the structural interference to which it can lead, have been well studied and illustrated by Romanists (see, for instance, Sala 1985, 1988; and Meo Zilio, this volume). In many documented cases, the interference takes place not as a result of infant bilingualism but following the acquisition of a second language by adult learners. Particularly revealing are the adaptive patterns shown by migrants between Romance-speaking areas (see Lüdi and Vizmuller-Zocco, this volume). In such cases, because of the similarity of codes, migrants do not uniformly perceive their task as the learning of a foreign language, nor are they always conscious of backwash effects on their first language: Grosjean and Py (1991), for instance, document a tendency among Spanish migrant workers in the Neuchâtel area to calque idioms and syntactic constructions from French into Spanish, and to give grammatical acceptability judgements implying that they have edited out of their first language some prominently Spanish characteristics. From the evidence hitherto available, it is difficult to know whether the adaptive changes observed in their language (in Le Page's Sense 2; see section 2 above) would be reversed after a period of reimmersion in the original cultural

matrix, or whether, as Grosjean and Py believe, a permanent retrospective change has been wrought in their (Chomskyan) competence. If the latter, the mechanisms of the change remain explicable by accommodation theory, but the extent and permanence of the change go far beyond what its proponents would normally envisage.[12]

Perhaps the best-known (and certainly the most notorious) explanations advanced for externally motivated change in Romance – as befits an area whose linguistic history has been significantly shaped by invasions and population movements – are the concepts of substratum and superstratum championed by Wartburg (for a critical assessment, see Kontzi 1982; Pellegrini 1980; and Schlemmer 1983). Both are concerned with the consequences of second-language learning by adults, with the difference that substratum effects are said to well up from the first language of speakers compelled to learn the language of foreign conquerors while superstratum effects trickle down from a dominant group which has chosen to learn the local language. In both cases, a period of societal bilingualism must have accompanied the linguistic changes, with transitional variants persisting long enough to outlive the corrective pull of models originally acknowledged to be 'native'. In a context characterized by unequal power relations, it is a moot point whether the resulting symbiosis would be more akin to bilingual contact as envisaged by Weinreich or to conflictual diglossia (see section 4 below); certainly Marcellesi (1981 b) is happy to abandon the term 'contact' when, as here, there is complete territorial overlap of the two codes.

Rather as analogy is offered as the intelligent brake on the destructive regularity of sound laws, so bilingual contact may be presented as the convergent force counteracting 'natural' divergent change. The evidence is clear that bilingual contact can act as a conduit for change in the observable behaviour of individuals. Whether the contact leads to long-term change or merely increases the range of synchronic variation, must depend on other, sociolinguistic factors. Especially when the number of individuals affected is fairly small and their bilingualism is exogenous to the community (Hamers – Blanc 1989: 10 – 11), there is no reason to assume that any resultant changes will be diffused and adopted by non-bilinguals; they are as likely to be dismissed as mistakes. Diffusion of new variants takes place when chains of individuals are sufficiently pleased with the innovations to want to imitate and communicate them to others – a process no doubt accelerated when the innovations originate in a high-status group; real change only occurs when new generations of language learners construct different underlying systems from the surface

variants to which they are exposed. In the history of Romance there are well-documented instances of prestige variants being imitated and diffused, but without a major impact on longer-term evolution. When, for instance, Catherine de Medici married Henri II in 1533 and brought with her an abundant Italian-speaking retinue, imperfect bilingualism at Court gave rise to a fashion for very italianate French which seems to have spread to upwardly aspiring circles beyond the Court; but it passed, bequeathing to modern French some technical vocabulary (most of which probably came via artisanal links) and few if any detectable consequences in morphosyntax.[13]

Within Romance, there is little doubt that the divergence produced by early dialectalization and abetted by the breakdown of communications after the collapse of the western Empire, has been counteracted since the Renaissance by growing cultural contacts and inter-Romance borrowing, but above all by the availability, at a crucial stage in the standardization of western Romance, of Latin as a standard and roofing language (for a summary of unifying factors in Romania, see Malkiel 1977). Once there is sufficient momentum, convergent languages tend to innovate independently in similar ways and to borrow from similar sources, so accelerating their convergence (Renfrew 1989). This is not to say that convergence at a macrolinguistic level, produced according to Stehl (1989) by vertical contact between a dominating language and its dominated dialects, cannot be interrupted or cut across by more localized currents if, for instance, convergent processes become refocused onto the relationship between a national language and the related dialects spoken within the same territory. That is the phase through which most Romance languages have been passing for a century or so. In the terms we have developed above, successive generations of speakers of non-prestigious varieties have probably experienced: monolingualism in a regional lect with at best passive competence in the national language; bidialectalism; and complex monolingualism in a koine no longer identical to the former prestige variant. As the goal of national convergence nears its attainment, the stage now seems to be set for a major shift in attitudes.

4. Diglossia

Few concepts in linguistics have proved so successful, so durable and so adaptable to new circumstances as that launched by Ferguson in his 1959 article "Diglossia". As Ferguson himself noted, the concept of functional differentiation of linguistic varieties was far from new, and the term he proposed to apply to it was novel only to the extent of a latinate suffix

and anglicized pronunciation. He derived it from *diglossie*, which is ascribed by Prudent (1981) to the Hellenist J. Psichari, who used it in his two-volume history of modern Greek to describe the alternation of *katharevousa* and *dhimotikí* and revived the term, some forty years later, in a popular and influential article published in *Mercure de France*. Appropriately, the same alternation figures as one of the four case studies in Ferguson's article, together with Cairene Arabic, Swiss German, and Haitian Creole French.

For each pair of 'High' and 'Low' varieties, Ferguson was able to demonstrate striking parallels in both intrasystemic characteristics and sociolinguistic attributes. H is the prestige variety, standardized, dignified by grammatical tradition, not acquired naturally but learned through schooling, and giving access to a valued literary and intellectual heritage. L is its workaday counterpart, used for everyday transactions, family conversation, and – if written at all – for political slogans and folktales. The functional differentiation is absolute, and misjudged usage of one or other variety risks provoking ridicule. Surprisingly, instances of diglossia are often stable and remarkably persistent – a duration of several centuries is not uncommon, and the communities themselves often see nothing problematic in the situation. Ferguson's analysis of the purely linguistic characteristics of H and L and the extent of their mutual influence, is predicated upon one of his premises that was soon to be hotly contested: that diglossia involves two varieties of the 'same' language. This assumption necessarily colours, if not determines, the range of possible outcomes, among which is the gradual emergence of an interlect preserving most of the morphosyntactic features of L but with heavy admixture of H vocabulary. Such an interlect, Ferguson claims, has a fair chance of evolving into the standard language, whereas the H variety will rarely do so unless it is also the standard language of an outside, and prestigious, community. Indeed, he sees standards in general as the product of interacting linguistic forces, and doubts whether their adoption ever owes much to legislation or to the fervour of their proponents.

We cannot survey in detail all of the vicissitudes of a term which, over thirty-odd years, has been subject to the usual evolutionary adjustments, periodic redefinition and what some would see as factional expropriation (for a fairly neutral account of its history see: Berger 1990, Mackey 1989, McConnell 1989, and Hudson 1992; and for a more polemical approach, Kremnitz 1981 and Prudent 1981). One of the earliest modifications has proved the most enduring. Ferguson, by directing attention firmly onto

societal bilingualism, had rather side-stepped the relationship between diglossia and individual bilingualism; and by concentrating on case studies where the two varieties were historically related, had arguably biased the debate on interlects and standardization (if H and L are genetically related, H, though prestigious, is by definition in decline – a decline that can only be reversed by a political decision to commit massive resources to an educational programme; see Fishman 1991). It is Fishman who is credited with reorienting discussion towards the "domains of language choice" (1965: 86) open to bilingual individuals, and with establishing the conceptual independence of diglossia and bilingualism (1967), realigning the terms so that bilingualism relates primarily to individuals and diglossia to society. Fishman's four-term system, distinguishing bilingualism with or without diglossia from diglossia with or without bilingualism, has survived some determined attacks to become canonical; but it was probably Fishman's recognition that diglossia must be freed from the straitjacket of genetic relationship that did most to launch an extensive and fruitful programme of research. Now, in the words of Mackey (1989: 28): "on a pu redéfinir la diglossie comme étant simplement la répartition des fonctions langagières dans la société, quel que soit le nombre ou la variété des langues qui en font partie". Even so, a recent critical survey (Spolsky 1988) discusses language functions and social attitudes under the heading of "bilingualism", with only a single throwaway remark on diglossia. And diglossia, unlike bilingualism – as McConnell (1989) reminds us – for all its original attractions and more recent halo of controversy, has remained a linguist's notion, never catching the popular imagination or developing a life of its own.

4.1 Romance applications

Broadly speaking, there have been two strands to the synchronic application of diglossia in Romance. The first, which may be thought of as evolutionary, has tested the original Ferguson/Fishman concept in new linguistic contexts, refining, modifying, and sometimes refuting its claims to usefulness; appropriately, since one of Ferguson's original case studies dealt with Haitian Creole, the relationship of Creoles to their lexifier languages has been a persistent theme. The second, which quickly acquired ideological overtones, has emphasized the conflictual aspects of diglossia, especially in the context of varieties of European Romance which have been downgraded, denied recognition, or actively suppressed for political motives.

The earliest and arguably still the best-known instance of planned linguistic discrimination in Romance is, of course, the espousal by the postrevolutionary Convention Nationale in 1794 of Grégoire's recommendation to promote French as a symbol of national unity and progress, with the concomitant aim of crushing – Grégoire used the word *anéantir* – patois and regional varieties (see Grillo 1989 and Joseph 1991).[14] Although the policy remained formally in place for the best part of two centuries, during which French did rise to the status of major world language and the dialects did decline, it is now generally viewed as having had little direct effect on linguistic behaviour except in irredentist enclaves where it may actually have been counterproductive (for a critical evaluation of the linguistic legacy of the Revolution on the occasion of its bicentenary, see especially Bochmann 1989 a, 1989 b, and Marcellesi 1989, the latter examining the opposing discourses of national unity and individual human rights). In fact, the hegemony of French was mainly due to vigorous colonial expansion, and the decline of the dialects to improved communications, mobility, and universal primary schooling – conditions which were replicated elsewhere in 19th-century Europe and with similar linguistic consequences. At most, the Revolutionary policy shaped attitudes in favour of a national standardized norm, for which the only practical model was the educated usage of Paris, and so established an attitudinal frame that has persisted largely unaltered to the present day (see Paltridge–Giles 1984).

Although Ferguson's original conception of diglossia certainly carried the implication of social stratification and elite access to literacy (and thence to the H form and social mobility), it was only through the struggle for the linguistic emancipation of Catalan that diglossia became overtly linked with power and dominance. Catalan was ruthlessly repressed during the early years of the Franco dictatorship, as was Basque and, indeed, any regional linguistic and cultural difference that might feed autonomist aspirations and so undermine Spanish national unity. Despite the denial of any official status, public discouragement, and severe restrictions on its use in the printed media, Catalan was showing clear signs of resurgence by the mid 1960s, so that its rehabilitation was an urgent and popular priority for the Generalitat after the restoration of partially devolved government a decade later. The linguists who did much to raise the international profile of Catalan – notably Aracil, Badia i Margarit, Ninyoles and Vallverdú (for an evaluation of their work, see Posner and Strubell i Trueta, this volume) – originally wrote, not of 'diglossia', but of 'linguistic conflict' in Catalonia and Valencia.

