

## University of Southampton Research Repository ePrints Soton

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g.

AUTHOR (year of submission) "Full thesis title", University of Southampton, name of the University School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

FACULTY OF LAW, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES

LANGUAGE, DISCOURSE & IDEOLOGY:  
THE *REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA* AND THE  
STANDARDISATION OF SPANISH

by

Darren J. Paffey

Thesis for the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

October 2008

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

**A B S T R A C T**

FACULTY OF LAW, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES

Doctor of Philosophy

**LANGUAGE, DISCOURSE & IDEOLOGY: THE *REAL ACADEMIA*  
*ESPAÑOLA* AND THE STANDARDISATION OF SPANISH**

by

Darren J. Paffey

This thesis aims to investigate the nature of ideologies of language, and specifically to understand what kinds of linguistic, social, political and historical factors impact upon and inform ideologies of standardisation. I consider the particular case of the Spanish language, and examine how public debates in Spain's press constitute discursive sites in which the ideologies of language authorities are evidenced. There are few studies which identify and critique the social actors in Spanish standardisation, and this thesis is a contribution to addressing that absence.

By adopting a Critical Discourse Analysis approach, I seek to relate the microstructures of texts from two of Spain's best-selling daily newspapers (*El País* and *ABC*) to the socio-political macrostructures in which press discourse is produced, and in which hegemonic ideologies underpin debates about Spanish. The press is a crucial vehicle of transmission in which language ideologies are staked out, and the large data corpus allows me to identify recurring aspects of discourse which become 'naturalised' and form 'common sense' beliefs about Spanish, its role, its authorities, and the practices of those who 'guard' the language.

The principal guardian of Spanish, the *Real Academia Española* (RAE), is the particular focus of this thesis. I interrogate RAE discourse and shed light on this institution's role in producing and maintaining a 'standard' Spanish in the contemporary context. Discourses of language unity and community are central, as are themes which form a vision of Spanish on an international scale. I argue that the RAE's discourse serves to reinforce its authority and leadership in standardisation. I further argue that this centralisation of linguistic authority is occurring simultaneously with a rescaling and expansion of standardisation practices which go beyond the nation-state paradigm in pursuit of a 'total Spanish' guided by 'panhispanic norms'. The role of other elite institutions in the panhispanic language policy is also legitimised in press discourse, with important social, cultural and commercial implications for not just Spain, but the entire Spanish-speaking world.

# CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Contents	ii
Declaration of Authorship	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii

## INTRODUCTION

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY	1
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	6

## CHAPTER 1

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (i): LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES 9

1.1	INTRODUCTION	9
1.2	CONCEPTUALISING IDEOLOGY	10
1.2.1	<i>Language, community and ideology</i>	10
1.2.2	<i>Definitions of ideology</i>	11
1.3	CONSTRUCTING LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY	14
1.3.1	<i>Linguistic factors</i>	14
1.3.2	<i>Socio-political factors</i>	16
1.3.3	<i>Historical factors</i>	17
1.3.4	<i>Dialectical factors: dominant vs. dominated ideologies</i>	18
1.4	CONTEXTUALISING LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY	21
1.4.1	<i>Historical specificity</i>	21
1.4.2	<i>Sites of ideology</i>	22
1.5	CONTROLLING IDEOLOGY	25
1.5.1	<i>Ideological brokers</i>	25
1.5.2	<i>Institutions and 'publics'</i>	27
1.6	IDEOLOGY WITHIN RESEARCH	30
1.7	SUMMARY	31

## CHAPTER 2

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (ii): STANDARD LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY 33

2.1	INTRODUCTION	33
2.2	LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION	34
2.2.1	<i>Writing</i>	34

2.2.2	<i>Hierarchy</i>	36
2.2.3	<i>Literacy</i>	38
2.3	NATIONALISM, DIALECT AND LANGUAGE	39
2.3.1	<i>Structure versus function</i>	40
2.3.2	<i>Population of speakers</i>	41
2.3.3	<i>Functions of standard language</i>	42
2.3.4	<i>Development of standardisation</i>	44
2.4	STANDARD LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY	49
2.4.1	<i>SLI as a process</i>	51
2.4.2	<i>SLI discourse</i>	57
2.4.3	<i>Sites of ideological discourse</i>	61
2.4.4	<i>SLI and 'prestige by transfer'</i>	64
2.4.5	<i>Mechanisms of SLI</i>	70
2.4.5.1	Language academies	71
2.4.5.2	Educational institutions	74
2.4.5.3	Media	76
2.4.5.4	Political/public life	80
2.5	SUMMARY	81

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY AND DATA: ANALYSING IDEOLOGIES IN PRESS DISCOURSE 83

3.1	INTRODUCTION	83
3.2	CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CDA)	85
3.2.1	<i>Introduction: development of CDA</i>	85
3.2.2	<i>CDA: general definitions and approaches</i>	86
3.2.3	<i>Defining discourse</i>	88
3.2.4	<i>Functions of discourse and the importance of context</i>	89
3.2.5	<i>Discourse and control</i>	91
3.2.6	<i>Agency</i>	92
3.2.7	<i>CDA as method</i>	93
3.3	CDA AND LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES	97
3.3.1	<i>Hidden agendas</i>	97
3.3.2	<i>Ideological vocabulary</i>	98
3.3.3	<i>Naturalisation</i>	98
3.3.4	<i>Sites of ideology</i>	99
3.3.5	<i>CDA and hegemony</i>	100
3.3.6	<i>Differences between CDA and Language Ideology</i>	100
3.3.7	<i>CDA: a guiding tool for ideological analysis</i>	101
3.3.8	<i>Metaphor analysis</i>	102
3.4	DATA	105
3.4.1	<i>Rationale</i>	105
3.4.1.1	<i>El País</i>	108
3.4.1.2	<i>ABC</i>	108
3.4.1.3	<i>Readerships</i>	109
3.4.1.4	<i>Periods of study</i>	111
3.4.2	<i>Data collection process and methods</i>	111
3.4.3	<i>Data Categorisation</i>	112
3.5	SUMMARY	114

<b>CHAPTER 4</b>		
<b>CONTEXT: LANGUAGE(S) IN SPAIN</b>		<b>116</b>
4.1	INTRODUCTION	116
4.2	SPANISH TODAY	116
4.2.1	<i>Linguistic configuration of Spain</i>	116
4.2.2	<i>Language policy in Spain</i>	120
4.2.3	<i>Spanish in the world</i>	122
4.3	THE REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA	123
4.3.1	<i>Foundations</i>	123
4.3.2	<i>Function</i>	125
4.3.3	<i>Status</i>	128
4.3.4	<i>Publications</i>	133
4.3.4.1	Dictionaries	133
4.3.4.2	Orthography	140
4.3.4.3	Grammar	140
4.3.4.4	Boletín de la RAE/Anejos	144
4.4	OTHER LANGUAGE AUTHORITIES	144
4.4.1	<i>Government and education</i>	145
4.4.2	<i>Instituto Cervantes</i>	147
4.4.3	<i>Media</i>	149
4.4.3.1	Television and film	150
4.4.3.2	Radio	153
4.4.3.3	Internet	154
4.4.3.4	Fundéu	156
4.4.4	<i>Style guides and affordable books</i>	158
4.5	SUMMARY	160
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>		
<b>THE UNITY OF THE SPANISH LANGUAGE AND COMMUNITY OF SPANISH-SPEAKERS</b>		<b>163</b>
5.1	INTRODUCTION	163
5.2	UNITY OF THE SPANISH LANGUAGE	164
5.2.1	<i>One common, unified language</i>	164
5.2.2	<i>Spanish as a factor of unity</i>	167
5.2.3	<i>Strengths and weaknesses of Spanish</i>	170
5.2.4	<i>The economic value of Spanish</i>	174
5.3	THE COMMUNITY OF SPANISH-SPEAKERS	176
5.4	UNITY AND COMMUNITY IN STANDARDISATION DISCOURSE	182
5.5	SUMMARY	187
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>		
<b>THE ROLE AND AUTHORITY OF THE REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA AND OTHER GUARDIANS OF SPANISH</b>		<b>189</b>
6.1	INTRODUCTION	189

6.2	THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE GUARDIANS IN STANDARDISATION	190
6.2.1	<i>The Real Academia Española</i>	190
6.2.2	<i>The King of Spain</i>	202
6.2.3	<i>The Instituto Cervantes</i>	204
6.2.4	<i>The Spanish media</i>	205
6.3	THE DISCURSIVE LEGITIMISATION OF ROLE AND AUTHORITY	206
6.3.1	<i>History</i>	207
6.3.2	<i>Authority</i>	209
6.3.3	<i>Agency</i>	211
6.4	SUMMARY	214
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>		
<b>THE SPANISH LANGUAGE IN THE WORLD</b>		<b>216</b>
7.1	INTRODUCTION	216
7.2	THE FRAMING OF DEBATES ABOUT SPANISH IN THE WORLD	217
7.2.1	<i>A language in expansion</i>	217
7.2.2	<i>A language of the future</i>	222
7.3	PLURICENTRIC SPANISH AND THE RAE	226
7.3.1	<i>Norms of pluricentric Spanish</i>	226
7.3.2	<i>El español común</i>	228
7.3.3	<i>Panhispanic Language Policy (PLP)</i>	231
7.4	TO WHOM DOES SPANISH 'BELONG'?	234
7.4.1	<i>Spain as a diminished linguistic power?</i>	234
7.4.2	<i>The shifting 'capitals' of Spanish</i>	238
7.4.3	<i>Spanish in the Americas</i>	239
7.4.4	<i>'La lengua de todos'</i>	241
7.5	SUMMARY	243
<b>CHAPTER 8</b>		
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>		<b>246</b>
8.1	THE IDEOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF 'STANDARD' SPANISH	246
8.2	THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF 'STANDARD' SPANISH	249
8.3	SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY	254
8.4	LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY	256
8.5	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	257
Notes		259
Appendix A: Fairclough's CDA questions		277
Appendix B: NVivo Data Analysis Categories		279
Primary Data References		281
Bibliography		287

# DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I, Darren James Paffey, declare that the thesis entitled '**Language, discourse and ideology: the *Real Academia Española* and the standardisation of Spanish**' and the work presented in the thesis are both my own, and have been generated by me as the result of my own original research. I confirm that:

- this work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
- where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
- where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
- where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
- I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
- where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
- parts of this work have been published as:

Paffey, D. (2007) Policing the Spanish language debate: verbal hygiene and the Spanish language academy (*Real Academia Española*). *Language Policy*, 6, 3-4, 313-332.

Paffey, D. (in press) Globalising standard Spanish: the promotion of 'panhispanism' by Spain's language guardians. In Johnson, S. & Milani, T. (eds) *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse: Texts, Practices, Policies*. London/New York: Continuum.

Paffey, D. & Mar-Molinero, C. (2009) Globalisation, linguistic norms and language authorities: Spain and the Panhispanic Language Policy. In Lacorte, M. & Leeman, J. (eds) *Español en Estados Unidos y otros contextos de contacto. Sociolingüística, ideología y pedagogía/ Spanish in the United States and other contact environments. Sociolinguistics, ideology and pedagogy*. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.

**Signed:** .....

**Date:**.....

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking all my colleagues in Modern Languages at the University of Southampton for supporting me in so many ways throughout my undergraduate, postgraduate and now my professional years. I truly am the student that just won't leave (!) and this is due in no small measure to the incredibly warm and supportive environment here. I am grateful for the teaching assistantship which not only funded this research project, but also kept me actively engaged with the full scope of activities here.

Thank you to my fellow PGRs with whom I have shared many enjoyable intellectual and social encounters. Whether in the classroom, conference hall or The Crown, I've benefited from your encouragements to push through to the end, and I'm glad to say I've reached it. Particular thanks go to Eleanor Quince who has, of late, answered many of my questions about the practicalities of putting this exhausting tome together. Thanks also to Susana for providing me with an invaluable and generous supply of coffee and chocolate, helping me to stay awake at key points in the writing of this thesis.

Clare Mar-Molinero has been nothing short of my inspiration for pursuing postgraduate studies. As my supervisor, Clare not only encouraged me to embark on the PhD in the first place, but subsequently opened every possible door and window of opportunity to help me achieve this. Alongside Clare, Patrick Stevenson has supported, guided and encouraged me throughout. Thank you both for helping me not just to complete a doctorate, but also to accumulate a wealth of additional academic experiences and to enjoy them all. You've set me up for life.

The sacrificial love and support of my parents, family and friends throughout my (many!) years of education have allowed me to pursue some of my dreams, and I will always be grateful to them for this. And finally, I'm immensely thankful for Nicki. Although you didn't choose to do a PhD, you've patiently and lovingly lived this experience with me (particularly at the editing stage!). Thanks for keeping me fed, watered, cared for, and constantly mindful that there's far more to life than the office.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASALE	<i>Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española</i>
CILE	<i>Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española</i>
CIN	<i>Comunidad Iberoamericana de Naciones</i>
DPD	<i>Diccionario panhispánico de dudas</i>
DRAE	<i>Diccionario de la Real Academia Española</i>
IC	<i>Instituto Cervantes</i>
PLP	<i>Política lingüística panhispánica</i>
RAE	<i>Real Academia Española</i>
SLI	Standard language ideology

## INTRODUCTION

El español vive uno de los mejores momentos de su historia, lo hablan más de 440 millones de personas y es idioma oficial en 21 países, asentándose además en Estados Unidos y Brasil. Expertos, académicos y gobernantes han tomado conciencia del valor cultural y económico que tiene como lengua y de la rentabilidad social que le puede sacar en el mundo de habla hispana.

