

Glocalisation and the Ausbau sociolinguistics of modern Europe

Peter Trudgill

Miséricorde, CH-1700 Fribourg, Switzerland

Peter Trudgill is Professor of English Linguistics at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. He has previously taught at the Universities of Lausanne, Essex and Reading. His main interests are in sociolinguistics, dialectology, linguistic change, and dialect typology. His major publications include *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*, *Sociolinguistics: an introduction to language and society*, *International English* (with Jean Hannah), *On dialect: social and regional perspectives*, *Dialectology* (with J. K. Chambers), *Language in the British Isles*, *Dialects in contact*, *The dialects of England*, and, most recently, *Sociolinguistic variation and change*.

Key Words: global English, glocalisation, identity, Ausbau sociolinguistics, linguistic autonomy, nation state.

Globalisation and the nation-state

Globalisation can be defined as “the crystallisation of the entire world as a single place” (Robertson 1987a: 38) and as the emergence of a “global-human condition” (Robertson 1987b: 23). The term can be used to refer both to a historical process and to the “conceptual change in which it is ... reflected” (Arnason 1990: 220).

In this paper I consider some sociolinguistic consequences of globalisation for the relationship between languages and dialects. There are two misconceptions concerning globalisation that we must confront before we are able to do this, however. First, globalisation, as a historical process and as a conceptual change in which it is reflected, is not a recent phenomenon. On the contrary, manifestations of globalisation were apparent in the 19th century, and even before that, as Mennell’s discussion of “the long-term structural integration of human society” (1990: 369) makes very clear. Secondly, globalisation does not necessarily involve only supra-national phenomena. On the contrary, social theorists regard the development of the nation-state as being a key part of the globalisation process – both in terms of the spread of the nation-state phenomenon itself, and in terms of the spread of the concept. The development of the nation-state was both part of globalisation, in that it involved “the linking of localities” (Robertson 1995: 35); and one of its consequences: “the spread of the nation-state has been an expression of globalisation” (Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 52) in the sense “that global culture is the basis of a carbon copy spread of nation-states in this century” (Friedmann 1990: 72).

In the first part of this paper I look at the relationship between language and dialect and this older nation-state-development aspect of globalisation, before moving on in the second part to discuss more recent supra-national developments involving language and dialect.

The nation-state and Ausbau sociolinguistics

Sociolinguists have been very aware of the link between the growth of nation-states and the growth of languages. Most people working in sociolinguistics are very familiar with Max Weinreich's dictum that 'a language is a dialect with an army and a navy'. There is of course a lot of truth in this statement, which is why it has become so well known. But it is a partial truth, as I am sure Weinreich would have acknowledged. The whole truth is a good deal more complex. There are two scholars who we owe a great deal to when it comes to understanding this complexity. The first is Heinz Kloss. He accepted that the notion of 'a language' is indeed as much a political, cultural and historical notion as it is a purely linguistic notion. But he also pointed out that languages are of two main sociolinguistic types. These types, as is well known to sociolinguists, are called in German *Abstandsprachen* and *Ausbausprachen*.

Abstand languages can be called in English 'languages by distance'. An Abstand language is a linguistic variety which is regarded as a separate language by reason of its linguistic distance from all other languages. The classical European example is Basque. Basque is an isolate with no known relatives and is extremely distant in terms of its linguistic structures and other characteristics from all other languages, including, importantly, its geographical neighbours. The status of Basque as a language is thus assured on purely linguistic grounds.

Ausbau languages, on the other hand, can be called in English 'languages by extension, or construction'. An Ausbau language is a linguistic variety which is regarded as a distinct language for political, cultural, social and historical as well as linguistic reasons. Ausbau languages depend on cultural factors for their status because they are associated with geographical dialect continua. Polish, Slovak and Czech are Ausbau languages which together form the West Slavic dialect continuum. They are mutually intelligible, especially Polish and Slovak, and Slovak and Czech, but they form three separate languages because there are three separate standardised norms with their own agreed and accepted orthographies, shared histories, traditional literatures, widely used dictionaries and grammar books – and their own nation states. Following the second scholar who we owe a great deal to in this field, Einar Haugen, we can say that, because of these separate orthographies, literatures,

histories etc., each of these three standard varieties has the characteristic of *autonomy* – they are independent varieties with, as it were, an existence of their own.