Indeed, before the theoretical widening of the term, to describe the Catalan situation as diglossic would have been to concede two of the principal arguments. First, the undoubted genetic relationship of Catalan and Spanish is that of co-eval branches and carries no implication of historical precedence. Second, and even more important, the division of functions under the Franco regime was in no sense organic, but imposed: each language had previously enjoyed the status and degree of elaboration necessary for use in any of Ferguson's list of roles, and each had its internal H and L registers, as tends to happen in any 'elaborated' language (see Muljačić below). The claim made on behalf of Catalan was for the restoration of usurped rights, not for the internal development of the language to make it suitable for 'H' functions. For this reason, the vigorous language planning policy adopted by the Generalitat has paid relatively little attention to 'normativization' (or corpus planning) and considerably more to 'normalization' (elsewhere called status planning; again see Strubell i Trueta, below, and for a more partisan approach to three case studies, Lamuela 1987).

While Fishman's realignment of the terms made it possible to apply diglossia in a context like that of Catalan, where throughout the repression there had been widespread bilingualism, the explicit linking of diglossia and conflict owes much to the Occitanist movement and the ideologically-committed brand of sociolinguistics associated with the journal *Lengas* (Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry, 1977–) and in particular with the names of Lafont and Kremnitz (for a sober assessment of the Occitan revival and its theoreticians, see Schlieben-Lange, this volume). The work of this prolific group has undoubtedly influenced other autonomist movements in Romance, in both theoretical and practical aspects of language planning, for instance in the choice of a single developmental norm or the deliberate recognition of 'polynomic' diversity – as advocated for Corsican by the Corte research group (see Thiers, this volume, and more generally: Boyer 1986; Calvet 1987; Gardy–Lafont 1981; Jardel 1979; Kremnitz 1981, 1987, 1991; Lafont 1982, 1984; Marcellesi 1979, 1981 a, 1981 b; and Marconot 1990). A particular point of attack for this group has been Ferguson's contention that diglossia can be stable. From a conflict perspective, stability could only be the product of an exact balance of strongly countervailing forces, which is rejected as implausible in anything but the short term. Rather, Kremnitz views the relationship as a dynamic between languages which "sont toujours des pôles d'attraction ou des pôles de refus, souvent les deux à la fois" (1981: 71) and, indeed, cites approvingly Lafont's claim that diglossia is always an "in-

dicateur de crise" (Kremnitz 1987: 211). In a recent re-evaluation of theoretical constructs, Kremnitz (1991) distinguishes four terms – bilingualism, diglossia, linguistic conflict and diglossic usage (what Lafont calls "fonctionnements diglossiques") – and, on the issue of complementarity, argues that diglossia excludes neutrality: the exchange of one variety for the other will always be interpreted as having glottopolitical significance, so that speakers are denied the freedom of consenting bilinguals to switch 'innocently' between the two varieties.

The relationship of a Creole language to its lexifier is, as we implied above, potentially one of diglossia and conflict. The conflictual model has been adopted by a number of Francophone creolists, working primarily on the French-lexicon Creoles that remain in close political contact with French, notably those of Guadeloupe and Martinique, which are still territorially part of France and where French is therefore the language of official administration and education, despite the fact that almost the whole population uses Creole as a family and transactional language, so that the great majority of children join primary school as monolingual Creole speakers. The resulting educational tensions in Martinique are graphically described by Kremnitz (1983), who dwells on the personal conflict created for many teachers, caught between official policy, strong but heterogeneous personal attitudes to Creole and French, and practical educational imperatives. While such tensions may be amenable to conflictual analysis, it is less obvious that they are truly diglossic, when observers report that the linguistic behaviour of individuals is not so much polarized at the clearly defined extremes of basilectal Creole and local acrolect, as located somewhere along the continuum between the two.[15]

In some ways, the most problematic case has proved to be that of Haitian, the French-lexicon Creole with the highest number of speakers and probably the greatest degree of internal dialectalization. Haiti gained independence from France in 1804 and for most of the intervening period has been ruled by a French-speaking oligarchy; but French is a foreign language for large sectors of the population, not mutually intelligible with, or shading into, Haitian Creole. Under these circumstances, some linguists argue that there is neither continuum nor diglossia. Dejean (1983), for instance, sees a bilingual dominant class in conflict with a monolingual, Creole-speaking majority (which, in turn, leads him to query the whole notion of diglossia). Valdman, on the other hand, while still rejecting Ferguson's original statement of Haitian diglossia, adopts a more measured, evolutionary approach, reanalysing some recent Creole

innovations – such as front vowel rounding and the reintroduction of post-vocalic /r/, both of which could be seen as instances of decreolization in the direction of French – as part of a crystallizing opposition between urban and rural Creole (see Valdman 1988, 1991). Clearly, classic diglossia does not fit all Creole situations and undue procrusteanism is bound to lead either to untenable analyses or to conceptual collapse ("éclatement du concept", in the words of Prudent, 1981: 20), above all in those cases where three or more codes are in competition and where contact has long been severed between the Creole and its lexifier (see Christie 1990 for a microcosm case in Dominica). Nevertheless, despite strongly held views in some quarters, the balance of opinion among creolists is that diglossia remains a useful analytical tool (Winford 1985), even if the resultant analyses are somewhat idealized and depend crucially on the maintenance of traditional language attitudes (Carrington 1990).

In summary, diglossia has had a major impact on studies of synchronic Romance contact, but almost always in its extended or conflictual reformulations, and rarely as Ferguson himself first defined the term. Reciprocally, Romance applications have played a major part in the refinement of the concept, questioning the stability of diglossic patterns, engaging with a dialectic of power, and adding pejorative overtones which, for conflict theorists at least, have turned diglossia into a rallying call for direct remedial action.

4.2 'Diglossia' in Late Latin / Early Romance

Although our primary concerns are synchronic, a word is surely not amiss on one potential application of diglossia not addressed elsewhere in this volume, namely the relationship of Latin and vernacular during the formative period of Romance. The precise form in which 'Latin' persisted during the centuries between the fall of the Empire and the Renaissance (after which it had to be learned quite consciously as a second or foreign language) has long been a matter of speculation and controversy. A brief paragraph in Ferguson's article implies classic diglossia: "The vernacular was used in ordinary conversation but Latin for writing or certain kinds of formal speech" (1959: 337). The first part of the assertion is unexceptionable (tautologous, indeed), but the second masks some highly questionable assumptions, particularly if the comments are meant to apply to the period between the collapse of the western Empire and the Carolingian renaissance.

The manifold definitions of diglossia discussed above, including Ferguson's own, require two *spoken* codes functioning in complementary

distribution and at least one written form corresponding to the H variety, though not necessarily representing it directly. The application of diglossia to Early Romance would therefore predict that a high-register form of spoken Latin survived for centuries, stable and intact, alongside spoken Romance, and that the literate minority was fully conscious of the distinctiveness of Latin and Romance, and skilled in switching between the two codes in response to social exigencies. In the view of Wright (1982), this was indeed the conception (erroneous, and expressed here in deliberately stark terms) of an earlier generation of Romance philologists: Wright argues, for instance, that Menéndez Pidal's explanation for the survival of 'semi-learned' vocabulary with conservative phonetism must presuppose the continuity of regional spoken Latin alongside true, illiterate, vernacular Romance. In fact, there is no evidence before the 9th century, and little before the 12th, for the existence either of identifiable communities speaking what would have been perceived as an archaic form of the vernacular, or of a stratum of individuals who were credited with being bilingual. There *is* evidence that writing was the preserve of a small elite; that it was equated not merely with a representational technique but with a complete linguistic superstructure known as *ars grammatica*; that it had to be learned laboriously; and that access to this high-status knowledge was very largely controlled by the Church – to the point where scribes in later medieval monastic scriptoria may have been taught to copy symbols without thereby acquiring literacy (see, specifically, Troll 1990; and on the extent of Carolingian literacy and the value placed upon it, McKitterick 1989).

The counter view to early diglossia, as advanced by Wright (1982, 1991 a), is that as Romance developed and dialectalized up to the end of the 8th century, its written form became increasingly remote and abstract, preserving grammatical features long eliminated from the spoken language, just as modern written French preserves grammatical concord where it is no longer heard, and perhaps no longer psycholinguistically real. Spoken Romance would have had dialects and high registers used by educated speakers, resulting in the complex monolingualism that we now view as sociolinguistically normal for languages serving large and diverse populations; but it would be wrong to conceive of two parallel spoken codes. What motivated the Carolingian reforms was a profound theological objection to the manifest fact that the liturgy was being enacted in diverse local forms that were not mutually comprehensible. Alcuin is believed to have devised a pronunciation, essentially based on grapheme to phoneme correspondences, that could be taught to priests,

so that the liturgy would be pronounced in the same way throughout western Christendom. There were two consequences: firstly that the rite became unintelligible to the congregation – which must have been apparent to the reformers, and accepted as the lesser of two evils; and secondly, that 'Latin' was perforce revealed as something different from Romance, an *Abstandsprache* in Klossian terminology. This revelation, whose far-reaching implications were almost certainly not anticipated at the time, led to the reconceptualization of Romance and Latin as separate entities, a process that has led Wright to claim that Alcuin "invented" medieval Latin (1982: 104–144; reiterated, after criticism, 1991 a: 109).

Wright's new perspective on late Latin and Early Romance, though still controversial in some quarters, has been generally welcomed, even by those who remain sceptical about important points of detail.[16] The major implications for our reading of early Romance texts are now being worked out, with promising results for the interpretation of such enigmas as the interlinear glosses of San Millán and Silos (see the papers in Wright 1991 b). Nonetheless, some important questions remain unanswered, such as the motivation for early attempts to write Romance in a new orthography, the dating of general awareness of a linguistic split between Latin and Romance, and above all the point at which awareness crystallized into the widespread use of language names (see especially Janson 1991 and Lloyd 1991).[17] If, as Posner argues (1992: 388–390, and in press), full awareness of linguistic distinctiveness was a Renaissance phenomenon, it is not until that period that we can properly apply the term diglossia. By then, of course, a second written code was in play and the status of the H spoken variety had shifted, not merely to that of a second language, but to that of a revived dead language, refined by 15th-century humanists to such a forbidding extent that from then onwards it could only "vegetate as a university jargon" (Kahane–Kahane 1979: 187–188).[18] While there can be no doubting the importance of medieval Latin as a source of lexical borrowing and an agent of linguistic convergence, it does seem that the constantly shifting relationship between Latin and Romance never perfectly fits the diglossic model, nor is helpfully explicated by it.