(Miguel Ángel Noceda, *El País* 05-11-2006) <sup>1</sup>

### CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

The confident and positive outlook for the Spanish language encapsulated in this quotation provides the important context in which this study is situated. The Spanish language is seen to be growing today in terms of its number of speakers, its popularity as a choice for second language learners, the breadth of functions it is required to fulfil and the influence this language exerts as it 'competes' in a global market of languages. However, a series of significant interlinking questions can (and, I argue, *should*) be asked of the short text above and the various presuppositions embedded within it. Firstly, when we talk or read about *el español*, what exactly is meant by this term? Is this synonymous with or distinct from *castellano*, *español mexicano*, *español chileno*, and so on? To what extent does each of these form *el mundo de habla hispana*? To whom exactly is Spanish economically and culturally valuable? And who are these experts who have decided on its value?

Underpinning all of these questions are issues relating to the processes and events which have brought about the contemporary global configuration of the Spanish language and the Spanish-speaking world. As a starting point, this thesis is based on an understanding that *standardisation* provides an appropriate and profitable framework within which to consider the construction and development of the concepts and assumptions on which the *El País* extract is based, i.e. language, standard language, language spread, linguistic value and authority in language matters. The emergence of language standardisation as an ideology and a process was tied to nation-building periods of 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. At the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century however, if social, political, and economic ideologies and contexts have changed so drastically since those past centuries, it is important to identify what has changed (or remained the same) about the events and discourses of standardisation as such an enduring linguistic phenomenon.

It should be noted that my undertaking in this thesis is *not* to discuss whether it is 'right' or 'wrong' to have a standard language. Standardisation – as we shall see from the discussion - is a reality, a process which has been repeated in many speech communities on many different language varieties. There are undoubtedly advantages as well as disadvantages to the prescriptive practices of standardisation, but as Cameron claims:

We must shift the terrain for debates [...] so that instead of asking 'should we prescribe?' (a question Marenbon quite reasonably counters with another – 'what is the alternative?'), we pose searching questions about who prescribes for whom, what they prescribe, how and for what purposes.

(Cameron 1995:11)

One of the specific objectives of this study, then, is to contribute to the debate on language standardisation by understanding more about whose standards shape this process, and by what means. To date, there has been a lack of scholarship concerning these questions, and it is indeed an important absence

to address because of the way that language standards play such a crucial part in contemporary societies. As Lippi-Green comments:

there is little debate at all about who sets the standards for spoken and written language, standards which have been the focus of legislation, *standards which affect our everyday lives.*

(Lippi-Green 1997:6, my emphasis)

Not only does this thesis respond to Lippi-Green's observation by identifying a number of possible agents responsible for language standards that might be found in any given nation-state context, but it does so through considering the Spanish case in particular. This specific focus is necessary because of the gap in knowledge noted by Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman:

To date, in the Hispanic intellectual context, there has been a remarkable absence of in-depth critical studies of the ideological/political foundations and implications of linguistic standardization.

(Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002a:xiii)

This study seeks to contribute to a fuller recognition of how processes of standardisation are shaped in and by the contemporary context of the Spanish-speaking world, and how standardisation takes place and is spread through the activities of institutions founded in order to standardise the language, chief amongst these being the *Real Academia Espanola*. Assuming that – despite the ubiquity of dictionaries and other language guides in most Spanish homes, schools and workplaces – the forewords, prefaces and epilogues of the Academy's (and others') authoritative reference publications are seldom (if ever) read (Lodares 2005:114), it is argued in this thesis that the media is a primary vehicle for the spread of ideologies about the Spanish language. The newspaper media represents the tension between *national* and *transnational/global* levels: it is a product which is predominantly concerned with and distributed within individual nation-states, yet which must also reflect

global concerns and be accessible to a global readership through the export of printed copies and the availability of an internet version. As such, the press is a remarkably powerful and widespread vehicle of ideological transmission. I argue that it is an essential site of investigation because the story of language in its contemporary context is seen in practices which are, as Blommaert notes,

performed by identifiable actors, in very specific ways, and by means of very specific instruments.

(Blommaert 1999a:426)

The press, as I will show in this study, is one of those ‘very specific instruments’ by which the story of Spanish can be told, and in which language ideological debates take place. The concern of this thesis, then, is to understand how the discourse of language authorities in the Spanish press is permeated with ideological framings, presuppositions and expressions of the worldview of discourse producers. Fairclough’s argument is that ‘ideology is pervasively present in language’ (2001:2), and so the way in which language is used – as well as how it is discussed – in texts and overarching discourses related to the discussion of the Spanish language is fascinating domain in which to critically analyse texts and their ideological processes of production.

Of course the purpose of this thesis is not restricted to an academic exercise, and it is envisaged that the case study presented in these pages will necessarily trigger greater awareness of powerful social and linguistic processes at work within a number of domains, primarily language academies, schools, the press and wider society. First, in terms of the application to language academies, the questions raised and discussed in this thesis might usefully contribute to a change in the approach to regionally / nationally-marked lexical items in dictionaries and other standardising publications. Thus far, the RAE’s leadership and production of these has led to a Spain-centric focus, with items which are specific to other varieties from the Spanish-speaking world marked as such, but with Spain-specific items remaining unmarked, signalling their acceptance as part of a ‘default’ variety of Spanish. The reconfiguration of

standardisation discourse which has taken place, and which has come to characterise Spanish as a *global* language necessitates a re-thinking of concepts of language ownership and 'centres' of norms, and this thesis offers significant considerations as to why. Secondly, educational institutions have, as I shall argue, played an indispensable role in the construction, maintenance and progress of nation-states throughout the past few centuries, and continue to do so in the contemporary world. The general expectation is that schools promote particular sets of values and standards in order to shape a nation-state's future citizens. Such 'standards' include those related to 'acceptable' language varieties and are based on the implementation of implicit or explicit language policies which consequently influence attitudes to the different varieties. However, only through recognising the ideological nature of language attitudes can those within the education system – be they students, educators or policy-makers – come to an awareness of how dominant ideological discourses are enshrined in education curricula, textbooks and other educational materials which often drown out competing discourses. Acceptance or contestation of hegemonic ideologies should take place on the basis of a more informed understanding of how they work, and to this end, the present thesis seeks to describe how prominent conceptualisations of the Spanish language arrive at a position of hegemony. Thirdly, the findings of this study can be applied to the news media, and in particular to the readers/consumers of this highly influential means of mass communication. What is important here is that readers should be better informed as to how the principle arguments and textual features of press articles are structured, and consequently better equipped to discern how these arguments serve to naturalise the ideology of Spanish language standardisation, and spread this vision of language through the everyday press. Finally, this thesis can be applied to employment practices and other situations in which language use is often a criteria for success or failure due to the classification of a person's speech or writing as 'correct/right/acceptable' or 'incorrect/wrong/unacceptable'. In these cases, language can become a tool of exclusion and discrimination, and so it is vital

that we understand how standard language ideology works so as to be able to challenge it where it is in evidence.

## **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In order to investigate the specific aspects of language standardisation discourse in the press that I have discussed above, there are two overarching research questions which will guide my study:

1. What are the ideological and political factors which impact upon and inform:
  - a. public debates about language standardisation?
  - b. the debates and practices of standardising institutions and agencies?
  
2. What is the nature of the ideological debates and discursive contestations surrounding 'standard' Spanish?

The analytical framework I will be using to consider data from the Spanish press is based on Critical Discourse Analysis, and this approach requires a number of more focused questions to be asked of the data texts. Under the second research question, I add the following sub-questions:

- a. How is Spanish defined and referred to linguistically?
- b. How are the speakers of Spanish defined and referred to linguistically?
- c. Who controls and influences the standards for spoken and written Spanish?
- d. What is the role of language guardians (Cameron's (1995) 'verbal hygienists') in the process of producing and maintaining a 'standard' variety of Spanish?
- e. In particular, how does the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) discursively legitimise its role and authority in the process of standardisation?

- f. What discursive strategies are employed by the RAE through the press to frame ideological debates about Spanish in the world?
- g. How does the RAE react to the various norms of pluricentric Spanish?
- h. According to the RAE, to whom is Spanish perceived to 'belong'?

In order to answer these questions, I begin in Chapter 1 with a synthesis of the main arguments and definitions regarding language ideology. I discuss how definitions of language ideology are constructed on the basis of the dialectical relationship between linguistic, socio-political and historical factors. I also show how language ideologies are not merely attitudes or mental perceptions, but they emerge from – and equally, transform – the particular real-world situations in which they arise.

Chapter 2 builds on the framework of language ideology by concentrating on the ideology of standardisation, and situating the emergence of this specific ideology in its socio-historical context. I explore the work of key scholars on language standardisation, and show how this framework has underpinned efforts to establish and maintain a 'common' language in nation-state contexts for centuries past. I also begin to identify the mechanisms and agents of standard language ideology, pointing to their discourses and practices as key sites in which implicit representations of their ideology can be located.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodological and analytical approach I intend to follow in order to examine discursive representations of standardisation ideology in the press. After defining and discussing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), and problematising the notion of discourse which is so central to it, I make the link between CDA and language ideologies and demonstrate the appropriateness of my chosen methodology. I go on to describe the data collection, and explain the rationale for selecting the two primary sources, *El País* and *ABC*.

Chapter 4 traces the history of 'standard' Spanish and the primary influences on the development of this language variety up to the present day, in order to set this study in its contemporary social context. My discussion of the

RAE follows, establishing my focus on identifying the agents of institutional ideologies and practices. The final part of the chapter considers the role of other language authorities in Spain, and deals with these institutions insofar as they relate to the RAE, as well as outlining the legislative, education and media tools these institutions employ in the pursuit of 'standard' Spanish.

In Chapter 5, I begin the data analysis by considering how 'unity' and 'community' are central themes in language guardians' definitions of Spanish and its speakers. Critical analysis of the data in this chapter reveals the linguistic strategies employed by language ideological agents in press discourse, and how these strategies contribute to the achievement of social, political and psychological aims.

Chapter 6 will discuss the role and authority of the RAE as this is established in the press. I consider how this authority is established in order to discursively legitimise and perpetuate ongoing standardisation practices, which are also undergoing significant changes. Furthermore, I illustrate how this discourse is led by the RAE but involves a network of authorities including the other Spanish language Academies, the King of Spain, the *Instituto Cervantes* and Spain's media organisations.

In Chapter 7, my attention turns to the Spanish language in the world as I consider how the RAE frames discussions of the language – its shape, value and frailties – in relation to the global context. Issues related to the representation of pluricentric Spanish and its various norms are considered, as well as the notion of the 'ownership' of Spanish, and I analyse how the RAE's responses to these are manifested in press discourse. The question of language authorities and their objectives in collaborative practices and policies are discussed throughout.

Chapter 8, the concluding chapter, is where I draw together the various strands of the preceding discussion and outline the findings of the data analysis in order to offer answers to my research questions. I draw the thesis to a close with some reflections on the significance and limitations of this study and some indication of potential new avenues of research that might follow this one.



# 1

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (*i*): LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES**

### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

The aim of this first chapter is to synthesise some of the main arguments in the debates surrounding language ideology as a concept. The discussion will draw on the seminal works in this relatively new field of research in order to firstly consider the various contributions that have been made. I will, in addition, comment on the usefulness of these works not only in a general discussion, but also with my more limited focus on language standardisation debates in mind. I begin by looking at how scholars have sought to define and conceptualise the general concept of ideology. I then consider how definitions of language ideology in particular are constructed on the basis of dialectical relationships between linguistic, socio-political and historical factors. The importance of context in understanding language ideologies is the topic of my next section, in which I discuss scholarly views on the siting of language ideology. After this, I consider the question of who controls the establishment, development and diffusion of language ideologies. And in closing, I share some brief reflections on the myth of academic neutrality and the ideological stance inherent in research. Throughout the chapter, it is my intention to synthesise principal scholarship in order to construct an understanding of language ideological issues which will then serve to frame the remaining theoretical discussion and later empirical work of this project.

## 1.2 CONCEPTUALISING IDEOLOGY

Much of the initial debate on language ideology has developed within the scholarly discipline of anthropology, or more specifically, anthropological linguistics. The fact that this debate has arisen from the scientific study of human society and behaviour suggests that, however we define 'language ideology' itself, it cannot be sufficiently regarded as a matter of ideas or attitudes about language structure alone, nor simply a study of individual responses to language.

### 1.2.1 *Language, community and ideology*

The very nature of language as (not only, but primarily) a means of human communication indicates that it is a *common* system of expression used *within a community*. Thoughts, desires, instructions and beliefs are just some of the notions we express using language, be it written or spoken.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, language does not simply serve a functional purpose, but has been used historically as a *symbol* of identity and belonging; it is here we begin to understand language use as an expression of adherence to one group and distinction from another. Such a community will, following the discourse of nationalism, generally share one common idiom, and the resulting 'imagined community' is widely (though not universally) accepted as the *nation* (Anderson 1983). It follows that language is perceived as an important identity marker, identifying an individual as part of the nation and identifying one particular nation as different from all others (for further discussion of language and national identity, see Mar-Molinero 2000b:7-16).