This gives us a useful definition of an Ausbau language: an Ausbau language is an autonomous standardised variety together with all the nonstandard dialects from that part of the dialect continuum which are heteronomous with respect to it i.e. dependent on it. With the term heteronomy, or ‘dependence’, we refer to facts such as that a Slovak and a Pole from opposite sides of the national frontier may be able to converse with one another very readily, but one will go home and read Slovak newspapers and write a letter to their grandmother in Slovak, while the other will go home and watch Polish television and correct their children’s Polish language homework.

It should be clear, then, that autonomy and heteronomy are cultural and political phenomena, which entails that Ausbau languages are cultural and political constructs. However much we may reify them, this has the consequence that Ausbau languages are potentially temporary entities. In particular, languages can become dialects, through loss of autonomy, and dialects can become languages, through the opposite process.

Dialects become official languages

In this paper, I concentrate on the phenomenon of dialects becoming languages, that is, on the acquisition of autonomy by formerly heteronomous language varieties. In particular, I examine overt and organised attempts to convert dialects into languages. In this first part of the paper, I do this specifically in connexion with nation-state development and maintenance, a phenomenon which began in earnest in Europe in the 19th century. To give just one example, it was in the years following 1814 that successful steps were taken which led to the acquisition of (Ausbau) language status by Norwegian, the dialects of which had formerly been heteronomous with respect to Danish, parallel to the achievement of independent nation-state status by Norway after centuries of colonisation by Denmark. (I regard this type of movement from dialect to language status as being a rather different phenomenon from the standardisation of varieties already considered to be languages, which also occurred in connection with nationalist movements in the 19th century, such as the development of Finnish.)

Generally, such dialect-to-language developments can be divided into two types. First, there are attempts to establish separate language status which have the support of the community involved. For

example, Romansch was declared in 1938 to be, not only a language in its own right, but also a national language of Switzerland. This was partly in response to nationalistic sentiments being expressed by the government of Mussolini across the border in Fascist Italy: it would have been possible to claim, on linguistic grounds, without being too ridiculous, that the various dialects of Romansch were simply dialects of Italian, rather than dialects of a language which was found exclusively in the Swiss nation-state.

Similarly, by the law of 24 February, 1984, Luxembourgish was granted, by the government of Luxembourg – a small but independent nation-state – the status of “national language” as opposed to being simply a dialect of German.

Secondly, there are attempts to establish separate language status which appear not to have the support of the community involved. In these cases, it might be more appropriate to talk of “denial of dialect status” than “assertion of language status”. For example, the Soviet Union declared in the 1940s, after their annexation of parts of Romanian Moldavia, that the new Soviet Republic of Moldova had a language of its own, Moldavian, which was distinct from Rumanian, the language of a now separate, neighbouring nation-state (Mallinson 1988).

A similar policy has been apparent from time to time in Austria. Here, the indigenous Slovenian-speaking minority of Carinthia has been the object of (unofficial) claims, particularly in the 1930s though the theory still has some currency today, that their language is not Slovene at all, but a separate language called ‘Windisch’ (Priestly 1997). The implication is that the people themselves are not Slovenes, but members of a separate ethnic group, often suggested to be German-speakers who have become Slavicised. The implication of this claim is, in turn, that the minority have no connection with the majority in the neighbouring nation-state.

In yet other cases, the views of the communities involved are not so clear. For example, the government of Yugoslavia, on August 2, 1944, formally created Macedonian as a new Ausbau language by declaring it the official language of Yugoslavian Macedonia, partly in response to territorial claims to Yugoslavian Macedonia by the neighbouring nation-state, Bulgaria. It has to be said, though, that they did not create this language entirely out of the blue, given that there was, as early as the 19th century, a tradition of writing in a normalised version of the dialects from this part of the South Slavic dialect continuum.

Similar though less official policies have been followed in Greece. Varieties of Romance spoken in the southern Balkans are referred to by linguists as *Arumanian* (Mallinson 1988). Speakers of these varieties are known as *Vlachs*. From a sociolinguistic point of view, there is the interesting Ausbau sociolinguistic problem of whether Arumanian is a dialect of Rumanian or not. This linguistic problem naturally has parallels with the ethnic question of whether Vlachs are “really” Romanians or not: Winnifrith (1993) has described Vlachs as a “minority which never achieved ethnic identity”. Certainly, earlier in this century, the Romanian government established Rumanian-medium schools in some areas of what is now Greece, and argued that the dialects spoken by the Vlachs were indeed dialects of Rumanian. This does have some linguistic justification, although in fact mutual intelligibility is by no means always easy because of the rather large degree of Abstand (linguistic distance) between them. In Greece, in any case, the language is never referred to as (A)rumanian but rather as *Vlachika*.