5. Conclusion: representations of Romance

Linguists of very different persuasions use the term 'representation' in connection with the mental image that speakers form of their language. For Chomsky (1980), representation is a psycholinguistic concept, associated with such intrasystemic considerations as the storage of grammat-

ical and lexical information and the rule schemata underlying its retrieval. For a group of French linguists drawing inspiration from the work of Bakhtine and Moscovici, on the other hand, representation is a sociological construct, heavily conditioned by attitudes and value judgements, which occupies the intermediate ground between abstract conceptualization and perceptions of reality (see Boyer–Peytard 1990: 3–5; and, for a history of the notion, Peytard 1990). Representation in this sense acts as a codeterminant of behaviour and shapes what Boyer (1990: 102) calls "l'orientation des communications sociales". Significantly, Boyer exemplifies his approach from conflictual diglossia, in which the speakers' representation of their language may be eroded by subordination and acculturation to the point where they become sufficiently alienated to acquiesce in its replacement by the dominant code.

The case studies of Romance bilingualism and diglossia examined in this volume, most of which adopt a mainstream social-psychological perspective, stress the intimacy of the links between language and social identity and offer ample support for the view that speaker attitudes can indeed affect linguistic systems in contact. In an article provocatively entitled, "Qui est latin?", Pohl (1988) concludes that the primary meaning of such epithets relates to language: we attribute characteristics to individuals and societies on the basis of the language we perceive them to be speaking and we use the label of the language or lect as a convenient shorthand (see, again, Paltridge–Giles 1984). Representations and beliefs do matter: speakers may borrow freely from what they perceive as another language in order to satisfy a communicative need, or simply to follow a fashion, but they may not borrow from a lect of their 'own' language without thereby affecting, and perhaps compromising, their own linguistic identity.

It is not necessarily easy, however, for linguists to ascertain what language informants believe they are speaking, or to form a judgement on the appropriacy of the belief. Herman (1991), for instance, attempts to reconstruct the view of Latin held by literate speakers in the last centuries of the Empire – a view of fundamental unity, which he nevertheless argues was objectively unsustainable.[19] Schlieben-Lange, reporting on the current state of Occitan (this volume), points to a detectable – and sometimes gross – discrepancy between what speakers claim to be doing and what an impartial observer perceives to be 'objectively' true. Likewise, Meo Zilio (this volume) relates how a *cocoliche*-speaking informant who was asked to speak in Italian on the occasion of his first interview and in Spanish on the occasion of the second meeting a few

days later, did not demur at the requests, yet produced speech on related topics that overlapped so significantly in its structural characteristics that the analyst now cannot be sure whether or not two codes are present. (An analogous problem in the description of *fronterizo* is documented by Hensey, this volume.) If the speaker is convinced of having access to two distinct codes, on what basis, if any, is the observer to challenge this belief? The mere existence of overlapping surface realizations is no proof that they can be traced to a single underlying representation. Indeed, the very fact that the overlap falls short of identity can be argued to imply divergent representations, in the same way that for classic generative grammar the existence of ambiguous surface structures is taken as ample justification for postulating twin or even multiple deep structures, each with its own, unambiguous semantic representation.

It seems likely that the existence of representations of 'a language' in Le Page's Sense 4 (see section 2 above), as opposed to the mere awareness of variable linguistic behaviour, is a fairly recent phenomenon, connected with widespread literacy, standardization, and the acceptance of prescriptive authority over language (see Milroy–Milroy 1991). Standardization implies the elaboration of something that already exists, on which the standardizing process confers the stability and prestige that result in eloquence and power (see Joseph 1987; Muljačić 1990 b, and this volume). But the precondition must be the ability to identify the variety to be singled out for standardization, and identification involves both naming and reification (see Marcellesi 1981 a: 8, on the crucial importance of naming as a symbol of linguistic autonomy).[20] Indeed, an important contributory factor may be metalinguistic: the *expectation* that speakers should perceive the distinctness of, and be able to name, the language or lect they profess to control. Informants of limited educational attainment when consulted on their use of a named lect, may give more or less coherent replies, but they do not usually round on the investigator by challenging the legitimacy of the language label embodied in the question.

As the consciousness of language representations and the potential for conflictual diglossia are heightened in literate societies, especially through the adoption of explicit language planning programmes, it must be expected that politicization will lead to new demands for democratic participation in, and control over, decisions affecting language status. Whether this will lead to better decisions and the resolution of linguistic conflict, only time will tell. What is certain is that, in the case of the multiple instances of linguistic overlap in Romance, forces have been set in motion that will be difficult, if not impossible, to reverse.

Notes

1. For a discussion of the application of generative theory to Romance languages, see Green 1981. In the same volume, Lavandera (1981) surveys Romance applications of sociolinguistics, and Rogers (1981) attitudes towards linguistic nationalism. For a programmatic view of the priorities for research on language in its social context, see Labov 1972a, which retains its freshness and vitality.
2. Chomsky views linguistics as a part of psychology: "The theory of particular and universal grammar, so far as I can see, can be sensibly regarded only as that aspect of theoretical psychology that is primarily concerned with the genetically determined program that specifies the range of possible grammars for human languages and the particular realizations of this schematism that arise under given conditions. One may perfectly well choose to study language and grammar with other purposes in mind and without concern for these questions, but any significant results obtained will nevertheless be a contribution to this branch of psychology." (1980: 202).
3. For enlightening applications of the model see, among others, Christie 1990 and Tabouret-Keller 1987. The notion of identity is common to a number of social psychological approaches to language (see, for instance, Eastman 1984 and Ross 1979). Le Page's work on attitudes and accommodation has much in common with that of scholars like Howard Giles and Wallace Lambert, whose ideas have been fruitfully applied to Québec French and are more fully discussed by Bourhis and Lepicq, this volume.
4. It is beyond the scope of this section to give a systematic evaluation of the many taxonomies proposed by Romance scholars for the Romance languages and lects. For enlightening discussion, see Hall 1974, Malkiel 1978, and Posner 1980. The monumental *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik* (Holtus et al. 1988–), which aims to offer detailed coverage of every variety of Romance and which refers to each by the common substantivized adjective (as in "Okzitanisch"), is so vast as to be able to avoid conceding or withholding language status in its choice of titles, though, to be sure, there is an implication of relative importance in the number of pages and articles devoted to each variety.
5. Muljačić (1990a) documents a Romance variety spoken near Scutari/Shkodër, Albania, which he calls 'Labeatic' and which may be a survival of southern Dalmatian. See also Posner, this volume, sections 2.2 and 2.5.
6. For detailed discussion of the relationship of the Romance Creoles to their respective lexifiers, see Green 1988, and the chapters in this volume by Hazaël-Massieux–Robillard (on French), Lipski–Schwegler (on Spanish), and Stolz (on Portuguese). Stolz (section 5.1) is impressed by the mechanism proposed by Dulce Fanha as the most likely explanation for lusitanization: bilingualism leads to structural insecurity and consequently to interference via code-switching.
7. It is clear from a survey of bilingualism and contact written twenty years later (Haugen 1973), in which he reiterates that too narrow a definition leads to "virtual sterility", that Haugen had defined his terms quite intentionally in order to highlight the need for remedial research on aspects of bilingualism that were proving a handicap for diverse minority groups in America: "However, when bilingualism surfaced as a social or personal problem, it was nearly always because of some disability or handicap imposed on one or the other of the languages in contact. The bilingual was observed to fall short of the norms in one or both languages, and his failure was rightly or

wrongly attributed to his knowledge of the other." (1973: 507). Mackey (1956, 1962) also used definitions as a means to reorientate research.

8. Among the many reliable manuals on bilingualism now available (with inevitable differences of emphasis and quality of coverage), we should cite: Appel – Muysken 1987; Baetens Beardsmore 1986; Grosjean 1982; Hamers – Blanc 1989; Hoffmann 1991; and Romaine 1989. Psycholinguistic aspects of processing and the maintenance of bilingual competence are addressed respectively in Bialystock 1991 b, and in Hyltenstam – Obler 1989. Spolsky 1988 is a brief survey of (chiefly Anglo-American) research preoccupations, concentrating on social aspects of bilingualism. For a more European perspective on bilingualism and language contact, see: Denison 1988; Lüdi – Py 1986; and the conference papers collected in Lüdi 1987, and in Ureland 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1985. Zuanelli Sonino 1989 is an interdisciplinary reader on literacy, as experienced in both monolingual and multilingual communities.
9. The word 'bilinguality' is used by Weinreich (1953: 81) in a context referring to a property of the individual, but he does not offer a definition or appear to invest it with any theoretical significance.
10. The field has unfortunately been marred by disputes between prominent scholars on the validity of statistical techniques and the extent of their originality: see Goebl's three-volume account of dialectometrical methods (1984) and its hostile review by Guiter (1985), and their exchanges at the Trier round table on dialectology (Goebl 1991; Guiter 1991).
11. It is not within our scope to give a detailed survey of recent developments in dialectology, which were more fully covered in earlier volumes of this series (see, for example, my Introduction to Posner – Green 1981). For appraisals of current trends in general and Romance dialectology, see respectively Alinei 1991 – 92 and Pfister 1987. For discussion of continua and the Schuchardtian concept of catenate intelligibility, see Hockett 1958: 322 – 326; Iordan – Orr – Posner 1970: 51 – 53; and Posner 1980: 12 – 18, and below. The effects of dialectal and other types of linguistic variation on first and second language acquisition are investigated in Adamson 1988 and Preston 1989 b, with Preston 1989 a concentrating on attitudinal factors in dialect shift. General principles of research on multilingualism are addressed by the papers in Gendron – Nelde 1986, and Raith et al. 1986.
12. Patterns of adaptive change resulting from the contact of English and varieties of French in Canada have been well studied: see Mougeon – Beniak 1991, and Bourhis – Lepicq, this volume. Berruto et al. 1988 is a detailed study of the effects of multilingual contact on formal registers of Italian: the authors examined the written work of Italian students at the University of Zurich, finding that many morphosyntactic features are very unstable, and that non-native speakers and bilinguals make similar numbers and types of mistakes when compared with native speakers.
13. In a more light-hearted vein, Wandruszka (1985) reports on more tolerant attitudes towards southern pronunciation variants, and even the adoption into Parisian French of some 'francitan' expressions – as a result, he avers, of the success of the French rugby team, almost wholly composed of southerners. It is not clear whether the innovations can survive a series of defeats or replacement team membership.
14. The much earlier Edicts of Villers-Cotterets, of 1539, had certainly had discriminatory effects, but the ostensible legislative goal had been to resolve potential ambiguities in the interpretation of statutes. Schlieben-Lange (this volume) debates whether the crucial phrase of the Edicts, "en langage maternel françois et non aultrement", was meant to

tolerate or exclude southern vernaculars. In section 4.2 below, we discuss whether the Carolingian reforms amounted to a conscious act of language planning.