The relationship between language and nation is by no means as simple as this brief introduction would suggest. As is inevitable within any community, a great diversity of opinions and choices emerges, and this is evident through the choices people make about how to use language, and even which language or language variety to use. What tends to emerge is a set of common ideas or *ideologies* around which smaller groups or 'micro-communities' converge, and inevitably the projection of each group's ideology becomes a matter of agreement, contestation and hegemony as each vies for legitimacy and power.

### 1.2.2 *Definitions of ideology*

At this point, some attempt at defining ideology would be useful, though as Eagleton reminds us (Eagleton 1991:1), we must take care to not simply endorse just one of the number of helpful meanings that commentators have offered. Indeed, as this chapter will attempt to show, divergent conceptualisations of language ideology reveal a number of different ways in which ideology itself is problematised.

Woolard, introducing language ideology as a field of inquiry, identifies four recurring themes in contemporary usage of the term 'ideology'. These can be summarised as: 1) ideology as an ideational concept, a system of beliefs and ideas which emphasises the mental, intellectual phenomena involved in consciously constructing an evaluative framework of the world around us; 2) ideology as a response to lived experience, a way of ordering our reflections and interests based on social position and dependent on interaction with the material world; 3) a combination of ideas and practices, the purpose of which is constrained by the struggle to obtain and secure power relations; and 4) the perception of ideology as illusion, distorted and rationalised in order to defend existing structures of hegemony (1998:5-9).

Woolard's discussion and analysis of the various perspectives draws value from her acknowledgement of the different values of the term: neutral and negative. Conspicuously omitting any examination of a 'positive' use of the term, she posits that:

The great divide in studies of ideology lies between the second and third conceptual foci, between neutral and negative values of the term. Uses that focus on power and/or distortion share a fundamental critical stance toward ideology; [...] More globalizing and intellectualizing approaches apply the term broadly to all cultural conceptual schemata and are noncommittal on the truth value of ideology.

(Woolard 1998:7-8)

Woolard's second 'conceptual focus' (a neutral view of ideology as dependent on human experience) is, in her view, the most widely agreed-upon (1998:6) and yet she observes that the third (negative, power-related) focus still holds sway in certain sections of the scholarly community, notably in the work of the social theorist, Michel Foucault.

Tony Bex, echoing much of Foucault's thinking and terminology in this matter, argues that while some theorists are content to generally employ 'ideology' in reference to schemes of shared public discourse (Woolard's 'more globalizing and intellectualizing approach'), he reserves the term for 'organised and largely coherent sets of ideas which can be clearly articulated' (Bex 1996:200). While Bex's definition could be viewed as falling somewhere between the second and third conceptual foci outlined above, this position aligns itself more with the third by restricting 'ideology' to the notion of power-associated discourse. It seems that in the arguments of Foucault and Bex, subaltern discourse is excluded from classification as ideology *per se*, and by inference remains unorganised, incoherent and unarticulated. This particular conclusion, I would suggest, is untenable given my earlier observation that communities are formed partly through common *practice*, and that through variation within practice, divergent ideologies are formed. Their nature as part of a social *process* would, in contrast to Bex's emphasis, suggest that there is room, within an otherwise common framework, for there to exist contradictions, assumptions, unarticulated ideas and underlying beliefs. I align myself more with Blommaert who writes:

It is not always the State that is the main actor, and neither are all attempts at hegemony aimed at maximizing (malevolent) control over the polity. In a similar vein, the hegemony of one ideology does not necessarily imply total consensus or total homogeneity. On the contrary, ambiguity and contradiction may be key features of every ideology, and subjects' adherence to one ideology or another is often inconsistent or ambivalent.

(Blommaert 1999b:11)

While, as Blommaert suggests, it may not always be the State that is the main actor, those groups that establish ideological hegemony are often linked to the state or are one of a number of *institutions* whose authority is based on their dominant discourse and the acceptance of this by dominated groups. Much of this framework comes from the work of Antonio Gramsci (1971), an Italian Marxist who laid the foundations of our understanding about the role of institutions in securing ideological hegemony in society. This particular aspect of his work was later expanded in relation to the media by Herman and Chomsky, who encapsulated the Gramscian concept well in the title of their work, 'Manufacturing Consent' (2002) .

Returning to Blommaert's conception of ideology, in the light of his focus on situating the development of ideologies in their historiographical context, he logically includes the social processes by which ideology is formed amongst non-hegemonic groups – as well as hegemonic ones. In contrast, Briggs (1998) shares Foucault's concern that analysts' emphasis on ideology as a valid label for non-dominant collective ideas and signifying practices risks 'reifying the perspective of only a sector of a community' (cited in Woolard 1998:9). Briggs' argument, although a valid concern for academic integrity, seems to defend what would only be an arbitrary numerical 'cut-off point' after which a so-called 'sector' would win the right to call its views an ideology.

While perhaps more discussion of the distinction between 'opinion' and 'ideology' might be helpful, Blommaert argues that delimiting ideology on the basis of its consistency and coherence is neither necessary nor possible, given observable ambiguities in subjects' ideologies (1999b:11, also Blommaert and Verschueren 1998:189-210).

What I wish to highlight here is that it is possible to conceive of two categories of ideology: dominant and dominated; under the same definition of ideology, these might be unequivocal or ambiguous, unanimous or contested, subjacent or explicit. The tension of where ideology is sited is, as Woolard observes, a recurring theme of much academic analysis.

As we move on in this next section to consider how ideology is produced, our focus will narrow from a general discussion to a more specific consideration of how commentators have debated the ideology of language.

### 1.3 CONSTRUCTING LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY

Before analysing some of the ways in which language ideology is formed and functions, I will clarify how we can apply our discussion above to the concept of an ideology of *language* in particular.

One potential source of confusion worth clarifying at the outset is our key term and its alternatives. The expressions 'language ideology', 'linguistic ideology' and 'ideology of language' are, for the most part, used interchangeably throughout this discussion. Some would recognise, however, that 'linguistic ideology' may be construed as referring more to the 'pure' linguistic structure of language, that is, beliefs about phonetic variation within standard/non-standard language, grammaticality issues, and so on. While this is acknowledged here, on reflection I do not believe this to be a widespread difference of understanding, and certainly does not warrant a distinction in my synonymous usage of the terms. Should any particular nuances occur, these will be signalled explicitly. For a brief overview of how other scholars have interpreted the differences in terminology, see Woolard (1998).

#### 1.3.1 *Linguistic factors*

I turn now to consider a number of contributions towards a working definition of language ideology. Woolard begins her analysis of ideology by explaining that:

Representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world are what we mean by 'language ideology.'

(Woolard 1998:3)

This brief explanation is somewhat vague, and given that it precedes her discussion of a general conceptualisation of ideology, it is unlikely that her intention was to be comprehensive. Nevertheless, what this does underline is that language not only serves as an identity marker but also as a means of organising people into groups according to those 'representations'.

Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman write:

We consider a language ideology to include a vision of the linguistic configuration of a specific community, as well as the reasoning that first, produces that vision, and second, justifies its value.

(Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002c:11)

What emerges from these definitions is that ideology is shaped, individually and collectively, by a set of attitudes ('a vision') regarding the historical role, usefulness, value and quality of a language or language variety. Furthermore, as Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman stress, the presence of variety within and between languages leads to justification of an ideology, achieved by judgements on the relationship between these various communicative systems. Kroskrity's view helps us to begin to envisage on what basis these judgements are made.

For him:

...it is profitable to think of 'language ideologies' as a cluster concept consisting of a number of converging dimensions.

(Kroskrity 2000a:7)

Although many languages have historically – in the Herderian tradition – been valued by their writers and speakers as having 'natural' intrinsic qualities of grandeur and splendour, it is more often in situations of language contact that value judgements come to the fore (see Joseph 1987:30). The sense of identification with one's mother tongue is heightened by the proximity of a different language and its society of speakers. However, it is rarely a simple preference for one particular linguistic form or style or structure that leads to competition between languages. The construction of language ideologies from

'converging dimensions' is an important factor in understanding why, on contact, different ideologies lead to conflict. As Woolard highlights, 'ideologies of language are not about language alone' (1998:3).

### *1.3.2 Socio-political factors*

In his overview of the development of language ideology within anthropological research, Kroskrity stresses this multiplicity of social dimensions with which language interacts in shaping ideologies of language:

...[L]anguage ideologies are profitably conceived as multiple because of the multiplicity of meaningful social divisions...within sociocultural groups that have the potential to produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group membership.

(Kroskrity 2000a:12)

As a result, he argues, dimensions such as class, gender, clan, elites and generations inform and influence the worldviews – including social, political, linguistic – that social groups develop and construct from their lived experiences. To this it seems necessary to add other factors such as education, ethnicity, cultural practices and religion which affect the construction of a language ideology.

Since the recent rise of scholarly interest in this field, identification of the social practices in which language acquisition, use and development are rooted have provoked critical reflection on the relationship between social structures and forms of talk (see for example Cameron 1995, Hodge and Kress 1979). As I observed earlier, language as a medium of communication not only carries functional meaning, but also indexes characteristics and values common to individuals or groups of speakers, such as educational experience, family background, moral instruction, political persuasion and authority structures. Kroskrity highlights this, saying:

Language users' ideologies bridge their sociocultural experience and their linguistic and discursive resources by constituting those linguistic and discursive forms as indexically tied to features of their sociocultural experience.

(Kroskrity 2000a:21)

### 1.3.3 *Historical factors*

We have seen, then, how the particular social situation of an individual or community and their interaction with the materiality of human existence forms the framework they employ to understand and evaluate many facets of life in general, and (as regards this study) language in particular. It should be apparent from the discussion so far that any analysis of contemporary language attitudes will necessarily reveal evidence of the 'cultural and historical specificity' by which construals of language are forged in the society of that time (Woolard 1998:4).

According to Blommaert (1999b), recent academic interrogation has failed to construct a 'historiography of language ideologies'.<sup>3</sup> In his excellent introduction to the edited work *Language Ideological Debates*, he frames the later empirical chapters with a call to adopt methodology in language ideology research which will better take into account the human and historical context in which ideologies arise. He goes on to explain:

They [language ideological debates] develop against a wider sociopolitical and historical horizon of relationships of power, forms of discrimination, social engineering, nation-building and so forth. Their outcome always has connections with these issues as well: the outcome of a debate directly or indirectly involves forms of conflict and inequality among groups of speakers: restrictions on the use of certain languages/varieties, the loss of social opportunities when these restrictions are not observed by speakers, the negative stigmatization of certain languages/varieties, associative labels attached to

languages/varieties. Language ideological debates are part of more general sociopolitical processes...

(Blommaert, 1999:2)

From the literature reviewed so far, it is evident that language ideology is 'derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experience or interests of a particular social position' (Woolard 1998:6). Real people live in real communities and have real responses to their perceptions of real situations – language ideology is formed by the interplay of these social realities.

#### 1.3.4 *Dialectical factors: dominant vs. dominated ideologies*

The notion of interplay is important in understanding the reflexive nature of ideology formation. Ideology does not simply serve as some kind of metanarrative – a way of describing the thoughts, attitudes and practices amongst language users – but to some extent functions as a constitutive element of society. Woolard, inspired by the writings of Eagleton (1991), writes:

The point is not just to analyze and critique the social roots of linguistic ideologies but to analyze their efficacy, the way *they transform the material reality they comment on*. The emphasis is on what Eagleton, harking back to Austin's speech act theory, calls the performative aspect of ideology under its constative guise: *ideology creates and acts in a social world while it masquerades as a description of that world* (1991:19).

(Woolard 1998:11, my emphases)

Her comments here add to our established view of language ideology as highly contextual by defining the relationship between language and social relations as reciprocal. The 'converging dimensions' of social phenomena determine the variety of language and the attitudes towards it of its speakers, as well as speakers of other languages. Furthermore, discourse about language – the expression of individual and collective beliefs about how people ought to communicate – is, as Woolard argues, not a purely descriptive activity. As

ideology takes root, either in habitual practice or in evaluative discourse, its reciprocal nature means that the former affects the latter, and vice versa.

Woolard again emphasises that:

Ideology – not as ideas so much as construed practice – is consequential, for both social and linguistic process [...]

(Woolard 1998:10-11)

Silverstein goes some way to confirming this, suggesting that:

The total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of language, is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms contextualized to situations of interested human use and mediated by the fact of cultural ideology.

(Silverstein 1985:220, cited in Kroskrity 2000a:21)

Although perhaps not explicit here, Silverstein does acknowledge the role of ideology in shaping the context of the 'total linguistic fact'. He rightly views ideology as a mediatory site for interpreting values placed on language as part of a cultural system, although his use here of the term 'mediated' omits any suggestion that ideology can be causative. Elsewhere, Silverstein is paraphrased by Rumsey:

Language structure and ideology are not entirely independent of each other, nor is either determined entirely by the other.

(Rumsey 1990:357, cited in Woolard 1998:12)

This emphasis on the dynamic and mutually compelling effects of both ideology and usage of language is perhaps summarised most succinctly by Woolard and Schieffelin:

Linguistic ideology is not a predictable, automatic reflex of the social experience of multilingualism in which it is rooted; it makes its own contribution as an interpretive filter in the relationship of language and society.

(Woolard and Schieffelin 1994:62)

To the 'social experience of multilingualism', we could, in this case, include situations where two or more varieties of a single language and the multiple ideologies underlying them are in contact.