The position of the indigenous Albanian-speaking minority in Greece is very similar to that of the Vlachs, in that their sense of separate identity is weak and their feelings of connection with Albania for the most part non-existent (Sella-Mazi 1997; Trudgill 2000). These people have been in what is now Greece since mediaeval times, and the biggest concentration today is in the areas where they were formerly the dominant element in the population – in Attica, Boeotia and much of the Peloponnese; many of the suburbs of Athens are, or were until recently, Albanian-speaking. Linguistically, there is no doubt that the language they speak is a variety of Albanian; the degree of linguistic Abstand between it and the dialects of southern Albania is so relatively small that mutual intelligibility is usually very possible – problems are caused mainly by the usage of Greek loanwords – and the identification is much less controversial than that of Vlachika. Nevertheless, all Greeks have adopted the interesting practice of referring to the language of this minority not as *Alvanika* (“Albanian”) but as *Arvanitika*. This is paralleled by the practice of calling the people themselves not Albanians but *Arvanites* (singular *Arvanitis*).

In both cases, this terminology has the effect of implying that the people concerned are not Romanians or Albanians, and that both Vlachika and Arvanitika are autonomous languages rather than dialects of, respectively, Rumanian and Albanian, the national languages of different and nearby nation-states (Trudgill, 2000). That is, while these languages are obviously not Greek, they are

“languages of Greece”, i.e. languages that are found only within the frontiers of the Greek nation-state.

Note that, in cases such as a this, the relationship between Ausbau and Abstand comes to the fore. That is, linguists and politicians involved in the creation of Ausbau languages do well to make the most of whatever Abstand - linguistic distance - there is in relation to other languages on the dialect continuum. Thus, in Norway, Ivar Aasen, the creator of one of the two standard Norwegians which still survive to this day as alternative solutions to the problem of creating a Norwegian standard language, deliberately based his variant of Norwegian, today called Nynorsk, on the dialects spoken in Norway which were most unlike Danish i.e. the dialects of the western part of the country. Similarly, Yugoslavian Macedonian avoided forms which were too like Bulgarian or Serbian. Proponents of the Windisch theory in Austria point to dissimilarities between standard Slovene and the Slovenian dialects of Austria, and even discuss the difficulty or impossibility of mutual intelligibility. And if there is no Abstand, it is as well to create some: the Soviet government attempted to introduce a degree of Abstand where there was none by requiring Moldavian to be written in the Cyrillic script, thereby distinguishing it visually from Rumanian, which uses the Latin alphabet.

Many other examples of this form of development could be given. I conclude this section, however, with the best known example of all from modern Europe of nation-state proliferation and Ausbau language proliferation going hand in hand. Between 1918 and the 1990s, Yugoslavia was a multi-ethnic, multilingual nation-state. Most of the country was covered by a geographical dialect continuum of South Slavic dialects. This continuum also includes the Bulgarian dialects of Bulgaria and neighbouring areas. Everybody was agreed that the dialects of Slovenia in the north-west of Yugoslavia were heteronomous to Standard Slovenian. And from 1944, the official position was that the dialects of Yugoslavian Macedonia, in the south, were dialects of Standard Macedonian, as we have already noted. In the centre of the country, however – Croatia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia – the situation was rather more complex.

The official position was that the language of these areas was Serbo-Croat. However, as the name suggests, Serbo-Croat came in two rather different forms: Serbian, which was often written in the Cyrillic alphabet, and was based for the most part on dialects from the eastern part of central Yugoslavia; and Croatian, which tended to be written in the Latin alphabet, and was based more on

western dialects. At various times in history, and by different people, Serbian and Croatian have variously been considered a single language with two different norms, or two different (though mutually intelligible) languages, depending on the prevailing ideology and political situation. Croatian was associated with the Croatian ethnic group, who were dominant in the western area and were traditionally Roman Catholic Christians; and Serbian was associated with the Serbian ethnic group, who were dominant in the eastern part of the area and were traditionally Orthodox Christians. (The situation was further complicated by the fact that many major dialect boundaries actually run east-west across areas inhabited by Croats and Serbs, rather than north-south between them.) Croats who were natives of Croatia therefore had a choice: they could say that they were native speakers either of Serbo-Croat or of Croatian. Serbs who had grown up in Croatia, on the other hand, and who spoke in exactly the same way, would prefer to say that they spoke Serbo-Croat. The same would apply in reverse to Serbs and Croats living in Serbia.