15. We cannot here debate the theoretical validity of the continuum postulate, which is widely accepted and used in anglophone creolistics (for example, Bickerton 1975), but regarded with some suspicion elsewhere, either because empirical studies fail to locate all speakers within a single dimension of variation (see Le Page – Tabouret-Keller 1985: 180 – 200), or because a continuum may be held to imply inevitable decreolization as the acrolect exerts an irresistible 'pull' on Creole usage.
16. It is beyond our scope to examine all the points of detail. The reviews, some of them substantial, include: Steven D. Kirby, *La corónica* 12 (1983 – 84): 295 – 297; Saul Levin, *General linguistics* 24 (1984): 194 – 199; Paul M. Lloyd, *Hispanic review* 52 (1984): 367 – 377; Francisco Marcos Marín, *Revista de filología española* 64 (1984): 129 – 145; Ian Michael, *Modern language review* 83 (1988): 925 – 926; Frank H. Nuessel, *Language* 60 (1984): 184 – 185; Arnulf Stefenelli, *Revue de linguistique romane* 47 (1983); 446 – 447; and Máximo Torreblanca, *Journal of hispanic philology* 7 (1982 – 83): 141 – 143. Of these, Kirby and Lloyd are completely convinced by the basic hypothesis, while Torreblanca thinks it is wholly erroneous.
17. Wright originally claimed that the reconceptualization dated from the early 9th century in Carolingian France and sometime after 1080 in northern Spain; more recently, he has accepted that these are 'first possible' dates for awareness in the minds of some exceptional individuals, with the idea being diffused very much more slowly through the general population. Posner (in press) takes issue both with Wright's chronology and with his explanation for the emergence of written Romance; the invention of a Romance orthography in northern France, she believes, took place later than generally supposed and owed much to pre-existing Germanic models.
18. The precise nature of medieval competence in Latin remains obscure. It is noticeable that scholars do not usually speak of 'bilingualism'. Can one, indeed, be bilingual in one living and one dead language? Balibar's (1985) history of French from Carolingian times to the Republic, faces the problem in its title, by speaking of 'colingualism'.
19. Varvaro 1991 offers support from a rather different angle: the 'collapse' of Latin after the fall of the western Empire can be seen as the loss of the centripetal force that had previously held together variants that were obvious without being destructive. Perceptually, what is important is the moment when speakers "lose, or more precisely feel they have lost, the consciousness of belonging to a whole and acquire instead a sense of local identity" (Varvaro 1991: 48).
20. It is well known that language descriptors in Latin were adverbs derived from adjectives denoting geographical or ethnic origin, hence *romanice* meant '[speaking] in the Roman way / like the Romans do'. The change from adverbial reference to nominal designation (via a metaphor *lingua latina* 'the Latin tongue'), marks the beginning of reification of language, as well as the sociolinguistic fact of its autonomy. For discussion of the importance of naming as a trigger for the consciousness of linguistic dichotomy in Late Latin / Early Romance, see Janson 1991; Lloyd 1991; Uytfanghe 1991; and section 4.2 above.

References

Adamson, Hugh D.
1988 *Variation theory and second language acquisition.* Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Agar, Michael
1991 "The biculture in bilingual", *Language in society* 20: 167–181.

Agard, Frederick B.
1984 *A course in Romance linguistics. Volume 1: A synchronic view.* Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Alinei, Mario
1991–92 "Whither dialectology?", *Quaderni di semantica* 12: 207–333 and 13: 93–139.

Ammon, Ulrich – Norbert Dittmar – Klaus J. Mattheier (eds.)
1987–88 *Sociolinguistics. An international handbook of the sciences of language and society.* 2 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Appel, René – Pieter Muysken
1987 *Language contact and bilingualism.* London: Arnold.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo
1986 *Bilingualism: basic principles.* (2nd edition.) Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Balibar, Renée
1985 *L'institution du français. Essai sur le colinguisme des Carolingiens à la République.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Berger, Marianne R.
1990 "Diglossia within a general theoretical perspective: Charles Ferguson's concept 30 years later", *Multilingua* 9: 285–295.

Berruto, Gaetano – Bruno Moretti – Stephan Schmid
1988 "L'italiano di parlanti colti in una situazione plurilingue", *Rivista italiana di dialettologia* 12: 7–100.

Bialystock, Ellen
1991 a "Metalinguistic dimensions of bilingual language proficiency", in: Ellen Bialystock (ed.), 113–140.

Bialystock, Ellen (ed.)
1991 b *Language processing in bilingual children.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bickerton, Derek
1975 *Dynamics of a creole system.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloomfield, Leonard
1935 *Language.* (3rd, British, edition.) London: Allen and Unwin.

Bochmann, Klaus
1989 a "La glottopolitique dans la Révolution Française et ses reflets italiens", *Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie* 28: 237–246.
1989 b "Die Französische Revolution und ihre Sprachpolitik – nationale and internationale Kurz- und Langzeitwirkungen", *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42: 561–563.

Boyer, Henri
1986 "«Diglossie»: un concept à l'épreuve du terrain. L'élaboration d'une sociolinguistique du conflit en domaines catalan et occitan", *Lengas* 20: 31–54.

1990 "Matériaux pour une approche des représentations sociologiques. Éléments de définition et parcours documentaire en diglossie", *Langue française* 85: 102–124.

Boyer, Henri – Jean Peytard (eds.)
1990 *Les représentations de la langue: approches sociolinguistiques.* (= *Langue française* 85.) Paris: Larousse.

Bright, William (ed.)
1992 *Oxford international encyclopedia of linguistics.* 4 vols. New York: Oxford University Press.

Calvet, Louis-Jean
1987 *La guerre des langues et les politiques linguistiques.* Paris: Payot.

Campbell, George L.
1991 *Compendium of the world's languages.* 2 vols. London: Routledge.

Carrington, Lawrence D.
1990 "The instrumentalization of St. Lucian", *International journal of the sociology of language* 85: 71–80.

Chomsky, Noam
1980 *Rules and representations.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Christie, Pauline
1990 "Language as expression of identity in Dominica", *International journal of the sociology of language* 85: 61–69.

Comrie, Bernard (ed.)
1987 *The world's major languages.* London: Croom Helm.

Dardel, Robert de
1991 "Types d'isoglosse en roman commun", in: Dieter Kremer (ed.), 478–484.

Dejean, Yves
1983 "Diglossia revisited: French and creole in Haiti", *Word* 34: 189–213.

Denison, Norman
1988 "Language contact and language norm", *Folia linguistica* 22: 11–35.

Eastman, Carol
1984 "Language, ethnic identity and change", in: John Edwards (ed.), *Linguistic minorities, policies and pluralism* (London: Academic Press), 259–276.

Entwistle, William J.
1936 *The Spanish language, together with Portuguese, Catalan and Basque.* London: Faber and Faber. [Second edition, revised by William D. Elcock, 1962, with subsequent reprints.]

Ervin, Susan – Charles E. Osgood
1954 "Second language learning and bilingualism", *Journal of abnormal and social psychology* 49 (supplement): 139–146.

Ferguson, Charles A.
1959 "Diglossia", *Word* 15: 325–340.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1965 "Who speaks what language to whom and when?", *La linguistique* 2: 67–88.
1967 "Bilingualism with and without diglossia, diglossia with and without bilingualism", *Journal of social issues* 23: 29–38.
1991 *Reversing language shift. Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Fleischman, Suzanne
1992 "Romance languages", in: William Bright (ed.), 3: 337–343.
Foresti, Fabio – Elena Rizzi – Paola Benedini (eds.)
1989 *L'italiano tra le lingue romanze. Atti del XX congresso internazionale di studi. Bologna, 25–27 settembre 1986.* (Pubblicazioni della Società di Linguistica Italiana 27.) Roma: Bulzoni.
Francescato, Giuseppe
1982 "Rhaeto-Friulian", in: Rebecca Posner – John N. Green (eds.), 131–169.
Gardy, Philippe – Robert Lafont
1981 "La diglossie comme conflit: l'exemple occitan", *Langages* 61: 75–91.
Gendron, Jean-Denis – Peter H. Nelde
1986 *Plurilinguisme en Europe et au Canada. Perspectives de recherche.* Bonn: Dümmler.
Goebl, Hans
1984 *Dialektometrische Studien.* 3 vols. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
1986 "Problems and perspectives of contact linguistics from a Romance scholar's point of view", in: Peter H. Nelde – P. Sture Ureland – Iain Clarkson (eds.), *Language contact in Europe* (Tübingen: Niemeyer), 125–150.
1991 "La dialectométrie – pourquoi faire?", in: Dieter Kremer (ed.), 332–341.
Green, John N.
1981 "Generative grammar", in: Rebecca Posner – John N. Green (eds.), 369–407.
1988 "Romance creoles", in: Martin Harris – Nigel Vincent (eds.), 420–473.
Grillo, Ralph D.
1989 *Dominant languages. Language and hierarchy in Britain and France.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grosjean, François
1982 *Life with two languages: an introduction to bilingualism.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Grosjean, François – Bernard Py
1991 "La restructuration d'une première langue: l'intégration de variantes de contact dans la compétence de migrants bilingues", *La linguistique* 27.2: 35–60.
Guiter, Henri
1985 Review of Hans Goebl 1984, in: *Revue de linguistique romane* 49: 201–207.
1991 "Applications d'une méthode géolinguistique en galloroman et ibéroroman", in: Dieter Kremer (ed.), 352–361.
Haiman, John
1988 "Rhaeto-Romance", in: Martin Harris – Nigel Vincent (eds.), 351–390.
Hall, Robert A. Jr.
1964 *Introductory linguistics.* New York: Chilton Books.
1974 *Comparative Romance grammar. Volume 1: External history of the Romance languages.* New York: Elsevier.
Hamers, Josiane F. – Michel H. A. Blanc
1989 *Bilinguality and bilingualism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Harris, Martin – Nigel Vincent (eds.)
1988 *The Romance languages.* London: Croom Helm.
Haugen, Einar
1953 *The Norwegian language in America. A study in bilingual behavior.* 2 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

1973 "Bilingualism, language contact, and immigrant languages in the United States: a research report 1956–1970", in: Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Current trends in linguistics. Volume 10: Linguistics in North America* (The Hague: Mouton), 505–591.

Herman, József
1991 "Spoken and written Latin in the last centuries of the Roman Empire", in: Roger Wright (ed.), 29–43.

Hockett, Charles F.
1958 *A course in modern linguistics.* New York: Macmillan.

Hoffmann, Charlotte
1991 *An introduction to bilingualism.* London: Longman.

Holtus, Günter – Michael Metzeltin – Christian Schmitt (eds.)
1988– *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Houwer, Annick de
1990 *The acquisition of two languages from birth: a case study.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, Alan
1992 "Diglossia: a bibliographic review", *Language in society* 21: 611–674.

Hyltenstam, Kenneth – Loraine K. Obler (eds.)
1989 *Bilingualism across the lifespan. Aspects of acquisition, maturity, and loss.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, Dell
1974 *Foundations in sociolinguistics. An ethnographic approach.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Iordan, Iorgu – John Orr – Rebecca Posner
1970 *An introduction to Romance linguistics: its schools and scholars.* (Revised, with a supplement "Thirty years on", by Rebecca Posner.) Oxford: Blackwell.