The discursive construction of language ideologies is not usually a matter of a neat, organised exchange of viewpoints, calmly debated and agreed upon. Indeed, few (if any) debates evolve in this way, particularly not at nation-state level where, largely since the nation-building projects of the nineteenth-century, contentious issues of language, nation and identity have been discussed and legislated upon. As Kroskrity comments:

As in Gramscian (1971) models of state-endorsed hegemonic cultures, there is always struggle and adjustment between states and their opponents, so that even 'dominant' ideologies are dynamically responsive to ever-changing forms of opposition.

(Kroskrity 2000a:13)

What I am suggesting here is that where one particular language ideology is dominant within state institutions, this becomes the dominant one in wider public language debates (certainly in terms of power, even if not in grassroots popular belief). However, one ideology's dominance over another does not necessarily render the dominated belief obsolete. Characterising dominant ideologies as 'dynamically responsive', as Kroskrity does, reflects my earlier claim that ideology originates with human beings and their relationships with society, and is thus a matter of experience, belief, debate, contestation, struggle and adaptation. Thus dominated ideologies are critical to the dialectical nature of ideological discourse: it is obvious that without the existence of counter-

discourses there could be no interaction between these and the dominant discourses.

Ricento draws out this theme of reflexivity between 'dominant' and 'dominated' in comments relating to language ideology and policy. In his edited volume (2000b), Ricento summarises Pennycook's findings which claim that in colonial and post-colonial contexts, ideological debates between the colonial 'centre' and the colonised 'periphery' are not simply one-way (Ricento 2000a:5-6). On the contrary they are, as Gramsci suggests, a matter of struggle and adjustment, and not just in (ex-)colonial settings. Indeed, it is possible to argue that in other circumstances, the 'centre' equates to the dominant ideology and the 'periphery' can similarly be likened to dominated counter-ideologies; on both sides, the conceptualisation and construction of language ideologies are dialectic and discursive in nature.

## **1.4 CONTEXTUALISING LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY**

### **1.4.1 *Historical specificity***

If we are to understand the foundations of language ideology, it is clear from the discussion so far that these cannot be deduced from explicit textual/discourse analysis alone. Indeed, it is impossible to separate ideologies of language from the social, political and historical context in which they develop. Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman write of these same foundations, and to them add cultural and economic considerations which underpin language and discourse on language (2002c:11). Blommaert's espousal, mentioned earlier, of a historiographical approach to investigating language ideology is also based on this premise. He writes:

The fact is that discourses, texts, talk all have their 'natural history' – a chronological and sociocultural anchoring which produces meaning and social effects in ways that cannot be reduced to text-characteristics alone. Context, in this approach, is historical and the dynamics of textualization is not restricted to the event in which discourse is produced and exchanged.

Every event – dynamic and processual in itself – is situated as part of a tradition of events, and this tradition contributes heavily to what happens in each concrete event.

(Blommaert 1999b:5-6)

Blommaert's rationale for including preceding and surrounding events in the study of language ideologies is that ideologies do not construct themselves in a vacuum. On the contrary, the actions and decisions of individuals – historically, socially and politically informed – contribute to events which both construct and are constructed by ideology.

Regarding these traditions of ideological events and their historicity, Bex observes that:

The discursive practices of a given society always contain traces of the history of that society...and therefore contain traces of the struggles which have allowed one kind of discursive practice to dominate over another.

(Bex 1996:60)

This observation raises the issue of a dominant ideology, and I will expand on this point when considering standard vs. non-standard language in chapter 2.

#### **1.4.2 *Sites of ideology***

The question remains, though, as to where we can find evidence of these ideological discursive practices. Common practice amongst investigators is to talk of the 'siting' of ideology, and Woolard suggests three specific contexts where we might look to identify ideological practices in language (1998:9-11): linguistic practices, metapragmatic discourse and implicit metapragmatics. The first of these, linguistic practices, focuses on how ideologies are naturalised and expressed through linguistic usage. I take this at a fairly broad level to signify decisions such as the choice (or lack thereof) of which language to use in given situations in, say, bilingual contexts (for example the use of Castilian or Catalan

in Catalonia). Linguistic practices as sites of ideology would also include examples such as the choice of register which is deemed 'appropriate' in a given sociosituational context (Holmes 1992). Language practices can inform and shape ideology by taking the status quo and reifying it not just through repetition, but through justifying existing linguistic configurations.

The second site where ideology is found is in metapragmatic discourse. This is 'talk about talk' – explicit discussion, evaluation, and planning about how speakers both *use* language and *ought* to use it. Metapragmatic discourse usually takes place within circles of so-called 'experts', and often through discussion which may then be published in printed format. Blommaert refers to these processes as language ideological debates, and points to the textual nature of the debating process, treating spoken debate as 'text':

In the light of the textual nature of the process, it would be accurate to characterize debates as historical episodes of textualization, as histories of texts in which a struggle is waged between various texts and metatexts.

(Blommaert 1999b:9)

With echoes from Anderson's concept of 'print capitalism' (1983) and its role in nation-building ideology and discourse, Blommaert argues that ideology can be successfully spread through firstly entextualising the debate. Then – through acceptance as a canon of language ideology – these texts can become cornerstones of language definition and usage; the 'locus of ideology (re)production' within their respective language communities (Blommaert 1999b:10, see also Fairclough 2001).

The third site of language ideology that Woolard suggests is implicit metapragmatics, which she goes on to define as:

...linguistic signalling that is part of the stream of language use in process and that simultaneously indicates how to interpret that language-in-use.

(Woolard 1998:9)

It could be argued that this siting is where language users employ linguistic strategies (e.g. questions, interruptions, (im)politeness) to reinforce symmetrical or asymmetrical social relations and their corresponding forms of talk. As regards asymmetrical social relations, language ideologies which reflect these can often be seen more in institutional discourse (e.g. police interrogations, medical consultations) where assumptions about the relative authority of different interlocutors and their roles/rights within spoken discourse are well established and ritualised (Fairclough 2001: Ch.2). Such ideology would rarely be expressed in any written regulations, as would be the case in the metapragmatic discourse of media style guides for example. Rather, a critical analysis of both linguistic markers and the discourse context in which they occur should reveal implicit ideological strategies. It is important to note that ideologies sited in implicit pragmatic markers are not simply embedded in the discourse itself, but, as Kroskrity observes, 'rarely rise to discursive consciousness' (paraphrased by Woolard 1998:9).

What should be clear by this point is that locating ideology gives rise to various 'tensions', as Woolard describes them (1998:6). In the numerous possible ideological loci discussed in this section, we might observe explicit or implicit evidence of ideology – which may itself be in a dominant or contending position – held by individuals or institutions that may or may not be consciously aware of their underlying ideologies and any resulting representation. In whatever understanding we might gain of ideologies of language, it is critical that we contextualise their construction and take into account the historical, political, social and other factors under which these beliefs and practices are formed and conditioned.

Having considered the importance of recognising the context in which ideologies are formed and perpetuated, I turn in this next section to a

discussion of how particular agencies and actors are involved in the metapragmatic discourse which contributes to language ideological debates.

## **1.5 CONTROLLING IDEOLOGY**

One central premise apparent from much of the contemporary debate on language ideology is that the nature of all living languages is to vary and change (Lippi-Green 1997:8) Variationist studies have shown how key variables such as gender, age, class, education, networks, geography, attitudes, function and context lead to the production of language varieties and the embedding of these in particular linguistic communities. What is equally crucial to understand, and is already widely acknowledged amongst scholars, is that however much romanticising its literary enthusiasts might engage in, a language does not have any kind of organic 'life' of its own apart from its users (see Silverstein 1985 and comments above). Indeed, it is the act of spoken and written discourse which keeps a language alive; changes of habits are what cause it to adapt; standardisation, education and literacy are what consolidate and perpetuate its current (and changing) form. Moreover, the decisions taken by individuals with effects at personal or state level – based on the opportunities (or lack of) to make use of one's language(s) – are the catalysts of language survival or demise. This raises questions of particular significance to this study: who influences or controls the linguistic 'climate', i.e. public attitudes to the configuration of languages used within a particular society? How are language attitudes formed and informed? How do these attitudes spread? Not only is the question of agency in shaping and proliferating language ideology the basis of my particular study; it is an essential question with much to contribute to the unfolding body of knowledge in this field.

### **1.5.1 Ideological brokers**

As Lippi-Green notes:

...there is little debate at all about who sets the standards for spoken and written language, standards which have been the focus of legislation, standards which affect our everyday lives.

(Lippi-Green 1997:6)

What emerges from comments such as these (see also Blommaert 1999c, Gal and Woolard 2001, Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002a) is the need to shift our perception of the sources of ideology from the very general societal movements to more specific agents. Following his argument for a conception of language debates rooted more in their historical contexts, Blommaert suggests that the next step is to identify the agents who hold authority to establish and occupy discursive space for ideological debates (1999b:7-9). For Blommaert, these 'ideological brokers' include 'politicians and policy-makers, interest groups, academicians, policy implementers, the organized polity, individual citizens'(1999b:9). The constraints of this investigation make it impossible to consider taking all of these groups as case studies; the empirical work will, however, seek to acknowledge where certain groups may be categorised as key language ideologues in the Spanish context.

It is important, then, to stress how agency necessarily plays a major part in my discussion of language ideology. I have shown that ideologies are derived from social interaction within a historical context. Moreover, interaction such as this has, over the course of history, given rise to varying forms of societal organisation which generally comprise a number of 'institutions'. Blommaert calls these 'social reproduction systems' (1999:10): hardly surprising when we consider that these institutions – schools, government, military, justice, culture and media to name but a few – have assumed responsibility for regulating and reproducing the 'foundations of a society' (most frequently within the structure of a nation-state). It is within these institutions that language ideologies often originate and frequently spread; in other words, they become loci where ideologies of language are anchored, and from where they are consequently disseminated through institutional activities (Blommaert 1999b:15).

As organised societies have developed public spheres in which common debates are held, these public institutions have not only used language to communicate and contribute to debate, but have actually come to define the boundaries of public discourse. Although these institutions frequently work to establish the same ideologies, they may also develop divergent perspectives of language. Gal and Woolard describe these public bodies as ‘social sources of authority for diverse definitions of language phenomena’ (2001:10). In my own British context (even in the writing of this thesis), I find that it is to the perceived authority of the Oxford English Dictionary that I turn in order to clarify definitions or spelling; it is to the pronunciation of the BBC newsreader that I compare my own and others’ accents; and it is the rebuke of not a few school teachers that still influences my conceptualisation of what supposedly constitutes ‘good’ English. However, I am increasingly aware that these institutions do not have a monopoly on ideas, even if they do on widespread dissemination of their particular views. More recent developments in regional television have introduced presenters with (often very slightly) more localised accents, promoting the stance (and its underlying ideology) that public communication need not always be in the prestigious ‘Queen’s English’ accent. We can deduce from this that within the public sphere there exists at least some representation of an ideology which transmits a message of inclusion and value of non-standard varieties. Speakers of regional accents may regard a local newsreader as ‘one of us’, and so language becomes a political resource to enhance public opinion of a given configuration of language varieties and their social associations.

### ***1.5.2 Institutions and ‘publics’***

The idea that languages are sociocultural and political resources leads Blommaert to conclude that, in tracing the development of languages through a historiographical approach, language history:

*...should be a story of different, conflicting, disharmonious practices performed by identifiable actors, in very specific ways, and by means of very*

*specific instruments*. Crucial evolutions in the history of languages have to be located in 'real' space and time, that is, in socioculturally and politically molded space and time.

(Blommaert 1999a:426, my emphasis)

In arguing that history ought to account for the ideologies and ensuing actions of individual people and institutions, Blommaert acknowledges that there has been a lack of this in linguistic scholarship to date. Another key commentator, Fairclough, relates this obfuscation of agency and ideology to the process of 'naturalisation' in which:

...discourse types actually appear to *lose* their ideological character. A naturalized type tends to be perceived not as that of a particular grouping within the institution, but as simply that of the institution itself.

(Fairclough 2001:76, original emphasis)

The construction of 'common-sense' arguments surrounding particular language ideologies – achieved through naturalisation and subsequent 'loss' of ideological character – does not, however, stop at the level of the institution. On the contrary, social institutions involved in promulgating naturalised, dominant linguistic ideologies do so in a way that does not necessarily associate ideology with themselves, but with public reality, with the status quo, with 'common-sense' and fact. Highlighting this, Gal and Woolard write:

One theme that has been developed in Habermasian studies is that publics derive their authority from being in a sense anonymous...They supposedly or potentially include everyone but abstract from each person's interest-bearing and privately defined characteristics. By this reasoning, publics can represent everyone because they are no-one-in-particular.

(Gal and Woolard 2001:6)

It is this strategy of veiling language ideology behind the notion of the all-inclusive yet anonymous 'public' that has, to date, often made it difficult to identify ideology brokers. Nonetheless, contemporary scholarship has begun to change this, and I view the continued questioning of underlying ideologies and ideologues as entirely necessary if we are to understand more about how language practices and wider social processes correlate and are influenced by particular individuals and institutions.

Gal and Woolard offer an analysis of the perceived anonymity of ideological movements:

This disinterested, disembodied public, a form of aperspectival objectivity, was constructed against the personified and embodied legitimacy of the absolutist monarch, whose authority was often enacted exactly through spectacle and self-display.

(Gal and Woolard 2001:6)

Furthermore, they go on to suggest that:

The notion of public need not even rely on the idea of a concrete readership or spectatorship, but rather on the projection or imagination of groups or subjectivities in print or other mass media.