In Bosnia, the central part of Yugoslavia, the position was even more complex. The dialects spoken in this central part of the dialect continuum are intermediate between those of Croatia and Serbia. There was therefore no particular reason to say that these dialects were dialects of Croatian or dialects of Serbian. Inhabitants of, say, Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia, might perhaps *say* that they spoke Croatian if they were Croats and a Croat ethnic identity was important to them; similarly, some Serbian Sarajevans might say that they spoke Serbian. In actual fact, however, the dialects they spoke were exactly the same, and therefore the combined name Serbo-Croat actually made much more sense. Using the term Serbo-Croat also seemed more sensible to the other major ethnic group in Bosnia – the Moslems or Bosniacs – who, not being either Serbs or Croats, had no reason to favour one language designation over another. This term was also favoured by the large numbers of Yugoslavs who were of ethnically mixed parentage and/or who had come to feel that their national identity as Yugoslavs was what counted for them, rather than any particular ethnic identity.

Since the early 1990s, with the break-up of Yugoslavia, this situation has changed. The government in Zagreb of the now independent nation-state of Croatia calls its national language Croatian, while the Yugoslavian Government in Belgrade calls its national language Serbian. If there is, then, no longer any such language as Serbo-Croat, what are the Moslems of Bosnia to think of themselves as speaking and writing? They would obviously not want to have to choose between the labels ‘Serbian’ and ‘Croatian’, and it was therefore not at all surprising when the Bosnian

ambassador to the USA requested that the language of his government should now be referred to as *Bosnian*. Even more recently, there have been suggestions that the language of Montenegro, in parallel with a separatist movement there, is not Serbian but Montenegrin.

The sociolinguistic conclusion we can draw from this brief historical sketch is that the proliferation of nation-states in the 19th and 20th centuries, which as we have noted was an early part of the globalisation process, was accompanied by a proliferation of Ausbau languages, through the development of autonomy by formerly heteronomous dialects. This development was not necessarily always the straightforward one of newly independent nations promoting newly autonomous national languages, although we have seen a number of examples of this, as in the creation of Norwegian and the separation of Croatian and Serbian. Independent nations also responded to the perceived nationalism of neighbouring states by means of Ausbau developments, such as the creation of Romansch and Macedonian, which were intended to demonstrate that minority languages within their own national borders were not heteronomous with respect to the national languages of these neighbouring countries.

Ausbau sociolinguistics and localism

The second part of this paper now looks at more recent, supra-national developments in the globalisation process, and at a particular linguistic correlate having to do with Ausbau sociolinguistics. In recent years, we have seen in Europe the attempted, continuing development of even more Ausbau languages. Unlike those of the 19th century and early 20th century, however, these more recent attempts appear to have developed out of motivations which are not connected to the creation or maintenance of the nation-state. Indeed, they may actually be opposed to such maintenance. They also appear to contradict the widespread assumption that world-wide homogenisation is an inherent part of cultural globalisation, and to fly in the face of suppositions that this is being accompanied by linguistic homogenisation. Here are some examples.

Finnish becomes Meänkieli

The Tornedalen area of northern Sweden, adjacent to Finland, has an indigenous population who are for the most part Finnish speaking. However, in recent years there has been an internally driven movement to have the local dialect of Finnish – which is indeed linguistically very different from

Standard Finnish – categorised as a new language called Meänkieli (meaning ‘our language’). Since April 2000, a Swedish law has been in force which gives the right to local people to use their own language (as opposed to Swedish) in communications with the local administration. The English version of the law includes the statement “The present law will be enforced in those relations with the authorities of the state, local or regional administration in a geographical territory of activities which partially or entirely covers the territory of administration for the Finnish and Meänkieli languages. The territory for the administration for the Finnish and Meänkieli languages comprises the towns of Gällivare, Haparanda, Kiruna, Pajala and Övertorneå.” Clearly the wording “Finnish and Meänkieli” is a response to these attempts to establish Meänkieli as a separate language. It is clear that the people involved for the most part regard themselves as “a purely ethnolinguistic, not national, minority” (Vikør 2000: 121) who have no desire to set up a new, independent nation-state i.e. they regard themselves as Swedes who happen to be native speakers of some language other than Swedish (see also Wande 1992). The movement of Meänkieli to language status cannot be seen, either, as a defensive measure designed to thwart territorial claims by neighbouring Finland, since there are no such claims; and the movement, as we have already noted, was generated within the community itself and not by the Swedish government.