Janson, Tore
1991 "Language change and metalinguistic change: Latin to Romance and other cases", in: Roger Wright (ed.), 19–28.

Jardel, Jean-Pierre
1979 "De quelques usages des concepts de bilinguisme et de diglossie", in: Gabriel Manessy – Paul Wald (eds.), *Plurilinguisme: normes, situations, stratégies* (Paris: L'Harmattan), 25–38.

Joseph, John E.
1987 *Eloquence and power: the rise of language standards and standard languages.* London: Pinter.
1991 Review of Ralph D. Grillo 1989, in: *Language* 67: 159–163.

Kahane, Henry – Renée Kahane
1979 "Decline and survival of western prestige languages", *Language* 55: 183–198.

Kloss, Heinz
1976 "Über Diglossie", *Deutsche Sprache* 4: 313–323.
1987 "Abstandsprache und Ausbausprache", in: Ulrich Ammon et al. (eds.), 302–308.

Kontzi, Reinhold (ed.)
1982 *Substrate und Superstrate in den romanischen Sprachen.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Kremer, Dieter (ed.)
1991 *Actes du XVIII^e congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes, Université de Trèves (Trier) 1986. III. Grammaire diachronique et histoire de la langue – Dialectologie et géographie linguistique – Textes non-littéraires.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kremnitz, Georg
1981 "Du «bilinguisme» au «conflit linguistique». Cheminement de termes et de concepts", *Langages* 61: 63–74.
1983 *Français et créole: ce qu'en pensent les enseignants. Le conflit linguistique à la Martinique.* Hamburg: Buske.
1987 "Diglossie, possibilités et limites d'un terme", *Lengas* 22: 199–213.
1991 "Y a-t-il des «diglossies neutres»?", *Lengas* 30: 29–36.

Labov, William
1963 "The social motivation of a sound change", *Word* 19: 273–309.
1972 a "The study of language in its social context", in: William Labov 1972 b: 183–259.
1972 b *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1992 *Principles of linguistic change. Volume 1: Internal factors.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Lafont, Robert
1982 "La privation d'avenir ou le crime contre les cultures", in: Robert Lafont et al. (eds.), *Langue dominante, langues dominées* (Paris: Edilig), 15–36.
1984 "Pour retrousser la diglossie", *Lengas* 15: 5–36.

Laforge, Lorne – Louise Péronnet (eds.)
1989 *Bilinguisme et diglossie. (= Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée* 8.2). Trois Rivières, Québec: Presses Universitaires.

Lamuela, Xavier
1987 *Català, occità, friülà: llengües subordinades i planificació lingüística.* Barcelona: Edicions dels Quaderns Crema.

Lavandera, Beatriz R.
1981 "Sociolinguistics", in: Rebecca Posner – John N. Green (eds.), 129–228.
1988 "The study of language in its socio-cultural context", in: Frederick J. Newmeyer (ed.), 1–13.

Lazard, Sylviane
1985 "Les frontières du dialecte frioulan: étude dialectométrique à la lumière de la méthode globale d'Henri Guiter", *Revue de linguistique romane* 49: 27–70.

Le Page, Robert B.
1973 "The concept of competence in a creole-contact situation", *York papers in linguistics* 3: 31–50. Reprinted in: David Feldman (ed.), *Studia gratularia in honor of Robert A. Hall Jr* (Madrid: Playor), 173–189.

Le Page, Robert B. – Andrée Tabouret-Keller
1985 *Acts of identity. Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lloyd, Paul M.
1991 "On the names of languages (and other things)", in: Roger Wright (ed.), 9–18.

Lüdi, Georges (ed.)
1987 *Devenir bilingue – parler bilingue. Actes du 2^e colloque sur le bilinguisme, Université de Neuchâtel, 20–22 septembre 1984.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Lüdi, Georges – Bernard Py
1986 *Être bilingue.* Berne: Peter Lang.
Mackey, William F.
1956 "Towards a redefinition of bilingualism", *Journal of the Canadian linguistic association* 2: 4–11.
1962 "The description of bilingualism", *Canadian journal of linguistics* 7: 51–85.
1989 "La genèse d'une typologie de la diglossie", *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée* 8.2: 11–28.
Malkiel, Yakov
1977 "Factors in the unity of Romania", *Romance notes* 18: 263–271.
1978 "The classification of Romance languages", *Romance philology* 31: 467–500.
Marcellesi, Jean-Baptiste
1979 "Quelques problèmes de l'hégémonie culturelle en France: langage national et langues régionales", *International journal of the sociology of language* 21: 63–80.
1981 a "Bilinguisme, diglossie, hégémonie: problèmes et tâches", *Langages* 61: 5–11.
1984 "La définition des langues en domaine roman: les enseignements à tirer de la situation corse", in: Jean-Claude Bouvier (ed.), *Actes du XVII^e congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes. V: Sociolinguistique des langues romanes* (Aix-en-Provence: Presses Universitaires), 309–314.
1989 "Les deux discours glottopolitiques issus de la Révolution Française: la période 1790–1794 et le Rapport Giordan (1982)", *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42: 564–571.
Marcellesi, Jean-Baptiste (ed.)
1981 b *Bilinguisme et diglossie.* (= *Langages* 61.) Paris: Larousse.
Marconot, Jean-Marie (ed.)
1990 *La parole et le pouvoir. Diglossies dans l'histoire.* (= *Lengas* 27.) Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry.
Martinet, André
1982 "Bilinguisme et diglossie. Appel à une vision dynamique des faits", *La linguistique* 18.1: 5–16.
McConnell, Grant D.
1989 "Les concepts de bilinguisme et de diglossie historique, développement et application", *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée* 8.2: 43–55.
McKitterick, Rosamond
1989 *The Carolingians and the written word.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Melis, Ludo – Serge Verlinde – Patricia Derynck
1984 "La notion de dialecte supralocal: essai de définition dialectométrique", *Orbis* 33 [1989]: 70–132.
Milroy, James – Lesley Milroy
1991 *Authority in language: investigating language prescription and standardisation.* (2nd edition.) London: Routledge.
Mougeon, Raymond – Édouard Beniak
1991 *Linguistic consequences of language contact and restriction. The case of French in Ontario, Canada.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Muljačić, Žarko
1980 "Per una classificazione 'standardologica' delle lingue romanze", in: Herbert J. Izzo (ed.), *Italic and Romance. Linguistic studies in honor of Ernst Pulgram* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 85–96.
1989 a "Über den Begriff *Dachsprache*", in: Ulrich Ammon (ed.), *Status and function of languages and language varieties* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), 256–277.
1989 b "Hanno i singolari diasistemi romanzi «emanato» le «loro» lingue standard (come di solito si legge) o hanno invece le lingue standard romanze determinato in larga misura *a posteriori* i «loro» dialetti?", in: Fabio Foresti et al. (eds.), 9–25.
1989 c "The emergence of the Florentine > Italian language", in: Thomas J. Walsh (ed.), *Synchronic and diachronic approaches to linguistic variation and change* (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press), 221–226.
1990 a "Sul dalmatico meridionale (o labeatico)", *Abruzzo, rivista dell'Istituto di Studi Abruzzesi* 23–28 (1985–1990): 369–386.
1990 b "Ausbau-Universalien und quasi-universalien", *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 57: 167–173.
Newmeyer, Frederick J. (ed.)
1988 *Linguistics: the Cambridge survey. Volume IV: the socio-cultural context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Paltridge, John – Howard Giles
1984 "Attitudes towards speakers of regional accents of French", *Linguistische Berichte* 90: 71–85.
Pellegrini, Giovan Battista
1980 "Substrata", in: Rebecca Posner – John N. Green (eds.), 43–73.
1991 *La genesi del reto-romanzo (o ladino).* (Beiheft zur *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 238.) Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Peytard, Jean
1990 "Évaluation sociale dans les thèses de Mikhaïl Bakhtine et représentations de la langue", *Langue française* 85: 6–21.
Pfister, Max
1987 "Dialettologia italiana e dialettologia romanza (1976–1986)", *Rivista italiana di dialettologia* 11 [1989]: 39–93.
Pohl, Jacques
1988 "Qui est latin?", *La linguistique* 24.2: 39–73.
Posner, Rebecca
1980 *On the Romance languages.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Inaugural lecture.]
1992 "Language", in: Richard Jenkyns (ed.), *The legacy of Rome. A new appraisal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 367–398.
in press "Latin to Romance (again!): change or genesis?", in: Jaap van Marle (ed.), *Papers from the tenth international conference on historical linguistics* (Amsterdam: Benjamins).
Posner, Rebecca – John N. Green (eds.)
1980 *Trends in Romance linguistics and philology. 1: Romance comparative and historical linguistics.* (Trends in linguistics, studies and monographs 12.) The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
1981 *Trends in Romance linguistics and philology. 2: Synchronic Romance linguistics.* (Trends in linguistics, studies and monographs 13.) The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

1982 *Trends in Romance linguistics and philology. 3: Language and philology in Romance.* (Trends in linguistics, studies and monographs 14.) The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Preston, Dennis R.

1989 a *Perceptual dialectology. Non-linguists' views of areal linguistics.* Dordrecht: Foris.

1989 b *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Prudent, Lambert-Félix

1981 "Diglossie et interlecte", *Langages* 61: 13–38.

Raith, Joachim – Rainer Schulze – Karl-Heinz Wandt

1986 *Grundlagen der Mehrsprachigkeitsforschung. Forschungsrahmen, Konzepte, Beschreibungsprobleme, Fallstudien.* (*Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* Beiheft 52.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Renfrew, Colin

1989 "Models of change in language and archaeology", *Transactions of the philological society* 87: 103–155.

Rogers, Kenneth H.

1981 "Studies on linguistic nationalism in the Romance languages", in: Rebecca Posner – John N. Green (eds.), 229–256.

Romaine, Suzanne

1982 "What is a speech community?", in: Suzanne Romaine (ed.), *Sociolinguistic variation in speech communities* (London: Arnold), 13–24.

1989 *Bilingualism.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Ross, John A.

1979 "Language and the mobilization of ethnic identity", in: Howard Giles – Bernard Saint-Jacques (eds.), *Language and ethnic relations* (Oxford: Pergamon), 15–26.

Sala, Marius

1985 "Langues en contact: évaluation des résultats", in: Ursula Pieper – Gerhard Stickel (eds.), *Studia linguistica diachronica et synchronica Werner Winter sexagenario MCMLXXXIII gratis annis ab eius collegis amicis discipulisque oblata* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), 751–756.

1988 *El problema de las lenguas en contacto.* México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Sanga, Glauco

1981 "Les dynamiques linguistiques de la société italienne (1861–1980): de la naissance de l'italien populaire à la diffusion des ethnicismes linguistiques", *Langages* 61: 93–115.

Saussure, Ferdinand de

1965 *Cours de linguistique générale,* publié par Charles Bally et Albert Sechehaye avec la collaboration d'Albert Riedlinger. (3rd edition.) Paris: Payot.

Schlemmer, Gerd

1983 *Die Rolle des germanischen Superstrats in der Geschichte der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Hamburg: Buske.