(Gal and Woolard 2001:8)

This combination of historicity and agency underlines what I have discussed above in relation to the context in which ideologies of language are structured. What I also wish to highlight is that, as Gal and Woolard suggest here, a sense of agency and responsibility is lost by projecting an ideology into the often anonymous realm of print and media.

DiGiacomo refers to the printed press as a locus of 'authoritative entextualization' (1999:105), alluding to its importance in language ideological discourse. In summarising DiGiacomo's work, Blommaert describes how:

In newspapers, 'things happen': people choose sides, quote and comment, represent, criticize, and they do all this through influential channels that articulate a 'massive' voice – the presumed voice of the masses.

(Blommaert 1999b:16)

The consequence of this fluidity of exchange within the press is that, along with other printed media, it is highly instrumental in forming, debating and reforming ideology. This observation can be added to my earlier reflections on the dialectic relationship between language ideology and its sociocultural and historical context, in order to emphasise the different contextual forces and distinct actors that play a part in language processes. Hence, in my case study, I will examine how such debates are played out in 'texts' as Blommaert defines them, i.e. discourse – printed or spoken – that has been entextualised by an ideological agent which in this case is the *Real Academia Española*.

In this last section, we have considered the way in which agency and responsibility are lost through anonymous print-based proliferation. This should not lead us to conclude, however, that dominant ideologies have no direct personal or institutional source, or that they are merely 'common-sense'. On the contrary, they are 'grounded in social experience and often demonstrably tied to [the agent's] political-economic interests.' (Kroskrity 2000a:8). We should instead seek to understand how such conclusions block open debate on the legitimacy of alternative, dominated ideologies.

## **1.6 IDEOLOGY WITHIN RESEARCH**

One issue which is worth noting in brief at this point is that of my own ideologies as a researcher and the role these play in any analysis undertaken. It is clear that ideology becomes institutionalised and that higher education institutions are by no means exempt from this phenomenon. As much as academic analysis might be presented as a 'science' which brings with it requirements of investigative balance and rigour, the actual conditions under

which research takes place must also be acknowledged, as these – to an extent – embody the choices and assumptions of the researcher. Ricento notes that:

[...] the unreflected interests of academics inevitably influences our choice and interpretation of data, the arguments to which our descriptions contribute, and the values that our analyses embody.

(Ricento 2000a:4)

It is not the case that individual/institutional choices necessarily negate the need for high standards of academic rigour – particularly those which are expected in order for a doctoral award such as the one pursued in this thesis. It is simply to acknowledge that, as Fairclough comments: ‘illusions about the neutrality of academic research should surely have been shattered by now’ (2001:216). While my own ideologies – like those of the standardisation agencies this thesis discusses – may not necessarily rise to discursive consciousness in such a way that I could explicitly state them, I acknowledge that my own positioning of the subjects being studied, my own framing of their discourses and the way I use language to express my analysis are all open to the same scrutiny that I employ in this study.

## 1.7 SUMMARY

In this opening chapter, my aim has been to map recent scholarship on language ideologies by way of an introduction to the theoretical framework of this thesis. I began by highlighting the emergence of ideologies from their foundations in linguistic communities and practices, and how these ideas about language as both a transactional system and a symbol of identity become matters of agreement, contestation and hegemony. As such, it is difficult to conceive of ideology as always coherent and consistent, and Blommaert’s view (1999) that ambiguity and contradiction may characterise ideologies can certainly be applied to those about language. I highlighted that language ideologies can be both dominant and subaltern, and that in particular reference to dominant ideologies, the work of Gramsci and his concept of *hegemony* is key.

Gramsci helps us to understand how ideologies, when part of state and other institutional discourse, lead to the manufacturing of consent by a large part of society.

By examining Woolard's claim that language ideologies are rarely, if ever, about language alone, I established how language ideologies are constructed on the basis of not only linguistic but also social, political, and historical factors which relate dialectically: that is, language ideologies emerge from and equally transform particular real-world situations. Consequently, it is important to take not only a 'snapshot' of the contemporary context of language ideologies, but also to understand the impinging historical developments and changes.

Finally, it has been shown that more emphasis is needed to identify ideological brokers: the actors and agents of ideology who, in hegemonic ideologies, are often veiled behind discourses of authority and anonymity in the public sphere. This obfuscation of agency allows for the naturalisation of institutional ideologies and discourses in construction of 'common-sense' ideas and the exclusion of alternative discourses from language ideological debates.



# 2

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (*ii*): STANDARD LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

In the first chapter, I sought to outline and highlight principal scholarly work on the ideologies of language. In this chapter, I shall be concentrating on the particular question of standard languages and – building on my earlier framework and analysis – asking how this phenomenon might be understood from an ideological viewpoint. For many years, commentators and language ‘experts’ have treated standard language as a commodity which can be objectively defined and is often proudly defended. In recent years, however, the concept has come under much more scrutiny, and ideological dimensions have been illuminated, providing a vigorous and often vitriolic source of debate. As a result, it is very difficult to discuss standard languages without also considering the individuals, discourses and processes involved in developing a language variety for its establishment as the ‘standard’.

I shall deal firstly with the concept of a ‘standard language’ in the way that some have sought to define it, examining its characteristics and functions, and asking whether a standardised language can indeed be treated as a reality or, as Milroy and Milroy (1999) suggest, as more of an abstract ideology. Following this I shall explore ‘language standardisation’ as the ideological framework underpinning efforts to establish and maintain a ‘common’ language. I will consider throughout how theorists and analysts have treated the nature, foundations and outcomes of these processes.

## 2.2 LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION

Use of the term 'standard language' in popular discourse often evokes terms such as 'good', 'pure', 'proper', or 'correct' language – all commonly held to be synonymous. While such labels indicate the generally positive value placed on standard language, they offer little insight into how one might define this as a discrete and identifiable variety of spoken and/or written language – if indeed that is what we are dealing with.

Before reviewing some of the scholarly work in this field, I should stress one principal assumption upon which the discussion that follows is based. Language in its most basic form and function is originally a spoken phenomenon. We shall of course see how writing has fundamentally altered the course of language history and in many cases, determined its spread or decline. However, language is principally oral communication which is a social activity, rooted in specific contexts; it can be planned or spontaneous; it allows for variation and can be 'repaired' if vagueness or ambiguity occurs; it relies on paralinguistic features such as tone, emphasis, and body language to convey information; and it is ephemeral (Lippi-Green 1997:20, Milroy and Milroy 1999:54-55). If we add to this factors such as age, gender, personality, mood, relationship, formality and geographical origin of the particular interlocutors, it becomes clear that no two speakers will sound absolutely identical, nor will any two speech events naturally follow an identical pattern, even if they result in successful communication. Variation becomes, as Lippi-Green claims, a 'linguistic fact of life' (1997: Ch.2). On this premise, then, how might a 'standard' be defined? And can it realistically be applied to such an unpredictable phenomenon as human speech?

### 2.2.1 *Writing*

Crowley offers some explanation regarding 'standard language':

It is a form of language in any particular national geographic territory which lies beyond all the variability of usage in offering unity and coherence to what otherwise appears diverse and disunited. It is the

literary form of the language that is to be used and recognised all over the national territory.

(Crowley 2003:84)

For Crowley, the national territory is the focus of efforts to reduce language variation. What is immediately striking is that the goal, according to Crowley at least, is not necessarily to have a standard *spoken* language: he defines it instead as the 'literary form'. Spolsky, too, claims that 'the first critical need for standardization is a writing system.' (2004:27), and Schiffman makes a fundamental collocation when he refers to the 'literary or standard language' (1996:4). By equating the standard with written or literary language, Schiffman highlights the importance of a writing system as a distinguishing feature of standard languages – as opposed to non-standard 'dialects'. So it can be noted that in the transfer of spoken sound to written symbols the need arises for a 'system', an agreed arrangement of symbols by which language users can communicate the desired information. However, these observations do not exclude the possibility of spoken language becoming the object of standardisation and its ideologies, as I shall discuss below.

Joseph comments on writing as a system which takes it beyond a simply communicative function. He claims that having an alphabet:

...endows language with a much more substantial materiality than it inherently possesses, leading to the logical assumption of graphi-centrism. Because of [this], writing vastly increases language's political force – what is material can be possessed, and withheld – a change that will be of paramount importance in the struggle to achieve standard language status.

(Joseph 1987:38)

This reference to 'graphi-centrism' contrasts with my earlier comments on the oral basis of language. Yet it shows how the nature of language in many developed societies has changed from being focused on spoken production as a

source or 'authority', to having writing as the example of how language should be (re)produced and used. Joseph's comments also go some way to introducing the social and political aspects of language: far from existing as nothing more than a tool of communication, language has come to play a significant, often deciding role as a marker of identity. As such, Joseph suggests that a written language has far more strength than a purely oral one, and as a result can be used in order to achieve a dominant status where there is contact and even conflict between language varieties.

Another reason for the importance attached to graphi-centrism is to minimise variation not just for the sake of convenience or effective communication, but because of the belief that there are in fact right and wrong ways of using language. As Spolsky writes:

Underlying this urge to standardize is a belief in correctness, that there is a correct and desirable form of the language, distinct from normal practice.

(Spolsky 2004:27)

### ***2.2.2 Hierarchy***

There are, then, difficulties in conceiving of a principled basis on which to divide different speech varieties into any kind of hierarchy (another of Lippi-Green's linguistic facts of life is that 'All spoken languages are equal in linguistic terms' (1997:11-14)). Speech systems have been built up firstly from communicative need and can therefore be said to be inherently adequate for that purpose by nature of their being 'normal practice'. However, Spolsky suggests here that out of normal practice arises a 'desirable' form of the language which can be captured by standardising it, which inevitably involves writing it down. In doing this, the form of language captured becomes a standard or 'correct' version. This leaves little room for the variation widely accepted as a sociolinguistic axiom.

Another problem is that, as we shall see in more depth later in the discussion, the status of a standard language variety is attained by what is

essentially an arbitrary choice. Language use is a social activity, played out between language-users who make choices, and so it figures that choices regarding official, correct or standard forms are decided by people, and not by some kind of linguistic 'natural selection'. Thus any notion of 'correct' cannot be seen as an objective evaluation: at best, the value 'correct' can mean 'adhering most closely to the style of prestigious dialect X'. It is for this reason that Spolsky refers to an idealised standard as being 'distinct from normal practice', given that capturing and reifying a constantly changing language variety at any one point in its development - 'linguistic embalming' as Edwards calls it (1985:29) - will lead to an increasing dissimilarity between the standard written and the spoken variety. It can be said too that native speakers of dialect X might become so unfamiliar with the standardised form of X that they would need to 'learn' it, as if it were not their native tongue. Joseph believes:

...the standard language is not 'native' to anyone, being a higher cultural endowment with functions that cannot be mastered until after the period of normal first-language acquisition. If the standard language were 'native' to a given person, he or she would not need to study it.

(Joseph 1987:16)

He goes on to observe that:

Native Anglophone students all through their education take courses in 'English', Hispanophones in 'español', and so on, in which they study a dialect which is not their own, but foreign to them.

(Joseph 1987:16)

The reasons for native-speaker language education are more complicated than Joseph implies here. For example, while a speaker has a native tongue and - in Chomsky's view - an innate ability to know and use the grammar of language, standard language education serves to give speakers the tools to describe the grammar of language, as well as fixing the content of the grammar of that

particular language (not to mention standardised vocabulary). Nevertheless, what Joseph's point does helpfully indicate is that education in a standard language will to some extent correct a native-speaker's knowledge of language structure and content, as well as furthering their understanding of new lexical and grammatical items.

### *2.2.3 Literacy*

A standard language, then, is formed by codifying spoken language in writing and upholding the written version alone as an authoritative record of 'the language'. This process of attributing prestige to a variety which will have originally only been the spoken variety of one particular dialect community indicates that, far from universal, it is a specific, usually elite variety. As Spolsky says, standard language,

...assumes the existence of an established, practising literary elite who use the language in a consensually standard way.

(Spolsky 2004:26)

The question remains: amongst whom is this consensus on language use reached? And how? Are we to believe that the regional dialects which have become national and standard languages today have done so through full democratic debate and agreement with other language communities within the national territory? It seems more likely that,

...by definition the true commonality of the 'standard' written language could only be established with the gaining of mass literacy.

(Crowley 2003:86)

We return again to the primacy of a literate form of language in the struggle to achieve a standard language within a community. Mass literacy is not necessarily a democratic process, nor does it occur naturally, but is taught through institutions which I discuss later as 'mechanisms' of language

standardisation. Through the status of these cultural institutions and their use of written language and conception of it as authoritative, the process of standardisation is brought to the level of a 'cultural phenomenon' (Joseph 1987:38).