Estonian becomes Võro

Since the independence of Estonia from the Soviet Union in 1991, Estonian has been the official language of that nation. However, there is now also an attempt in the south of the country to establish a new language with an Ausbau relationship to Estonian. The local speech of Võrumaa region is regarded as a specific language by some activists, and, for example, place-names in that region are now officially written in a local orthography, not in Standard Estonian. Steps are being taken towards a standardisation of Võro, led by the Võro Institute. There is considerable Abstand between the dialects of this area and Standard Estonian, and there is a history, dating at least from the early 20th century, of standardisation of this variety.

Ulster Scots becomes Ullans

The attempted development of a new Germanic language called Ullans in Northern Ireland is a remarkable phenomenon in that it involves the establishment of the autonomy of this variety not only

with respect to English but also with respect to Scots, with which it has traditionally been linked, as the older name ‘Ulster Scots’ demonstrates. Nevertheless, this attempt has received some official recognition and, for example, advertisements for posts in the Northern Ireland Civil Service now appear in the British press in English, Irish Gaelic, and Ulster Scots using an orthography different from that used for Lallans or Lowland Scots. For a description of this variety, see Robinson (1997).

The ‘new’ languages of northern France

In 2001, a conference was held in Amiens, northern France, on *langues collatérales* i.e. languages which are too close to a major language for, as it were, their own good. The main impetus for this conference came from supporters of Northern French varieties with little Abstand from Standard French, especially Walloon, Poitevin and Picard, but the major assumption underlying the organisation of the conference was that these varieties are indeed languages and not dialects of French, as was made clear in the initial announcement:

Colloque international: des langues collatérales. Problèmes linguistiques, sociolinguistiques et glottopolitiques de la proximité linguistique. Le cas des langues régionales et minoritaires génétiquement proches de la langue dominante est représenté en France et en Belgique par les langues dites d’oïl (poitevin, picard, wallon ...)

[International colloquium: Collateral Languages. The linguistic, sociolinguistic, and linguistic-political problems of linguistic proximity. Examples of regional minority languages which are genetically close to the dominant language in France and Belgium are the *langues d’oïl*, Poitevin, Picard, and Walloon ...]

Cashubian

Although it is quite usual in modern Poland to consider Cashubian as a dialect of Polish, there is currently a movement under way to assert, or reassert, its status as a separate language. There is now, for example, a lectureship in Cashubian at the University of Gdansk; and a certain amount of education and publishing takes place in this language. Attempts to standardise Cashubian, and thus to accentuate its autonomy, have been described by Popowska-Taborska (1997).

Iberia: two languages become nine?

Other examples could be given. I now conclude this section, however, with a discussion of the remarkable proliferation, in recent decades, of Ausbau languages in the Iberian peninsula.

In 1970 there were only two Ausbau languages in the Iberian peninsula, Portuguese and Spanish (Castilian). (We leave aside Basque, which as we noted above, is a non-Romance, Abstand language.) When democracy was restored to Spain in 1975, however, attempts began immediately to achieve autonomy for Catalan, in eastern Spain. The objective here was to restore an autonomy that had been lost or, more precisely, taken away by the centralist, nationalist, Fascist regime of General Franco after the Spanish Civil War in 1939. The Franco regime attacked the autonomy of Catalan by abolishing the Chairs of Catalan Language and Literature at Barcelona University, forbidding the publication of books and newspapers in Catalan, and closing down radio broadcasting in the Catalan language. The plan was to convert Catalan, in effect, into a dialect of Spanish. Catalans, in the new democratic Spain, wanted to reverse this process.

One of the most remarkable events which took place as part of this restoration of the autonomy of Catalan was the Second International Congress of the Catalan Language, in 1983. This was an academic event that was nevertheless also a propaganda exercise aimed at the Catalan-speaking population themselves. It included activities in many different Catalan-speaking areas, including in France and Andorra, and involved the participation of large numbers of linguists from many parts of the world, not all of whom knew very much about Catalan (see Trudgill 1993). Papers were presented in Catalan, French and English – but not in Spanish. Particularly prominent were contributions by academics who were non-native speakers but who were able to give fluent presentations and hold media interviews in Catalan. The message was: Catalan is a language, not a dialect. This congress and many other efforts in the same direction were ultimately very successful. Catalan today once again very clearly has the status of a language.