Sharwood Smith, Michael

1991 "Language modules and bilingual processing", in: Ellen Bialystock (ed.), 10–24.

Spolsky, Bernard
1988 "Bilingualism", in: Frederick J. Newmeyer (ed.), 100–118.
Stehl, Thomas
1989 "Typologie des contacts linguistiques: langues romanes, créoles français et dialectes italiens", in: Fabio Foresti et al. (eds.), 115–124.
Tabouret-Keller, Andrée
1982 "Entre bilinguisme et diglossie: du malaise des cloisonnements universitaires au malaise social", *La linguistique* 18.1: 17–43.
1987 "Parler créole, devenir créole: le cas complexe du district de Cayo, à Bélize", in: Georges Lüdi (ed.), 227–241.
Troll, Denise A.
1990 "The illiterate monk and written communication. The work of the medieval scribe", in: Richard L. Enos (ed.), *Oral and written communication. Historical approaches* (Newbury Park: Sage), 4: 96–125.
Trudgill, Peter
1986 *Dialects in contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Ureland, Per Sture (ed.)
1980 *Sprachvariation und Sprachwandel. Probleme der Inter- und Intralinguistik. Akten des 3. Symposions über Sprachkontakt in Europa*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
1981 *Kulturelle und sprachliche Minderheiten in Europa. Aspekte der europäischen Ethnolinguistik und Ethnopolitik. Akten des 4. Symposions über Sprachkontakt in Europa, Mannheim 1980*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
1982 *Die Leistung der Strataforschung und der Kreolistik: typologische Aspekte der Sprachkontakte: Akten des 5. Symposions über Sprachkontakt in Europa, Mannheim 1982*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
1985 *Glotto- und ethnogenetische Aspekte europäischer Sprachen: Akten des 6. Symposions über Sprachkontakt in Europa, Mannheim 1984*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Uytfanghe, Marc van
1991 "The consciousness of a linguistic dichotomy (Latin-Romance) in Carolingian Gaul: the contradictions of the sources and of their interpretation", in: Roger Wright (ed.), 114–129.
Valdman, Albert
1988 "Diglossia and language conflict in Haiti", *International journal of the sociology of language* 71: 67–80.
1991 "Decreolization or dialect contact in Haiti?", in: Francis Byrne – Thom Huebner (eds.), *Development and structures of creole languages* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 75–88.
Varvaro, Alberto
1991 "Latin and Romance: fragmentation or restructuring?", in: Roger Wright (ed.), 44–51.
Verlinde, Serge – Patricia Derynck
1991 "La dialectométrie de la délimitation des zones dialectales", in: Dieter Kremer (ed.), 342–351.
Walter, Henriette
1990 "La différenciation géographique en français et en italien", *La linguistique* 26.2: 35–45.

Wandruszka, Mario
1985 "Plurilinguisme au sein de la Romania", in: Jean-Claude Bouvier (ed.), *Actes du XVII^e congrès de linguistique et philologie romanes. 2: Linguistique comparée et typologie des langues romanes* (Aix-en-Provence: Presses Universitaires), 2: 65–95.

Weinreich, Uriel
1953 *Languages in contact. Findings and problems.* (Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York 1.) New York: Linguistics Circle. [Sixth printing, The Hague: Mouton, 1968.]

Winford, Don
1985 "The concept of 'diglossia' in Caribbean creole situations", *Language in society* 14: 345–356.

Wright, Roger
1982 *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France.* Liverpool: Francis Cairns.
1991 a "The conceptual distinction between Latin and Romance: invention or evolution?", in: Roger Wright (ed.), 103–113.

Wright, Roger (ed.)
1991 b *Latin and the Romance languages in the Early Middle Ages.* London: Routledge.

Zuanelli Sonino, Elisabetta (ed.)
1989 *Literacy in school and society.* New York: Plenum.

REBECCA POSNER

Language conflict in Romance: decline, death and survival

1. Introduction

My aim in this chapter (which takes as read Green's preceding discussion of general problems of contact, bilingualism and diglossia) is to survey the ways in which linguistic conflict has arisen between Romance languages and to ask whether the conflict can be resolved or regulated. I have tried to cover the whole Romance area, while concentrating on problems that are not fully treated elsewhere in the volume.

Contact between different Romance varieties, and between them and Latin, has been intense throughout our era and may be held responsible for some of the changes the Romance languages have undergone in the course of their history. Distanciation and competition between the languages, consequent on moves towards standardization, is, I maintain, a post-medieval phenomenon, but conflict arose only in comparatively modern times, as an aspect of assertion of ethnic identity.

2. Language conflict

Conflict is a term associated with a Marxist view of social change, engendered by the competition between classes to gain power (or, more exactly, authority) in a *Herrschaftsverband* – Max Weber's term translated by Dahrendorf (1959) as an "imperatively coordinated association". A class for Marx was identical with a social stratum; Dahrendorf modifies this to indicate a group of people with the common political aim of achieving authority, in competition, or conflict, with another group. In this view, social conflict can be associated with language in much the same way as it might be linked with religion: in simple terms a subjected class may have in common a language different from that of the dominant class. The conflict between the classes, if regulated, could lead to a resolution of the language problem, but this would be based on a shift in the personnel in positions of domination within the society.

Language conflict can refer, however, to two different, though sometimes overlapping, types of situation. In the first, bilinguals may experience conflict of allegiance between two languages, or more exactly between the two communities to which, for them, the languages belong. They may then desert one language or, unable to resolve the conflict, lapse into a state of anomia, psychologically alienated from their surroundings. The other 'language conflict' situation is not fundamentally different from that of social conflict, involving competition or hostility between communities each using a different language. This sort of conflict, which may even erupt into violence, is often associated with feelings of resentment and persecution by one of the linguistic communities and by the exercise of dominance and intolerance by the other.

In neither case can it properly be said that language as such is at the root of the conflict, rather than other socio-psychological, socio-economic or political factors. However, since the late 18th century, language has been regarded as the badge of ethnic or national identity, and even may today, with increasing uniformity of life-styles, be the only differentiating feature of many communities.

Conflict of loyalties for an individual bilingual speaker can be painlessly resolved if the environment appropriate to each language is clearly delimited, and if each language has similar prestige value. The conflict can be acute in circumstances in which loyalty to family and friends clashes with the desire for social integration and advancement in a wider society. A bilingual community where one language is treated as inferior to the other can be split asunder by such tensions. Socially mobile members of a monolingual dominated community will wish to acquire, or even shift to, the dominant language, arousing resentment among more loyal and less ambitious fellows, while possibly incurring scorn from the 'superiors' they ape. Where the dominant linguistic community uses political repression and social disapprobation to impose its language on the subservient community, dire consequences can ensue.

2.1 Language and nationhood

Although it is probably true that bi- or even multi-lingualism is more widespread in the world than monolingualism, modern Western thought has taken for granted the idea of the monolingual nation state (Laponce 1984). Until recently bilingualism, like racial admixture, was seen as undesirable, or even dangerous. Nazi German theorists, in particular, claimed that bilinguals were disloyal, unstable and intellectually backward (Weinreich 1953: 117–120). The Fascist regimes of both Italy and Spain

espoused the ideology of the 'national language', advanced by the French Revolution (Emsley 1988), and took vigorous steps to suppress minority languages and dialects.

The notion of 'language conflict' within Romance developed particularly in relation to the conflict between Catalan (or more precisely Valencian) and Castilian (*el habla cristiana*) during the Franco era (Aracil 1965; Ninyoles 1969), though the term had been used earlier by Terracini (1957) in discussion of language 'death', of translation, and of the relation of language to culture, and probably even earlier by social historians, especially about Austro-Hungarian tensions (Inglehart – Woodward 1972). The term was taken up by Haugen (1966) in discussion of Norwegian. It is during the last fifteen years, however, that it has become a major theme of language contact studies (Aracil 1982; Calvet 1987; Gardy – Lafont 1981; Kremnitz 1979, 1981; McRae 1983; Nelde 1980, 1986 a, 1986 b, 1987, 1988; Ninyoles 1977; Oksaar 1984; Trudgill 1986; and Wardhaugh 1987).

We may well ask why this theme should now have come to the fore, though it was hardly mentioned by the founder of contact linguistics, Uriel Weinreich, except obliquely in discussing 'language loyalty' (1953: 100 – 101) and more overtly in discussing psychological problems of bilingualism (1953: 86, 120). It may be that the attrition of cultural differences between communities in the modern world has provoked a backlash, an 'ethnic revival' (Gellner 1983; Smith 1971, 1979, 1981), and that, in the European context at least, language is now the peg on which militant political irredentist action hangs (Williams 1984). Modern life, moreover, requires more developed linguistic skills – a high standard of literacy, ability to present and assess arguments, and so on – among a wider range of the population than hitherto, as well as presenting the possibility, or even necessity, of greater geographical, professional and social mobility. Language has therefore become more important to more people. Whereas in earlier eras a relatively small elite had access to education, much of which was (Classical) language-based, now the majority must acquire, through the vehicle of language, the skills necessary for advancement or even survival. When a speaker's mother-tongue is not a vehicle for education, precious schooling time has to be devoted to acquiring a school language, rather than other skills.

In the ancient world, evidence about which language was used in any interchange is hard to find; indeed the Greeks and Romans showed little curiosity about foreign languages. One assumes that important people were well served by interpreters. Within medieval Europe, communication

between the 'literate' (see Troll 1990) would be effected in Latin. However, knowledge of foreign vernaculars seems to have been fairly widespread (Bischoff 1961), and comments on variety in language are frequent (Lusignan 1987). In Spain intercommunication between Christians and Moors often had to be conducted through bilingual Jews. Problems arose, however, when vernaculars took over the functions of Latin and the masses sought to play a greater part in public life. It has been suggested (Gellner 1983: 78) that if Western Europe had moved towards industrialization in the High Middle Ages, there might have been a Latin or Romance nationalism; this might mean that competition between vernaculars, and the communities that have adopted them as standard languages, would not have developed as it did. It is probably not an accident, however, that technological advances – like printing and the production of gunpowder – were accompanied by a growing desire of the submerged majority for self-esteem and self-expression, manifested by the questioning of authority, in religion and in politics, and the promotion of vernacular languages as an appropriate vehicle for serious debate. Was it accidental that simultaneously the idea of the nation-state was beginning to take seed? (see Fishman 1972: 15). We recall that Voltaire believed that the European identity was stronger than national differences (Godechot 1988). It was however Rousseau (following Herder) who probably got it right, with his insistence on national identity symbolized by language (Siccardo 1984). In the event, the Jacobin doctrine, that all citizens should learn and use the 'national language', to the exclusion of their regional varieties, in order to play a full part in the political life of a free nation, seemed the simplest and most efficient solution to linguistic problems (Balibar–Laporte 1974; Gordon 1978). Even in France, however, it was a long haul and eventually provoked reaction from regionalist groups (Grillo 1989).