### 2.3 NATIONALISM, DIALECT AND LANGUAGE

On the subject of the emergence of language varieties and 'standards' in their particular historical contexts, Einar Haugen writes at a time when foundational studies linking language to social factors and contexts were in their initial stages. In an early article (Haugen 1972) which has gained almost canonical status within its field, he relates the hierarchy of language vs. dialect to the development of 'the nation'. While the cliché that a language is 'a dialect with an army and navy' (e.g. Fairclough 2001:17, Honey 1997:38) is a somewhat exhausted one, two important observations can be made from it. Firstly, language and power are indeed closely entwined. A consideration of historical events confirms that where military force has been the vehicle of not only national defence but also imperial expansion (e.g. the British in India, Africa and the U.S.; the Spanish in Latin America<sup>4</sup>, the French in Africa and Asia), the mother tongue of the nation/empire has frequently spread, often irreversibly, even after political decolonisation (see Joseph 1987:45-47). A second observation is that while 'dialect' and 'language' are often perceived as two distinct entities, Haugen suggests that this view represents,

...a simple dichotomy in a situation that is almost infinitely complex. Hence they have come to be used to distinguish phenomena in several different dimensions, with resultant confusion and overlapping. The use of these terms has imposed a division in what is often a continuum, giving what appears to be a neat opposition when in fact the edges are extremely ragged and uncertain.

(Haugen 1972:97)

### 2.3.1 *Structure versus function*

There is almost universal acceptance amongst sociolinguists that no solid basis exists for a 'linguistic hierarchy' based on *structural* features of any given language variety. It is a mistake to pitch 'superior' language against 'inferior' dialect based on criteria such as complexity of grammar, quality of spelling, phonology or other inherent features, given that these can only ever be subject to evaluation by opinion, preference and custom. As can be seen then, creating a dichotomy based on subjective, shaky criteria is untenable, and when the categories imposed by such criteria are removed, I would argue that we are left with the language continuum that Haugen suggests.

There is arguably a greater rationale for distinguishing between dialect and language defined by *functional* features. On this basis, the terms dialect and language (and thus 'standard' language) are determined by the functions for which each is employed. In the context of nation-building, as Haugen emphasises, these functions serve the development of an 'imagined community' (Anderson 1983) through the official national domains of education, government, religion, literature, the press, etc. The national or 'standard' language is the variety used in order to achieve the aims of the national institutions mentioned above, and thus the question of how the language is used becomes more definitive than the question of how it is constructed (even if its structure then becomes a criterion of its prestige, as I shall discuss below).

What I wish to emphasise here is that structurally distinct systems of communication (language varieties) are equal in terms of their potential for complexity, variable features, etc (see Lippi-Green 1997:11-14). Dialects, languages, patois and other supposed 'levels' of language can all be considered as varieties of linguistic communicative systems, and I use the term 'language varieties' to refer to these collectively. Many would argue that their distinct definitions arise from the structural features which make it possible (or impossible) for them to fulfil significant functions within a society. I align myself, however, with the view that perceivable differences between, say, a language and a dialect are far more likely to be a *result* of a variety being 'selected' and 'elaborated' in order to perform a range of functions, rather than

being the *reason* that a variety is already 'fit' to perform such functions. Holborow states that, 'Dialects are equal; it is their histories that are different' (1999:159) and it is the detail of these histories which determine the status of a dialect. Standard language, then, is a language variety whose range of functions has come to be perceivably wider than other varieties, whose speakers are more numerous (although not always the case) and (frequently) more powerful than other varieties, which has been codified in writing, and whose lexicon has been elaborated more than a 'non-standard' language. In other words, it is a variety that has been subjected, more than other varieties, to the *process* of language standardisation.

### *2.3.2 Population of speakers*

The issue of the number of speakers should not be over-simplified: to do so would suggest that if a language variety or dialect has more than a given approximate (and arbitrary) number of speakers, it has 'earned' the right to be a language. For instance in Spain, Catalan is sometimes still regarded as a dialect (generally by non-speakers of Catalan), particularly in relation to the 'national language', Castilian. However, if it were the case that the number of speakers determined the acceptance of a variety as a 'language', Catalan would immediately qualify on the basis that its 6.5 million speakers outnumber those of the national, official languages of Denmark and Finland to name but two (SIL International 2005). This reiterates my earlier observation that perceived distinctions between dialects and languages are, at least initially, related much more to function and power than to linguistic structure or spread.

It is, therefore, crucial to emphasise the context of nationalism and nation-building in which standard language moves from being a concept to a bounded commodity. As we can see from the comments of both Crowley and Joseph, the materiality of a written standard language – capable of being 'possessed' by citizens – is a vital tool in creating commonality as part of nation construction. As Haugen writes:

Nation and language have become inextricably intertwined. Every self-respecting nation has to have a language. Not just a medium of communication, a 'vernacular' or a 'dialect', but a fully developed language. Anything else marks it as underdeveloped.

(Haugen 1972:103)

### 2.3.3 *Functions of standard language*

In exploring the linguistic aspects of post-independence nation-building in Latin America, Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman (2002c:8) characterise the functions of standard language – in a way which encompasses well some of my observations – as *instrumental*, *communicative* and *symbolic*. Firstly, they claim that standard language is *instrumental* insofar as it is learned and used by members of a nation. The standard becomes the tool or instrument by which information spreads through educational, governmental, religious, cultural and media institutions, and by which these different mechanisms of standardisation uphold the common national idiom. As a consequence, the need for a structured instrument of communication means that:

...standard languages are acquired largely, even primarily, through instruction, correction, imitation, assimilation, acculturation – precisely the ways in which one's native dialect is not acquired.

(Joseph 1987:19)

Milroy and Milroy also comment on the instrumental function of standard language:

The whole notion of standardisation is bound up with the aim of functional efficiency of the language. Ultimately, the desideratum is that everyone should use and understand the language in the same way with the minimum of misunderstanding and the maximum of efficiency.

(Milroy and Milroy 1999:19)

A standard language, then, is a tool which is employed to support the institutional order of the nation-state. The acquisition of a standard through instruction, correction, etc, also supports the authority structures and 'top-down' influence of state apparatus.

Regarding its *communicative* function, we have seen how language is the vehicle via which normal social interactions are conducted. Moving towards a perceived graphi-centric authority altered the communicative capacity of language to become a learned, planned, visual, solitary, more permanent activity through writing and print (Lippi-Green 1997:20, Milroy and Milroy 1999-55). Communication is also the maxim of language prescriptivists who cite the need for a standard language out of 'fear of fragmentation' (see Cameron 1995:23-27). It should also be stressed that a written standard, whilst claiming universality through mass literacy, takes away access for all to the official language of a nation before it is 'returned' through cultural institutions. Due to the fact that this standard language must be learned, issues arise of access to education and the other media through which the standard is transmitted; experiences of nation-building in recent centuries have shown that these are not by any means universally available (Fairclough 2001). Joseph describes how,

The cultural institutions of writing and education have served toward [keeping the language of the powerful difficult to attain] for a far greater portion of history than they have served the opposite, democratic purpose of bringing culture to the masses.

(Joseph 1987:43)

Hence the function of easing widespread communication through writing the standard language depends on a number of factors which can often be seen to work counter to this aim.

In Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman's third *symbolic* role of standard language, the 'spirit' of a nation is believed to be bound up in the national standard language. This reflects my earlier observation that citizens of

emerging nations expressed their belonging and loyalty to the community not so much by what they said, but by their use of a specific language variety: the standard. This symbolism has its roots in linguistic nationalism, the philosophy pioneered by Johann Herder which considers language, nation and citizenship to be historically and spiritually congruent. In this view, a standard language does not merely serve the function of communicative efficiency, but is a commodity which symbolises one's belonging to the overarching (monolingual) nation-state. At the same time, Lippi-Green argues that the symbolic role of language is equally seen in the way that:

All human beings living in contact with other human beings construct and project their social identities with the help of language variation.

(Lippi-Green 1997:173)

According to this view, language not only indexes national identity; personal and social identities are also represented through language by the differences in its use as well as the common features. We can say that in the same way language is employed to unite as well as distinguish nations, it also marks ethnic, regional, gender, class and cultural features with the aim of projecting 'self' and determining the 'other' person.

#### ***2.3.4 Development of standardisation***

A standard language, I have shown, is a concept born out of nationalist discourse which fulfils a number of functions – not only in service of constructing and maintaining a nation's common culture (Cameron 1995:160), but also in order to highlight its distinction from other national-linguistic communities. The principal characteristics of a standard are that it begins as one of many, linguistically-equal spoken dialects; it has an alphabet and consequently a written form; this codified and written form of speech is then promoted from dialect to language (Haugen 1972:97) ; it is superposed (Haugen 1972:102) and taught by national institutions; and it is viewed not only as a functional tool but also as an icon of national identity.

Haugen's work offers a detailed and systematic account of this process of development from dialect to language: the standardisation process. An interesting point he makes early on is that:

'Language' as the superordinate term can be used without reference to dialects, but 'dialect' is meaningless unless it is implied that there are other dialects and a language to which they can be said to 'belong'.

Hence every dialect is a language, but not every language is a dialect.

(Haugen 1972:99)

The process of standardising a dialect, then, can be perceived as a 'promotion' to a type of full language status as opposed to an undeveloped dialect. As Haugen suggests, the result is a hierarchy in which the term given to a language variety has clear implications for how it is viewed in relation to other varieties. Furthermore, there are important implications for our understanding of standardisation depending on the chronological perspective of a language. Seen synchronically, a standard purports to represent a single prestigious norm. From a diachronic point of view, if distinct varieties appear to be converging into a single norm, deliberate efforts to unify the dialects into a single language might arise from discourse citing 'destiny' or a 'natural' progression. On the other hand, if a so-called 'single' or 'unitary' language is seen to be fragmenting into variants – and current debates on Spanglish and 'World Englishes' illustrate this phenomenon – then pro-standardisation discourse will not only presuppose the existence of this language as 'unitary', but will also include talk of 'saving' the language and fighting for the purity of the language itself, as well as its national and cultural associations.

The process of standardisation itself is part of a larger phenomenon of Language Planning, which Cooper defines as 'deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of other with respect to the acquisition, structure or functional allocation of their language codes' (Cooper 1989:45). Language planning efforts – which can be seen as concrete measures originating in more general language policies (Grin 2003, Schiffman 1996, Shohamy 2006, Spolsky 2004) – are directed

towards the management of the language's corpus, status and acquisition.

Haugen (1972) suggests a taxonomy of four stages through which undeveloped languages pass in order to be standardised: these are selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance.

*Selection:* The stages of standardisation necessarily begin with the choice of which variety will become the common language. It is indeed extremely rare to find a nation-state in which every citizen speaks the same vernacular; therefore decisions to base national linguistic unity around any one language variety will actually lead to a significant degree of exclusion of speakers of other varieties. Haugen explains:

To choose any one vernacular as a norm means to favour the group of people speaking that variety. It gives them prestige as norm-bearers and a headstart in the race for power and position. If a recognized elite already exists with a characteristic vernacular, its norm will almost inevitably prevail. But where there are socially coordinate groups of people within the community, usually distributed regionally or tribally, the choice of any one will meet with resistance from the rest.

(Haugen 1972:109)

Lippi-Green claims additionally that,

...standard language ideology is concerned not so much with the choice of one possible variant, but with the elimination of **socially unacceptable** difference.

(Lippi-Green 1997:173, original emphasis)

So while selection of a vernacular to be the standard may at first appear to be a matter of endorsing one variety and promoting its use, it also means, by inference, that all other varieties are de-selected and – implicitly or explicitly – excluded from enjoying the status accorded to the standard.

*Codification*: this encompasses efforts to fix the selected language variety, firstly through alphabetisation if this does not already exist; then through securing conventions on orthography, lexicon and grammar, all with the aim of achieving 'minimal variation in form' (Haugen 1972:107).

*Elaboration*: if codification limits the acceptable variation within language to produce a single norm, then elaboration seeks to widely extend the use and influence of the standard variety in all possible domains. In other words, it is 'maximal variation in function' (Haugen 1972:107). Part of the underlying argument for standardisation seems to be that the more complex a language, the more functions for which it can be employed and therefore it becomes 'superior'. However, Milroy and Milroy (1999:12-13) give examples of certain functions and subtleties (e.g. the distinction between the singular and plural *you* pronouns) which can be found in non-standard dialects (e.g. Northern Irish, Geordie) but not in the standard English variety. We can deduce from this and other cases that no single variety – not even if it is the standard – can legitimately claim superiority of value on the basis of fulfilling the widest variety of functions, meanings and nuances. As I stated earlier, the function of a language may indeed provide a legitimate basis for distinguishing between a so-called 'dialect' and 'language'. However, this is a distinction based on the observable use of a language variety, as opposed to a value-based distinction between 'superior' and 'inferior' varieties.

*Acceptance*: One way in which the inclusion of 'standard' and exclusion of 'non-standard' languages is achieved is through efforts to enlarge the body of standard language users. In order to strengthen the position of one particular standardised dialect, members of a community must accept its usage in common life, and realise that it is in their favour to actively do so. To this end, Haugen claims:

Any learning requires the expenditure of time and effort, and it must somehow contribute to the well-being of the learners if they are not to shirk their lessons. A standard language that is the instrument of an authority, such as a government, can offer its users material rewards in

the form of power and position. ...National languages have offered membership in the nation, an identity that gives one entrée into a new kind of group, which is not just kinship, or government, or religion, but a novel and peculiarly modern brew of all three.