This successful restoration of the linguistic status of Catalan raised the number of Iberian Ausbau languages to three. However, this was not the end of the story because it was followed by attempts, also successful, to achieve autonomy for Galician, in northwestern Spain. There is considerable Abstand between Galician and Standard Spanish, and indeed Galician resembles Portuguese more than it does Castilian. (It would therefore be possible to claim that Galician is a

dialect of Portuguese, although historically it is actually the other way round – Portuguese developed out of Galician). The new Spanish Constitution of 1978 stated that Spanish was the official language of Spain, but also that “the other Spanish languages will also be official in their respective autonomous communities”. The statutes of the autonomous region of Galicia of 1981 accordingly stated (Hermida 2001) that Galician is the official language of Galicia alongside Spanish. Iberia thus now had four official languages.

The story does not stop there, however. In 1983 Catalan also became a co-official language, alongside Spanish, in the spheres of education and local government in the Valencian autonomous region. However, in the relevant 1983 act the language of Valencia is referred to as Valencian, rather than Catalan; and there has subsequently been considerable discussion as to what the language should be called, and whether it is a separate language or not (Ferrando 1991). There have also been suggestions that Valencian ought to employ a different orthography (Penny 2000: 222). This separatist position is advocated by the *Unio Valenciana* party (Pradilla 2001: 68). Their case would appear to be strengthened by the fact that the Spanish Constitution is issued in five official versions: Spanish, Basque, Galician, Catalan, and Valencian. (It is weakened by the fact that the Catalan and Valencian versions are word-for-word identical (Mar-Molinero 2000).) Now, if Valencian is a language distinct from Catalan, this leaves the Balearic islands of Majorca, Minorca and Ibiza with a problem. If we accept that Valencian is not Catalan, then ‘Catalan’ can now logically only mean ‘the language of the autonomous region of Catalonia’. The inhabitants of the islands cannot therefore be speakers of Catalan since the islands are not part of Catalonia. Since they obviously do not speak Valencian either, it will now be necessary to refer to their language by some other name such as ‘Balearic’. If we do this, Iberia now has six Ausbau languages.

We have still not finished, however, with this type of development. Asturian, also known as Astur-Leonese or Bable, is another variety for which language status is now claimed. (Asturia is the region of northern Spain immediately to the east of Galicia.) In 1974 the *Conceyu Bable* was formed which was intended “to get the population to defend their linguistic rights as Asturian speakers” (González-Quevedo, 2001: 167) and to promote publishing in Asturian. Then, in 1980, the Academy for the Asturian Language was founded, and Asturian is now taught as a subject in one third of all schools in the province. This increases the number of Ausbau languages to seven.

Then, in the province of Aragon, the *Colla Unibersitaria por l'Aragonés* at the University of Zaragoza is working to achieve the recognition of Aragonese as a distinct language, as is the *Consello d'a Aragonese Fabla*. According to their websites (written in Aragonese, Spanish and English), the First Congress for the Standardisation took place in 1987, and in 1997 the Aragonese parliament recognised Aragonese as a local language. This now makes eight Ausbau languages.

Finally, we turn our attention to Portugal. In the northeast of this country, in areas adjacent to Spain, there are varieties spoken which resemble Asturian quite closely. These varieties are known as Mirandese, and demonstrate quite considerable Abstand from Standard Portuguese (Head, forthcoming). The language gained official recognition in the Portuguese Constitution of 1976, but this aspect of the constitution was not enforced until 2000, when a law entitled, in the English version, “Official Recognition of the Linguistic Rights of the Mirandese Community” was passed, which permitted a presence of the language in schools and other areas of public life. This law raises the current total of Iberian Romance languages to nine.

Conclusion: glocalisation

What, then, are we to make of this kind of sociolinguistic development in terms of globalisation theory? If globalisation implies homogenisation, why are we witnessing the proliferation of all these new, local Ausbau languages?

The fact is, of course, that “globalisation is by no means synonymous with homogenisation” (Arnason 1990: 224). We are not all becoming identical; rather, we are becoming “different in ways that are not as they were in earlier times” (Hylland Eriksen 1995: 282). Moreover, and importantly for our purposes, Nederveen Pieterse (1995: 50) points out that not only does globalisation not necessarily imply homogenisation, it can in fact “mean the reinforcement of ... subnational regionalism”. The linguistic ‘reinforcement of subnational regionalism’ is surely what we are seeing in the development of Aragonese, and Cashubian, and Meänkieli. So how, then, is this subnational linguistic regionalism to be explained in the context of globalisation?

An increase in emphasis on local as opposed to national or international identities could be interpreted, as indeed it has been by some social scientists, as a simple, defensive, antagonistic *response or reaction against* globalisation (Østerud 1999). Sociolinguistically, one could say that, in

the face of the expansion of English as a global language, the response is to attempt to fight back by increasing the status of local dialects by awarding them language status.