The ideology adopted by most nation-states in Europe was that a common language promotes cohesion and facilitates communication between its citizens. In this way, too, each state would be maximally differentiated from its neighbour, potentially an enemy, and communication within the frontiers would be enhanced, while intercourse across frontiers would be discouraged or even forbidden. The education system, a state religion and universal military service are important means of cementing the nation as a linguistic unit. A linguistic, religious, or cultural minority would be a potential threat, a 'fifth column': foot-loose, lawless, and preferentially bilingual, gipsy communities are the prototype of such minorities, often the target of irrational fear and hatred. Minority lan-

guages associated with a finite territory may be tolerated, but any spread from the allotted ghetto arouses apprehension. The Swiss solution to the potential problems of multilingualism, we recall, is based on the 'territorial principle' (McRae 1983) – the language(s) traditionally used in the territory alone receive official sanction (though, in true Swiss fashion, it is usually possible to buy, by private finance, education or translation services in another Swiss language).

As fear of small wars between neighbouring states has receded, and as collaboration between states has increased, and with, also, a continual rise in population, the arguments for imposition of national languages become weaker. Where minority language speakers are reasonably numerous, it is feasible nowadays to provide school and university education for them. Even the problems of book provision are lessened by technological developments in printing techniques. Within the European Community, it is just as likely that Galicians or Sardinians will seek work in Germany, as outside their own region of Spain or Italy: there is no compelling reason that they should be more proficient in Spanish or Italian than in German, as their second language. If eventually they settle permanently in Germany, they may willingly shift their language loyalties to German, or, at any rate, accept that use of the mother-tongue is necessarily limited to family-circle interchange. At home, however, they may insist on the right to use the mother-tongue for all normal language functions.

It is in these circumstances that minority language speakers may resent the involuntary bilingualism imposed on them by resolutely monolingual national language speakers (Aracil 1982). Significantly enough, in Switzerland, where language conflict is muted, the majority German speakers are, or at least used to be, more ready to become bilingual than French speakers. Symmetrical bilingualism has been one of the strategies at the basis of Canadian attempts to resolve English-French language conflicts.

2.2 Language shift and language death

The overwhelming fear of minority language speakers is that bilingualism and consequently diglossia are merely steps towards language shift, attrition and even 'death'. Psychologists seek to link these phenomena to language 'loss' in individuals, as a result of brain damage or ageing. The processes of loss in bilingual individuals may indeed be akin to attrition and shift in a bilingual community (Sharwood-Smith 1989). However, it can be claimed (Woolard 1989 a) that 'shift' is more often associated with failure to acquire a language by a community's children than with 'loss'

by older speakers. Yet there is evidence that in some aphasic conditions, the language most easily lost is that acquired latest, and that there is recall of the earliest mother-tongue, even if it has not recently been used. If this is so, it would help to explain a puzzling finding of dialectologists in some Romance areas, like Northern France, where dialects were, eighty years ago, said to be known only by the very old, yet where it is now found that present-day old people still show knowledge of the dialects. However, it is to be noted that in minority language communities it is often claimed that children no longer have knowledge of the language, but nevertheless, unknown to their elders, the children may covertly use the 'underground' language among themselves. Perhaps the very old, no longer concerned with social prestige, are more ready to bring their knowledge of the language into the open.

Language 'death' has attracted much attention in recent times (see especially Dorian 1989 and Dressler 1988), in tune with current interest in 'ecological' matters (Haugen 1972). Threatened languages arouse the same concern in caring circles as disappearing animal species: the richness of our environment is seen as diminished by the loss, usually seen as consequential on the socio-economic pressures of modern life. Language shift on the part of an individual who chooses a new life in a new land may be the source of little anguish, though it can have the dire result of insecure command of any language by the individual ('semilingualism'). In an immigrant minority language community, new modes of discourse will probably develop, involving 'language-mixing' or 'code-switching' or 'long-term accommodation' and the creation of 'interlects' (see section 3.4 below).

Where, however, a linguistic community, in its own patrimonial territory, is threatened, by political pressure or by demographic decline, with extinction as a discrete entity, it may seek to defend itself. Influx of immigrants is often regarded as a particular threat – and indeed in the past resettlement has been used as a means of consolidating the political grip of a dominant group on a recalcitrant territory: examples within the Romance area are the repopulation strategies of Reconquista Spain or Mussolini's encouragement of immigration to the South Tyrol. The metaphorical 'death' of a language can occur by the extinction of all its speakers (possible if the community is small) or by their shift to another language (usually over the space of two or three generations). During the Roman Imperial period, languages were undoubtedly lost by the latter process and possibly by the former. To call Latin a 'dead' language is to invoke another process, for, in the relevant sense, the Romance languages

today are living Latin varieties. Their 'dead' ancestor consists of a finite corpus of texts and linguistic traditions. Change brought about by isolation, by 'accommodation' in contact situations, and by deliberate distanciation of one variety from another, left the traditional inert variety with fewer and fewer functions, culminating in its virtual abandonment in the Roman liturgy in 1965. Today it is a foreign language for everybody, and the second language of only a few. For an account of the 'death' of medieval Latin, see Kahane – Kahane 1979.

Romance languages that have 'died' in the last two millennia have probably all succumbed by way of the second process. Dalmatian, although surviving precariously till the 16th century in Ragusa (Dubrovnik), where its speakers are said to have lived in symbiotic relationship alongside Slavic neighbours, disappeared, possibly after converging with colonial Venetian, finally in the 19th century. German is known to have rolled back the Northern frontiers of Romance, most recently in Switzerland and Austria: so-called Rhaeto-Romance varieties survive in mountain fastnesses at the frontier. In Britain, too, Romance (or 'Vulgar Latin') varieties must have given way to Germanic, probably as a result of language shift rather than of extinction of the romanized population. In North Africa, the spread of Islam must have displaced Romance varieties, of which we have no direct evidence, as it might have eventually done in the Iberian peninsula, were it not for the Reconquista (Burns 1984). That some isolated varieties have survived and even flourished – Rumanian comes to mind – is a matter of surprise. Much seems to depend on the timing of revival: Rumanian profited from the popular tide of 19th century nationalism. In the second half of the 20th century pressures towards uniformity, better communications and educational requirements have threatened the varieties of formerly isolated and backward communities, so that many of them seem condemned to extinction.

The only Romance language that was twice nearly, though not quite, lost by the first process – extinction of its speakers – is Judeo-Spanish, *sefardi*. Suppressed in Spain after 1492, by the persecution and expulsion of the Jews, but nevertheless flourishing under the Ottoman Empire, it barely survived Nazi attempts at systematic genocide. In Israel, the national language ideology has encouraged a shift to Hebrew, but there remain pockets of speakers in virtually every continent (see Sala, this volume).

2.3 Linguistic purism

Within Romance, fear of language death focuses mainly on language shift, as the real threat. However, transformation of a formerly glorious language into a new variety, by the 'accommodation' process of change is sometime lamented as ignominious, in emotive and value-loaded terms like 'pure' and 'unadulterated' versus 'bastard' and 'degenerate'. Revival of a past stage of the language, accompanied by tastefully cosmetic modernization of the lexicon, after the model of Modern Hebrew, is an ideal sought, particularly today by minority language activists in Spain, and earlier in France and Italy. Where one Romance variety is 'threatened' by another, linguistic distance being small, the fear of 'contamination', with creation of interlects, is heightened by purist attitudes. Any interlect is condemned to a subordinate, and despised, status; the submerged community continues to suffer humiliation, without even the dignity of its own distinctive language system.

All the Romance national languages were inspired originally by the purist attitudes inherited from the Latin tradition (see Jernudd–Shapiro 1989). A strictly regulated written code is regarded as necessary for cultural expression, envisaged as an elite domain. Spoken vernacular was allowed more latitude, as long as it served only the functions of interpersonal oral communication and entertainment. But when the vernacular was elevated to higher roles – first for administration, and, especially from the 16th century on, replacing Latin as the vehicle of serious discourse – a more 'illustrious' version, modelled on Latin, was fashioned, and eventually imposed, through the education system, on the whole political unit. Thus the ideology of the monolingual nation-state has been closely associated in Romance speaking countries with linguistic purism (as, indeed, nationalist ideology usually stresses ethnocultural 'authenticity' and 'purity': Fishman 1972: 8). Attitudes to new varieties, interlects or Creoles, have been contemptuous, and sometimes linked, covertly or overtly, to racist prejudices. For subjugated linguistic communities, the choice has been between acceptance of a subservient role (and consequent withdrawal from many aspects of modern society), assimilation, or revolt. Self-confident, prosperous communities, with militant intellectual leadership, a historical tradition and an urbanized population are more likely to assert their independence. The fashioning of a standardized Catalan, or of dialect koines in industrial regions of Northern Italy, are examples: in both cases, unskilled immigrants from less advanced areas are effectively linguistically excluded from the privileged magic circle. Conflict here arises where central authority, as in the Fascist

era, attempts to suppress the linguistic aspirations of the privileged groups, and may persist even after the cessation of oppression, as the language issue has become associated with wider political programmes.

2.4 Isolates

Where the submerged linguistic community is composed of small rural units, with difficult intercommunication, economic advancement is often sought by way of assimilation or emigration. Emigrant groups, implanted in an alien environment, may resist assimilation more strongly than immobile ones. Thus, to give some Romance examples: support for the establishment of a Galician academy in 1905 came from emigrants to Cuba; Val Verzascans in California have preserved their dialect often with more pride than those who remained in Tessin (Sanga – Tuttle 1989); tiny isolated Daco-Rumanian communities, probably fleeing Ottoman domination, preserved their language in the Istrian peninsula for centuries, although assimilated culturally to their Serbo-Croat environment and dominated successively by Italians, Austrians or Jugoslavs (see Sala, this volume); Catalan-speakers in Alghero in Sardinia, isolated for centuries from contact with other Catalan varieties, and, indeed, unaware until the mid-19th century that their language was not a kind of Spanish, have continued to defend it, in spite of pressures exerted by Standard Italian and the Sassarese variety of Sardinian (Posner 1989); *sefardi*, we repeat, survived for centuries in Asia Minor, the Balkans and North Africa, after the expulsion of its speakers from Spain. Why low-prestige languages should be maintained in face of all the odds is a much-discussed question: 'ethnic identity' is the buzz-phrase in much of the discussion (Ryan 1979; Woolard 1989 b), but it is still not wholly understood and different conditions hold in each case.

Such isolates must, however, be bilingual, and diglossic, communities, in that their vernacular is used only for close personal interaction, in the family, in the fields or fishing-boats and in the bar, or perhaps as an in-group secret code, while another language is required for communication with the world outside. Commentators predict the attrition and death of the vernacular, as its privileged domains shrink, and as intercourse with the exterior increases. Alternatively, the isolated community, pauperized by economic changes and weakened by persistent endogamy, may so decline that eventually the language dies with its speakers.

Rural communities today, however, can breed their own share of able and educated sons and daughters, who reject the polarization between local loyalty and social mobility, and who seek to modernize and promote

their own vernacular, often to the derision of those who acknowledge the quaint charm and folkloric authenticity of local varieties, but who refuse them 'language' status. Conflict thus arises between older-style dialectologists and younger more sociolinguistically oriented investigators.