(Haugen 1972:109-10)

It could be said that offering material rewards and inclusion in communities such as the nation goes beyond the everyday idea of 'membership benefits' as such. In effect, what we see here is a 'carrot and stick' principle at work: those who accept what official, hegemonic institutions are seeking to establish will be rewarded with certain advantages. Joseph suggests that these include social mobility, the prospect of attaining a good position in society, a fuller interchange of ideas through clear, standard communication and prevention from any 'humiliation' one might feel by not using the societal standard (1987:44). Lippi-Green sums up the implied promises inherent in a spoken standard when she writes: 'Sound like us and success will be yours. Doors will open; barriers will disappear' (1997:50). Many would argue that these are laudable opportunities on offer; universal possibilities for personal and society-wide advancement. However, for those who are unable or unwilling to sideline their native language variety (if, indeed there can be a choice) and adhere to a proposed standard system, the implied consequences appear to be the converse of the promises made: success will *not* be yours. Doors will *close*. Barriers will *remain*. Milroy and Milroy believe that:

A person who speaks English perfectly effectively, but who has occasional usages that are said to be 'substandard' (e.g. omitting initial [h] in words like *happy*, *hair*, or using double negatives) may well find that his or her social mobility is blocked and may, for example, be refused access to certain types of employment without any official admission that the refusals depend partly or wholly on his or her use of language.

(Milroy and Milroy 1999:2)

Lippi-Green also shows how, in courtrooms, broadcast media, the workplace, education and entertainment media in the United States, there exists an ideology promoting 'good', standard English and often penalising the use of what she terms 'Non-mainstream' US English.

It is clear, then, that conceptualising standard language as a reality is far from straightforward – indeed, it is impossible to define without inevitably raising questions about the reasons and processes that underlie its conceptualisation. In particular, the advantages and disadvantages accorded to standard and non-standard language users respectively do not occur 'naturally': social mobility is awarded or blocked by established social systems and by concrete organisations made up of definable 'actors' in these processes. It is to these questions that I now turn as I consider in more detail the connection between language ideology and the process of standardisation.

## **2.4 STANDARD LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY**

This section should not be seen as an 'introduction' to the ideology of standardisation, but rather as a closer scrutiny of the ideological concept which emerged in the previous section. The ideology of standardisation, or 'standard language ideology' (a term coined by Milroy and Milroy 1985) is, as Joseph defines it, the belief in 'planned and centralised regulation of language' (1987:14). In particular, he writes that:

The interaction of power, language, and reflections on language, inextricably bound up with one another in human history, largely defines language standardization.

(Joseph 1987:43)

Earlier I noted that notions of power and reflections on language give rise to many differing ideologies. Rooted as these ideologies are in dialectical social relations throughout human history, it is crucial to recognise the multiplicity of interests represented in the discourse for and against standardisation. As such, while many standardisers may feel that they have succeeded in their goals, it is

difficult to defend the view that standardisation has ever resulted in a truly 'successful' product (Joseph 1987:15). In the view of Milroy and Milroy:

Standardisation is motivated in the first place by various social, political and commercial needs and is promoted in various ways, including the use of the writing system, which is relatively easily standardised; but absolute standardisation of a spoken language is never achieved (the only fully standardised language is a dead language). Therefore it seems appropriate to speak more abstractly of standardisation as an *ideology*, and a standard language as an idea in the mind rather than a reality – a set of abstract norms to which actual usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent.

(Milroy and Milroy 1999:19)

The Milroys emphasise standardisation as an ideology in order to highlight the instability of the standardised *product*. In 2.4.1, we shall see how standardisation can also be seen as an ongoing *process*. Continuing in this vein, Lippi-Green writes that:

...*standard language ideology* (SLI), is defined as a bias towards an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class.

(Lippi-Green 1997:64, original emphasis)

To this observation I would add that there is a two-way relationship between a standard language and upper-middle class speech, in that the upper-middle classes speak a variety that is very much influenced by the structure of written language.

Another key commentator, Cameron, believes that standard language ideology (hereafter: SLI)<sup>5</sup> is part of a phenomenon she calls 'verbal hygiene' and defines as 'the urge to meddle in matters of language' (1995:ix). She adds that:

More precisely, 'verbal hygiene' describes the set of normative metalinguistic *practices* that arise from this urge to meddle.

(Cameron 1995:237)

Woolard's claim that language ideologies can be found in 'metalinguistic discourse' (1998:9) echoes Cameron's characterisation of verbal hygiene 'practices'. In this way, we see that debates surrounding how language is used and *ought* to be used give rise to prescriptive practices which shape use of the 'common' language.

Based on these commentators, we can say that SLI is the discursive construction of a belief that there is (and ought to be) a common linguistic ideal to which language users within a determined community should aspire. On the one hand this is based on the argument that all members of a society/community should have universal access to a common language variety. On the other hand, there is an argument that stresses the need for uniformity and emphasises authority and respect for a centralised language variety while backgrounding the value of linguistic diversity. SLI, as outlined above, was formed initially in the context of the nation-building era of the 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Indeed, the social, political and historical background to the development of SLI is important not only in examining its origins but also in informing any understanding of contemporary situations in which a standard language is maintained. With this in mind, I will be examining the above aspects of Spanish society when setting the context of my case study in Chapter 4.

#### **2.4.1 SLI as a process**

Let us now consider how efforts are made to translate SLI from an ideological abstraction into tangible manifestations of linguistic practice. Milroy and

Milroy claim that standardisation itself is best considered as a process (1999:150). They observe that defining standard language as a *product* is almost impossible, given the propensity of language to vary and change. However, they acknowledge that not all scholars (and certainly not all 'verbal hygienists') agree, and there are many who have pursued the production and maintenance of a standard language as an end in itself. Whether language standardisation is seen as an achievable goal or as an unending idealisation, there is by definition a *process* involved in language 'development'.

Haugen notes that today's standard/national languages were all, at some point, undeveloped dialects (1972:103) and that these are subject to the processes of codification, elaboration, selection and acceptance in order to attain standard language status and usage. He also indicates that there are different 'degrees' of standardisation by virtue of a language being subjected to standardisation processes more than other varieties:

While we have so far spoken of standard languages as if they were a clear and unambiguous category, there are differences of degree even among the well-established languages. French is probably the most highly standardized of European languages, more so than, for example, English or German.

(Haugen 1972:106)

Schiffman agrees, saying, 'the degree of standardization of a language can vary' (1996:40). This might be due to a variation in the intensity of efforts to standardise a language, or the stage at which the standardisation process is presently found. Either way, it becomes clear that we need to distinguish between the process of standardisation and the supposed product. Even the end 'goal' of standardisation changes, as Joseph reminds us:

...the conceptual entity which standard languages represent has not remained stagnant in the course of history.

(Joseph 1987:50)

Further evidence for the processual nature of standardisation comes from its conception as a discursive and social practice. Woolard suggests that language may be construed as a complete 'product' when viewed synchronically, yet still recognises that:

The existence of language as a discrete entity is always a discursive project, rather than an established fact.

(Woolard 1998:20)

She continues:

But new emphasis on the ideological dimension of language practices has given rise to analyses of language standardization as discursive project, treating 'standard' more as ideological process than as empirical linguistic fact.

(Woolard 1998:21)

Cameron believes that the process of verbal hygiene with its underlying ideologies – whether expert or lay, pro-standard or anti-standard – consists of 'a struggle to control language by defining its nature' (1995:8). Equally, if language is seen as a perfectible product, then efforts to harness language change and make it 'do as it's told' (Cameron 1995:75) become justified. In this way, proponents of SLI view verbal hygiene as a legitimate activity with the purpose of managing language and improving its communicative efficiency (e.g. Honey 1997). On the other hand, the nature of language can be looked at as a constructed process, and the structure and use of language at any given point in history can be construed as the outcome of previous practices (and consequently at the mercy of future linguistic and metalinguistic practices). Cameron stresses that:

Language-using is a social practice: the human capacity for acquiring and using language is necessarily actualised within social relationships.

...what people think language is, or should be, makes a difference to the way they use it, and therefore to what it becomes.

(Cameron 1995:6 & 215)

It is on this basis that Cameron points out the inconsistency of anti-prescriptivists. If the 'status quo...is only the reflex of an earlier prescription', then it is inconsistent to say that 'while today's prescription is prescriptive, yesterday's is not' (1995:19). We can relate this back to my discussion in the first chapter of the ideology present even in supposedly 'descriptive' or 'objective' scholarly activity.

The discourse of nation-building and linguistic nationalism is one site of SLI; however, we also see language ideology present at the level of the individual and the 'tribe' or region/class. On this, Lippi-Green states that language is:

...more than a tool for the communication of facts between two or more persons. It is the most salient way we have of establishing and advertising our social identities.

(Lippi-Green 1997:5)

This is important when considering the two possible outcomes of standardisation. On one hand, using language to establish one's common national identity will lead to conformity and use of the standard variety. This represents what Milroy and Milroy refer to as the *status* choice; language-users choose to accept the advantages of social mobility offered as part of SLI (1999:49). On the other hand, regional and class-based language varieties have not been wiped out by the outcome of standardisation, and Milroy and Milroy propose that this is part of the same 'social network theory', i.e. users of non-standard languages express *solidarity* by using and perpetuating 'native' language varieties as an index of their identification with a community other than the nation-state. Such a community could be supranational too, as in the

example of the global norms of *español común* which index the wider Spanish-speaking community.

Gramsci also saw language standardisation as a progression of stages:

...the process of formation, spread and development of a unified national language occurs through a whole complex of molecular processes...

(Gramsci 1985:183)

Furthermore, Gramsci held that the diversity of influences, ideologies and practices meant that a predetermined, fixed standard language was not realistically attainable:

One need not consider this intervention as 'decisive' and imagine that the ends proposed will all be reached in detail, i.e. that one will obtain a *specific* unified language. One will obtain a *unified* language, if it is a necessity...What this language will be, one cannot foresee or establish...

(Gramsci 1985:183)

Again we see how the nationalist discourse, on which Gramsci comments, is instrumental in shaping SLI and not only its promotion of a common, unified language but also its sidelining (and even rejection) of other varieties within the national territory. On this, Haugen describes how:

Like any unit, it minimizes internal differences and maximizes external ones. On the individual's personal and local identity, it superimposes a national one by identifying his ego with that of all others within the nation and separating it from that of all others outside the nation. ...The ideal is: internal cohesion – external distinction.

(Haugen 1972:104)

Haugen goes on to specifically identify how SLI arises from its context of nationalism:

Since the encouragement of such loyalty requires free and rather intense communication within the nation, the national ideal demands that there be a single linguistic code by means of which this communication can take place. ...The dialects, at least if they threaten to become languages, are potentially disruptive forces in a unified nation: they appeal to local loyalties, which could conceivably come into conflict with national loyalty.

(Haugen 1972:104)

To this identification of micro-level loyalties we should add social class as another category which claims loyalty, particularly within a nation-building context. Holborow, writing from a Marxist perspective, refers to the development of Standard English in the time of the British Industrial Revolution, and identifies how SLI was a particular ideology held by the ruling class (1999:157).

Gramsci also writes in the Marxist tradition and argues that the identification of language with the national culture (part of linguistic nationalism as we have seen) and the subsequent study of language as a cultural phenomenon are aspects of standardisation which have indeed grown out of political needs (1985:185). An essential instrument in pursuing standardisation, for Gramsci, is normative grammar which holds a pivotal role in educating the masses through a common system with a common goal.

Gramsci remarks on such a project, drawing particular attention to:

...all the effort required to form hundreds of thousands of recruits, of the most disparate origins and mental preparation, into a homogeneous army capable of moving and acting in a disciplined and united manner, all the 'practical and theoretical lessons' on the regulations, etc.

(Gramsci 1985:184-5)

So we see that normativity is both a defining feature of the standardisation process (whether this is seen as ideological or not) and also an important characteristic of SLI: the belief in the perfectibility of language leads to the establishment of guidelines or *norms* as tools for achieving this, and these norms come to form part of the discourse through which SLI is channelled.

#### 2.4.2 *SLI discourse*

Crucial to this discussion of the discourse of standardisation is a brief clarification of what 'discourse' might mean<sup>6</sup>. One of the principal theorists on this, Michel Foucault, sees discourse as:

...not simply linguistic expression but also the various props around language that are its 'conditions of possibility'.

(Holborow 1999:5)

For Foucault, discourse is not just about using language to communicate; it includes procedures which determine who can say what, and what they can say about a subject. Discourse becomes the framework through which people can understand the world around them, and so the extent and boundaries of discourse form what he calls a 'regime of truth' (Holborow 1999:5). Holborow, critiquing Foucault's definition, stresses that if discourse is the only outlook on reality, then objective reality is denied and so political struggles become merely discursive rather than real, and politics becomes devoid of content and merely a matter of words. Where Foucault rejects ideology due to its resting on 'material reference points', Holborow affirms the role of ideology as constitutive of discourse because:

...it provides a framework for understanding that ideas and language constitute a different order of things than the material world.

(Holborow 1999:8)

Given my earlier claim about the dialectical relationship between language ideology and its sociocultural and historical context, we can understand discourse as fulfilling a communicative purpose ('language as social practice') but also setting the conditions for contributing to that very discourse ('determined by social structures', Fairclough 2001:14). Foucault calls these conditions 'orders of discourse' which embody distinct ideologies (Fairclough 2001:19).

Contemporary analysis of language has suggested a number of key characteristics of SLI discourse and features of debates around standardisation, some of which I have mentioned above. One of these is *uniformity*: many standardisers and proponents of SLI believe that there is a need for minimal variation in form and maximal variation in function. The 'agents' of SLI who believe in and labour for standardisation seek to achieve a high level of communicative efficiency through establishing uniform features of a language. Cameron refers to these people – journalists, academicians,<sup>7</sup> teachers, politicians, linguists – as 'craft professionals', and writes:

...to the degree that there is uniformity of usage, it is maintained in particular by the activities of trained craft professionals. It is these people's labour that produces the uniform spelling and consistent style of published materials, which in turn set the standard against which all written language (and eventually spoken language too) will come to be evaluated.