This is, however, too simple. The fact is that the opposition between global and local is not a straightforward polarity in which we witness a series of simple “local assertions *against* globalising trends” (Robertson 1995: 29). Cox (1992: 34) argues rather that in fact “globalisation *encourages* macro-regionalism which, in turn, *encourages* micro-regionalism” [my emphasis]. This is because “the present phase of globalisation involves the relative weakening of nation-states” (Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 49) and “the diminishing of the salience of national borders” (Barber 1992: 54), so that, for example, “Catalonia can outflank Madrid and Brittany outmanoeuvre Paris by appealing to Brussels or by establishing links with other regions” (Nederveen Pieterse 1995: 50). This scenario applies from an economic perspective also (Ohmae, 1995): the nation state is “too small in some respects and too big in others” (Østerud, 1999: 124 [my translation]). There has been an “upsurge of ethnic identity politics and religious revival movements” as well as “minorities who appeal to transnational human rights standards beyond state authorities, or indigenous peoples who find support for local demands from transnational networks” (ibid.). Consequently, “globalisation can mean the reinforcement of or go together with localism” (p. 49). The weakening of the nation-state that accompanies globalisation leads to the strengthening of sub-national regions.

The sociolinguistic parallel of this is that, if the importance and thus the status of a particular national language is reduced by the expansion of English as a global language, this may leave a gap into which local dialects can step by, as it were, awarding themselves language status. Ausbau-sociolinguistic micro-regionalism can then be seen not as a defensive reaction against globalisation, but as an example of micro regions *taking advantage* of opportunities afforded by globalisation in order to assert themselves.

This kind of “tandem operation” of local and global dynamics, or global localisation, has come to be known in social theory as *glocalisation* (Robertson 1995). This portmanteau word was originally used in business studies to refer to the aiming of goods on a global scale to particular differentiated local markets. Social theorists now use this term, however, to refer not only to the fact that globalism can strengthen localism, as we have just observed, but also to the rather paradoxical fact that localism is now a global phenomenon. That is, “the local is not best seen ... as a counterpoint to the global”; rather, it can be regarded “as *an aspect* of globalisation” (Robertson 1990: 30). “Particularity is a

global value” and what we are seeing is a “universalisation of particularism” and “the global valorisation of particular identities” (Robertson 1992:130). Modern communications technology may have contributed to the “disengaging of certain cultural phenomena from space” but as a consequence many phenomena now “exist globally (everywhere) and locally (in particular places) simultaneously” (Hylland Eriksen 1995: 282).

The sociolinguistic conclusion we can draw from this is as follows. The proliferation of *national* Ausbau languages in the 19th and early 20th centuries took place in parallel with the growth of nation-states that was an integral part of early globalisation. On the other hand, the more recent growth, in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, in the number of attempts to establish *local* Ausbau languages is equally an integral part of the glocalisation process that is an aspect of more modern forms of globalisation.

Acknowledgements

My very special thanks are due to my friend of forty years, Andrew Wernick, who introduced me to the concept of glocalisation and to the relevant works in social theory; without him, this paper would not have happened. I am also grateful to the following for comments on earlier versions of this paper, and especially for information and references provided on particular linguistic communities: Thomas Hylland Eriksen, Jan Terje Faarlund, Malgorzata Fabiszak, Tom Priestly, and Maria Teresa Turell.

Bibliography

Arnason, Johann

1990 “Nationalism, globalization and modernity”. In *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, M. Featherstone (ed.), 207-436. London: Sage.

Barber, Benjamin

1992 “Jihad vs. McWorld”. *The Atlantic* 269 (3): 53-65.

Cox, Robert

1992 “Global perestroika”. In *New World Order?*, R. Miliband and L. Panitch (eds.), 26-43. London: Merlin.

Featherstone, Mike (ed.)

1990 *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage.

Featherstone, Mike, Lash, Scott and Robertson, Roland (eds.)

1995 *Global Modernities*. London: Sage.

Ferrando, Antoni

1991 Les perspectives de normalització lingüística as País Valencia. In *Processos de Normalització Lingüística*, J. Martí (ed.), 103-38. Barcelona: Columna.

Friedman, Jonathan

1990 "Being in the world: globalization and localization". In *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, M. Featherstone (ed.), 311-28. London: Sage.