2.5 The case of Spain – past and present

At present, conflict is most virulent in Spain, following the relaxation of the oppressive linguistic policies of the Franco period, where the claims of Aragonese and Asturian activists are laughed out of court by some prominent academics (Posner 1992). Whereas Catalan and Galician (see Strubell i Trueta and Monteagudo – Santamarina, this volume) are recognized, sometimes reluctantly, as having a literary tradition, and with Valencian (Byrne 1989; Casanova 1988; Cremades Marco 1982; Ferrando Francés 1980, 1988), are recognized by Statute as co-official with Castilian, in their respective territories, the vernacular varieties that survive in Asturias and Aragon are treated as 'local modalities' (Alvar 1986a), and efforts to establish a normalized koine are vigorously opposed in some quarters. In these Northern territories, probably latinized late and then staying free of Moorish domination, the Romance varieties developed independently from Latin (Cano Gonzales 1987). However as the Reconquista advanced they were replaced, for many functions, by other Romance varieties. In the East, Catalan became the official language of the Kingdom of Aragon, which after the 15th century unification with Castile, gave way to Castilian. In the West, Galician expanded into Portugal (see section 3.2 below), and Asturian into the reconquered León region: Castilian is often seen as an innovating variety of Leonese (Lloyd 1987: 178–180), in its turn a diluted Asturian, which did replace Latin as the official language in the Kingdom of León until the 13th century. Soon after, the union of Castile and León (1230) led to the replacement of Leonese by Castilian: today it survives only as a number of regional features in Castilian (Llorente Maldonado 1986). Asturian local varieties, known since the 18th century as *bables*, are however still extant in rural areas (Neira 1982; Penny 1969, 1978), and among the working-class in industrial centres (D'Andrés 1987). There is little consciousness of linguistic separateness in the underpopulated, rural area of León (Holmquist 1988; Lang 1982), even though in Estremadura the isolated 'Hurdanos', who featured in a 1923 Buñuel film, have until recently been popularly regarded as genetically and linguistically quite un-Spanish (Catani 1983). Nevertheless, in Aragon (Conte et al. 1977; Monge 1989) and, even more so, in Asturias (Muljačić 1988; Tolivar Alas 1989), there is some popular

feeling in favour of promotion of the local languages, even though Castilian has made great inroads into their territories, especially since the 16th century.

Romance varieties used in Southern Spain, like Murcian and Andalusian, are treated historically as variants of Castilian, following repopulation, after the conquest of the Moors. Seeing it as a regional and popular variety of Castilian, speakers have low consciousness of the separate identity of Murcian (Muñoz Garrigós 1986; Pérez-Alonso 1979) except, as *panocho*, in a satirical comic setting. Probably originally the outcome of joint resettlement of Castilian and Catalan speakers, with the admixture of pre-conquest varieties, it has been influenced by Castilian from the 14th century on, adopting Southern features, like the *seseo* and the loss of plural *-s*. The resettlement of the extreme South of Spain was not completed until the 16th century, when the codification of standard Castilian was well underway.

In Andalucía, the language replaced by Castilian, Old Andalusian (Malkiel 1988), is sometimes called *mozarabic*, from the name (*musta'ribun*) given to Christians under Arabic rule, though there may have been very few of these, after about the 12th century. It was also spoken by the Jews and perhaps by the *muwallads*, or Muslims of Iberian stock (though there is evidence to suggest that these had by now adopted a variety of Arabic). Our knowledge of the 'mozarabic' language is scant and uncertain: it seems to have been a conservative dialect that did not share specifically Castilian developments. The contact of confident, and by now conflictive and intolerant, Castilian conquerors in their finest hour, with what must have been a demoralized and backward local population probably produced a language shift among Romance speakers towards the prestige variety, though forced conversion and repression was clearly unsuccessful, and culminated in the expulsion of the 'converted' *moriscos* in the early 17th century (see Boase 1990). How far features of the submerged languages were transferred to the adopted Castilian speech is disputed. Mena Calvo (1986) rejects vehemently the idea that Andalusian varieties are "mestizajes impuros de raíz morisca y judía", to which one might add the 'contamination' of gipsy settlement in the South. There is however early evidence for some Andalusian phonological features (Mondéjar 1988). We cannot be sure whether Andalusian is historically a dialect of Castilian or a castilianized form of a language that developed separately from Latin (Mondéjar 1986). Today many Andalusians will claim that theirs is a more authentic Castilian than that of Madrid (Carbonero 1982): in Seville, regional features are

spread through all classes of the population (Lamíquiz – Carbonero 1987) and carry no opprobrium.

The relative closeness of Southern Spanish speech to American Spanish no doubt adds to its prestige (Carbonero 1991). Consciousness among speakers of the identity of their language is fairly high: a survey in Seville in 1978 (Ropero Núñez 1982) shows that nearly 40% (most of them younger informants) believe they speak 'andaluz', some 22% 'español' and 27% 'castellano', mainly among older informants (with 5% opting for 'español andaluz' and nearly 4% for 'castellano con acento andaluz'). In the country, more informants named a local variety as their mother-tongue, but 20% still opted for 'andaluz'. Partly through the influence of tone-setting individuals, Southern pronunciation has become quite modish, and Andalusian speakers have none of the linguistic insecurity noted for Murcian (Lamíquiz et al. 1982–87). On the contrary, their variety is regarded as witty and racy, and is adopted by entertainers in preference to slower, grave and raspy Castilian styles.

In discussing the Spanish linguistic situation, we should not omit mention of Aranés, which is the only Occitan variety with official status (see Schlieben-Lange, this volume). In the far Northwestern corner of Catalunya on the Northern slopes of the Pyrenees, the Spanish Val d'Aran juts out into French Bearnese territory. Aranés is a Western Occitan variety, linguistically fairly close to the Aragonese used to the South-West, but more clearly differentiated from Catalan. Nearly 60% of the permanent population of this tourist area regard themselves as mother-tongue Aranés speakers, compared with 30% Castilian – and a mere 9% Catalan-speakers, though 80% of the population is competent in Catalan. About 30% claim to speak French. Nearly all are bilingual, many are trilingual, or even triglossic, but very few are quadrilingual (Climent 1986; Viault 1987). Attitudes towards Aranés are positive among the great majority of the population, especially since the Catalunya Language Statute, which speaks of 'el habla aranesa' rather than 'modalidades', decreed that it should be taught in schools as a written, as well as a spoken language: at present all primary schools should teach a normalized variety for one or two hours a week. The orthographic norm is adapted from the Occitan model. Variation within Aranés has been studied by Winkelmann (1989), with particular reference to phonology and morphology. 70% of the variants appear to be endogenous, with contact variants mainly geographically distributed (for example, the definite article forms *et/el*). Younger speakers are more influenced by Catalan and Castilian, but also, surprisingly, by Languedoc; older speakers retain

more Gascon features. One distinguishing Gascon feature – the *ke* 'énonciatif' which prefixes all assertive main clauses – is rare except in the extreme North, and is used more by older speakers. By all accounts, variation does not hinder the acceptance of the need for a norm, and conflict between the languages spoken in the Val is minimal.

2.6 Other Romance areas

In the more tolerant Italian atmosphere, where regional autonomy dates further back, linguistic conflict is less evident than in Spain (see Trumper, Rindler-Schjerve and Posner–Rogers, this volume). The hegemony of standard French, on the other hand, has barely been weakened by mild decentralization policies. Occitan and Corsican language advocates often lament their lot in conflictual terms (see Schlieben-Lange and Thiers, this volume). In Switzerland and in the South Tyrol, Rhaeto-Romance varieties, though paid lip-service in official circles, are under threat, and their ultimate demise is predicted by some (see Posner–Rogers, this volume). It is German, rather than another Romance language, that is encroaching on their territory. In Friuli, in contrast, the Rhaeto-Romance language is in contact with neighbouring Venetan varieties and with standard Italian, but appears to be in no imminent danger (for the Friulian varieties spoken in Rumania see Sala, this volume).

In Switzerland, Italian, although an official language, is somewhat under threat, in closer contact with German rather than with the other Swiss Romance languages. Because of a certain distrust of standard Italian, consonant with their loyalty to their local Tessinese dialects, and to the Federation, Swiss Italian speakers feel that they must defend their linguistic heritage, especially in face of the influx of immigrant workers from Italy, and they turn to parochialism and folkloric revival (Bianconi 1980; Lurati 1976), while tending to use German for many language functions. The French-speaking Romands traditionally believe that the Tessinese are their natural allies against the Germanophones, because they are perceived as sharing a Romance heritage, but the Romands rarely learn Italian, expecting, without justification, French to be the common language (Knecht–Rubattel 1985: 152). Italian is in fact hardly used in Switzerland outside the Tessin, except by immigrants. An attempt to preserve it as a federal language gave rise to the so-called 'Modell Schweiz', proposing that passive knowledge of Italian should be promoted in order to encourage polyglot interchange (Watts 1991: 99).

Rumanian varieties spoken in Greece, Bulgaria and Albania have little hope of survival in the future; speakers who settle in Rumania tend to

assimilate to the Daco-Rumanian standard language, while those who stay in place are often condemned to an archaic and obsolescent life-style (see Sala, this volume).

3. Language survival and revival

Frequently elderly loyal speakers in the small communities accept, with regret, that language death will occur, often lamenting, as old people do, the callousness and disrespect of younger generations. More politically conscious speakers may, we repeat, be steeled to active resistance by the example of apparent success in reviving dead or dying languages – as in Israel or Wales. Often they will not only accuse their persecutors – imposers of a dominant language – but also blame their fellows for lack of courage or 'self-hate' (Catalan *auto-odi*: Ninyoles 1969), for accepting others' low evaluation of their language and for selfishly seeking personal advancement at the cost of disloyalty to their community. As bilinguals, they may take pride in their greater aptitude for language acquisition than their 'slow-witted' monolingual neighbours (Nelde 1986 a), but still resent imposed asymmetrical bilingualism.

Experience suggests that immortality, or at any rate longevity, for a language depends on its extension in space, and its status, measured by the number and importance of its functions (Mackey 1985). To this must be added a positive will on the part of speakers to preserve their language, and their support for leaders in a political campaign for language retention. Sometimes such leaders are accused of manipulation of the community's imperfectly formulated wishes, and exploitation for ulterior motives of a deeply-felt desire for preservation of linguistic heritage as a sign of community identity. It is true that there have been examples of campaigners who abandoned the linguistic struggle once other more narrowly beneficial aims had been attained (the *Lliga Regionalista* founded in 1901 in Catalunya is one example: Woolard 1989 b: 25–26). Today even moderate advocates of language maintenance are sometimes lumped together, by opponents, with irredentists and militant underground organizations (see Thiers, this volume).

Studies of language maintenance and language death point to the conclusion that to secure survival of one's mother tongue concerted and vigorous action is necessary to devise a superordinate koine, which will cover local dialects, in order to extend its spatial validity, and to widen the functional relevance of the koine by rendering it apt for use in a greater range of domains. The former requirement can be met by the recognition of a more or less abstract diasystem – a sort of common