González-Quevedo, Roberto

2001 The Asturian speech community. In *Multilingualism in Spain: Sociolinguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects of Linguistic Minority Groups*, M. Turell (ed.), 165-82. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Haugen, Einar

1966 Dialect, language, nation. *American Anthropologist* 68, 922-935.

Head, Brian

forthcoming "Mirandese: linguistic and cultural features of a border area of Portugal and Spain". Paper presented at the *Methods in Dialectology XI* Conference, Joensuu, Finland, August 2002.

Hermida, Carme

2001 "The Galician speech community". In *Multilingualism in Spain: Sociolinguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects of Linguistic Minority Groups*, M. Turell (ed.), 110-40. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hylland Eriksen, Thomas

1995 *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London: Pluto.

Kloss, Heinz

1967 Abstand languages and Ausbau languages. *Anthropological Linguistics* 9, 29-41.

Mallinson, Graham

1998 "Rumanian". In *The Romance Languages*, M. Harris and N. Vincent (eds.), 391-419. London: Routledge.

Mennell, Stephen

1990 "The globalization of human society as a very long-term social process: Elias's theory". In *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, M. Featherstone (ed.), 359-72. London: Sage.

Mar-Molinero, Clare

2000 The Iberian peninsula: conflicting linguistic nationalisms. In *Language and nationalism in Europe*, S. Barbour and C. Carmichael (eds.), 83-104. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan

1995 "Globalization as hybridization". In *Global Modernities*, M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson (eds.), 45-68. London: Sage.

Ohmae, Kenichi

1995 *The End of the Nation State: the Rise of Regional Economies*. New York: Free Press.

Østerud, Øyvind

1999 *Globalisering og Nasjonalstaten* [Globalisation and the Nation State]. Oslo: Gyldendal.

Penny, Ralph

2000 *Variation and Change in Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Popowska-Taborska, Hanna

1997 The present-day linguistic situation in Kashubia. In *Language Minorities and Minority Languages*, B. Synak and T. Wicherkiewicz (eds.), 317-22. Gdansk: University of Gdansk.

Pradilla, Miquel Angel

2001 "The Catalan-speaking communities". In *Multilingualism in Spain: Sociolinguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects of Linguistic Minority Groups*, M. Turell (ed.), 58-90. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Priestly, Tom

1997 "On the development of the 'Windischentheorie'". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 124: 75-98.

Robertson, Roland

1987a "Globalization and societal modernization: a note on Japan and Japanese religion". *Sociological Analysis* 47: 35-43.

Robertson, Roland

1987b "Globalization theory and civilization analysis". *Comparative Civilizations Review* 17: 20-30.

Robertson, Roland

1992 *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.

Robertson, Roland

1995 “Glocalization: time-space and heterogeneity-homogeneity”. In *Global Modernities*, M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson (eds.), 25-44. London: Sage.

Robinson, Philip

1997 *Ulster-Scots: A Grammar of the Traditional Written and Spoken Language*. Belfast: Ulster-Scots Heritage Council.

Sella-Mazi, Eleni

1997 “Diglossia kai oligotero omiloumenes glosses stin Ellada” [Bilingualism and lesser-spoken languages in Greece]. In *To Meionotiko Phainomeno stin Ellada* [The Minority Phenomenon in Greece.], K. Tsitselikis and D. Christopoulos (eds.), 349-413. Ekdoseis Kritiki: Athens.

Trudgill, Peter

1993 Present directions in dialectology. In *Segon Congr s Internacional de la Llengua Catalana. Vol. 4: Linguistica Social*, I. Mari (ed.), 15-17. Palma: Universitat de les Illes Balears.

Trudgill, Peter

2000 Greece and European Turkey: from religious to linguistic identity. In *Language and nationalism in Europe*, S. Barbour and C. Carmichael (eds.), 240-263. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Turell, M.Teresa (ed.)

2001 *Multilingualism in Spain: Sociolinguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects of Linguistic Minority Groups*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Vik r, Lars

2000 Northern Europe: languages as prime markers of ethnic and national identity. In *Language and Nationalism in Europe*, S. Barbour and C. Carmichael (eds.), 105-129. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wande, Erling

1992 Ecological and linguistic aspects of Tornedal Finnish in Sweden. In *Minority Languages: the Scandinavian Experience*, G. Blom (ed.), 43-56. Oslo: Nordic Language Secretariat.

Winnifrith, Tom

1993 “The Vlachs of the Balkans: a rural minority which never achieved ethnic identity”. In *Roots of Rural Ethnic Mobilisation*, D. Howell (ed.), 58-73. Dartmouth: New York University Press.