(Cameron 1995:42)

Cameron raises a point here about the distinction – or rather the lack of one – made between written and spoken language, a point that is also taken up by Milroy and Milroy:

Whereas the writing system requires a high degree of uniformity so that messages may be transmitted over time and distance in a clear and unambiguous manner, speech is a social activity. The seeds of change

are always present in spoken languages...The standard ideology, however, promotes uniformity at the expense of variety, and the prescriptive tradition has always aimed at uniformity in speech as well as writing.

(Milroy and Milroy 1999:58)

Their comments here echo the points in my earlier discussion about the difference between spoken and written language. What is interesting is that the Milroys also seem to agree that SLI goes beyond creating a common written form of a language; it is also *verbal hygiene* aimed ultimately at minimalising variation in speech too, and often does not recognise that 'written language and spoken language are historically, structurally, and functionally fundamentally different creatures' (Lippi-Green 1997:18).

In the desire to establish uniformity as a fundamental characteristic of a language use, SLI gives rise to an expectation of *consistency* in linguistic performance (actual utterances of language). This tends to narrow down the judgement of a person's linguistic performance to two polarised possible values: 'correct' or 'incorrect'. I use these terms in inverted commas so as to indicate the questionable nature of attaching strong, seemingly objective values such as these to spoken language in particular. The first question must surely be, 'By which criteria is a given speech event deemed to be correct or incorrect?', and the second, 'Who determines these criteria?'

In exploring such questions, *anonymity* can often be found to be a feature of SLI. Schiffman (1996:88) and Cameron (1995:163), amongst others, affirm that when considering SLI rhetoric, it is of little value to query *why* there are standards in language; instead we should be seeking to find out *whose* usage is considered to be 'common' usage or which norms are being promoted as 'the' framework to adhere to, and in whose interests this is taking place. It is at this point we find that arguments for language standardisation are often 'naturalised' into conventions so that it appears they are not manmade and therefore have no 'authors' (Woolard 1998:21). Conventions and ideologies with no identified authors become anonymous and are not seen as having

derived from any particular territory (Woolard 2007). As a result, the link between the standard and the nation-state is (apparently) severed and the socio-political roots of a standard variety are obscured. This enables the promotion of a supposedly disinterested and more widely available standard variety, legitimised by the applicability of its norms across groups and nation-states precisely because it is not perceived as the preserve of any one of these.

The assumptions which come to underlie the existence of and need for a standard language are – by nature of being assumptions – seldom explained, but are accepted as ‘common sense’. SLI promotes the common sense assumption, Cameron argues, by positing that ‘such-and-such a usage is “just a fact about the grammar of x”’ (1995:6). Moreover, ‘mystification’ in language debates denies that an identifiable authority is, or could be, responsible for such common sense assumptions (see Lippi-Green 1997:41-62). While such anonymity leaves language standardisation looking politically neutral (or certainly of unspecified origin), Milroy and Milroy argue that the desired effect of anonymity and the proliferation of common sense arguments are themselves products of ideology. They comment:

If a belief is said to arise from ‘common sense’, the implication is that it need not be subject to further scrutiny and analysis... Such an appeal to common sense is powerful, as it engages an audience at a gut level at which it can readily respond. It also implies that the experts (who may raise objections to ‘common sense’) can be ignored; if we apply common sense our problems will be solved.

(Milroy and Milroy 1999:135-6)

What reason could there be for deflecting the attention and analysis of language users from arguments regarding standard language and its ‘common sense’ basis of communicative efficiency and access for all? Woolard reminds us that naturalised, cultural conceptions are ‘partial, interest-laden, contestable and contested’ (Woolard 1998:10); therefore viewing language standardisation from an ideological rather than a naturalised viewpoint will help to consider the

interests of the very real, identifiable actors involved. Lippi-Green comments on SLI:

...perhaps it is necessary to choose one social group to serve as a model. Perhaps there is even some rationale for choosing the 'educated' as this group. But there is nothing *objective* about this practice. It is the ordering of social groups in terms of who has authority to determine how language is *best used*.

(Lippi-Green 1997:55)

In Lippi-Green's observations, the issue of authority in setting prestigious linguistic norms seems to be underpinned by linguistic *authenticity*. In other words, a dialect which has become the standard language variety is seen as prestigious on the basis of it being authentically rooted in its original speech community. Woolard suggests that:

'Como ideología lingüística, la autenticidad sitúa el valor de una lengua en su asociación con una comunidad concreta y como expresión de su espíritu. La voz 'auténtica' está profundamente arraigada en un lugar y su valor es, por tanto, local.

(Woolard 2007:131)

Thus the particular social or regional group whose dialect is promoted as a standard maintains linguistic authority in ongoing discourses and language debates. Consequently, this group's discourse (debates, decisions, publications, language use or literature) is received as authentic in legitimising the form of a standard language.

### ***2.4.3 Sites of ideological discourse***

In Chapter 1, Woolard's view of three major categories of ideological siting was outlined (linguistic practices, metalinguistic discourse and implicit metapragmatics). Expressions of standard language ideology can be seen in

both written and spoken discourse. I see these two as similar to Woolard's sites but more specific, and they could equally be conceptualised as discursive 'channels' through which it operates (I will, however, continue to use the term 'sites' for Woolard, and 'channels' for what follows).

1. Firstly there are *written* channels. In SLI, the authority of a language rests on the written form as this is a fixed (or certainly fixable) entity, responsible for minimising variation and halting change (Joseph 1987:38). In the same way, print language renders any changes which result from codification or elaboration much easier to establish and proliferate in order to form a 'corpus' of legitimate linguistic terms and functions. Joseph goes on to write that:

...the creation of language standards and standard languages, defines a gamut of processes prompted by an implicit or explicit desire of returning the language to a real or mythical state of unification...

(Joseph 1987:38)

This 'golden age' to which those involved in SLI discourse hark back can be seen as the 'literary' age or tradition. Schiffman argues that when metalinguistic discourse usually brings to mind texts or discourses that already exist, these are frequently written rather than oral, i.e. a tradition of literature and/or normative reference works such as dictionaries. These printed works constitute the linguistic culture of a language community, formed in this mythical 'golden age', and as such, become a quantitative index of the quality of a language. That is to say, standardised languages are likely to be those which boast a significant body of literature and thus are 'rich'; equally, languages with few literary works are viewed as impoverished (Schiffman 1996:56-7), further evidence of graphi-centric ideology. For the English language, William Shakespeare is likely to be among the most cited writers and founders of the golden age of English literature. Shakespeare, at the same time as being lauded for his literary genius and mastery of language, has been shown to have employed linguistic usages (e.g. double negatives, three different spellings of his own name) which are today considered to be 'non-standard' and thus

supposedly frowned upon (see Milroy and Milroy 1999:45). Cameron effectively summarises this:

The point is, though, that it is in published printed text...that standards are maintained or modified.

(Cameron 1995:55)

2. SLI discourse can also be sited in *spoken* channels. Language ideologies, as Woolard points out, can be most obviously found in choices made as part of everyday linguistic practices (1998:9) which, in addition to written sites, are made also in spoken language. These can be subaltern language ideologies, such as non-standard language practices of 'solidarity' as mentioned above; they can also be the dominant SLI practices, often found in the 'official' domains of national institutions.

Woolard also mentions 'metalinguistic discourse' as a site of ideology. In terms of SLI, this would involve 'talk about talk': that is, debate around the issue of language use and its adherence (or non-compliance) to norms of a standardised variety. Such debates typically take place within a language academy, where a nation-state has established one. They also take place during radio or television broadcasts featuring news articles on, say, the adoption of new terms into language use (particularly public language use); opinions may be gathered, comments made and questions raised about 'the state of our language'. It must also be recognised that metalinguistic discourse as explained here could equally take place through the written medium, in equivalent newspaper articles, academic debates, or educational policy documents for example.

One of Woolard's sites of ideology is in implicit metapragmatics which is language-use containing indicators of how it should be interpreted. This can be achieved through indicators of superiority, such as an interlocutor taking control of a conversation, asking questions, interrupting, or using tone and intonation to establish a sense of their own authority. It can also be achieved by the use of vocabulary and other features of standard language.

#### 2.4.4 SLI and 'prestige by transfer'

One major theme to arise in SLI discourse is the value judgment placed on a language or variety. The variety of human experience means that when a person is confronted with a concept or entity that is somehow 'different', they make evaluations based on their understanding or experience of this 'other' in opposition to 'self'. Variation in language, as has been established, is a reality which constantly gives rise to different and new alternatives in a speaker's linguistic repertoire. 'Nevertheless,' argues Joseph, 'it seems inevitable that once people do become conscious of variants of behaviour, they evaluate them' (Joseph 1987:30). I have argued that linguistic variation has been interpreted as a commodity, something that 'belongs' to a particular group of speakers or a certain function, and thus comes to represent the distinct associated 'style' (see Cameron 1995:45). Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman, using Spanish as an example, observe how language varieties:

...have often become iconized, that is, they have been discursively associated with features that supposedly reflect the spirit of the community.

(Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002c:12)

When the community being promoted within a nation is the standard speaking community (as is often the case), then the standard variety and its component features become an icon of the ideal citizen. In distinguishing between standard and non-standard, the division between correct and incorrect is reified and thus, on introducing value judgments to the process, 'good' and 'bad' language become part of SLI discourse. We can see, then, how the ideal citizen speaks a 'good', approved variety of the national language and is by inference awarded the status of a model, ideal speaker, authenticated by speaking with the 'reference accent' and by using standardised written forms and vocabulary.

Of course, what is not promoted in SLI is the idea that this linguistic utopia is available only through a sort of natural selection or genetic

inheritance. It is, in theory, available to all and exists for the benefit of all, so that communication might be enhanced, a common identity forged, the nation built, and so on. However, Lippi-Green disagrees that this 'useful' and 'beneficial' commodity is truly within the grasp of all language users. Characterising the construction of a person's linguistic repertoire (in particular, accent) as a 'Sound House', she argues that reconstructing a person's sound house beyond the initial language acquisition phase and using 'bricks' (phonological features) from a different kind of house is extremely difficult and rarely successful. To illustrate this further, Lippi-Green cites the case of Mr. Kahakua, who sued his employer after he was refused a promotion on the basis of not speaking 'Standard English' in a post which would have involved radio broadcasting. The presiding judge rejected the appeal, believing that if Mr. Kahakua wanted promotion, it was reasonable for him to agree to the employer's request that he speak with a 'standard' accent. Lippi-Green claims that:

Mr. Kahakua can no more comply with the demand that he completely lose his native phonology – his accent – than he could comply with an order of the judge to grow four inches, or, and much more controversially, than it would be possible for him to change the colour of his skin.

(Lippi-Green 1997:45)

As a result of the positive connotations of using the 'good', standard variety of a language, it is with 'bad', 'incorrect' language that non-standard varieties are linked. What is remarkable, however, is that rarely is it argued as part of SLI discourse that non-standard phonology or grammar is merely a case of 'unpleasant' sounds or constructions. There is little defence offered of the position that non-standard language is inferior on the basis of linguistic features. It is judged to be a lesser variety firstly in opposition to the 'best' language, and secondly in relation to other features – social, moral, political - with which it is understood to be linked. In other words, the 'iconization' that

Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman write of, comes to link not only the abstract standard language with the imagined national community, but also links observable 'misuses' of language with dialect-speaking groups of people often discredited on the grounds of their 'inability' or refusal to use language well. So attitudes to the standard vs. non-standard debate in public discourse can be seen to reflect and stem from wider attitudes to societal issues. Cameron writes that:

...stylistic values are symbolic of moral, social, ideological and political values.

(Cameron 1995:77)

Lippi-Green makes the same observation, and also makes an important claim about the underlying significance of rejecting – through negative attitudes – the validity of non-standard language in public discourse:

[L]anguage is – among other things – a flexible and constantly flexing social tool for the emblematic marking of social allegiances. ...There can be no doubt that often when we ask individuals to reject their own language, it is not the message, but the social allegiances made clear by that language which are the underlying problem.

(Lippi-Green 1997:63)

It appears that SLI encourages language-users to make judgments not about what is said, but about how it is said and even who is saying it. Social allegiance to, for example, the non-powerful class, gender, an ethnic minority, or regional origins can be the source of language discourse which is not necessarily seen as authoritative or *authentic* in the sense that I discuss above. Milroy and Milroy write:

Language attitudes stand proxy for a much more comprehensive set of social and political attitudes, including stances strongly tinged with authoritarianism, but often presented as ‘common sense’.

(Milroy and Milroy 1999:45)

We can see that mystification – presenting language discourse without rational explanation – functions through a framework of ‘common sense’ and protects the division of SLI discourse into good or bad, authentic or inauthentic, prestigious or unimportant. Authenticating one standard language-speaking group by allocating social prestige to it seeks, in effect, to maintain a sense of linguistic ‘order’ and is linked to the pursuit of order found in Herderian ‘one nation-state, one language’ philosophy. Cameron considers how:

[V]erbal hygiene is not just about ordering language itself, but also exploits the powerful symbolism in which language stands for other kinds of order – moral, social and political. [...] But most forms of verbal hygiene are practised in order to ward off the threat, by making language a fixed and certain reference point. (Cameron 1995:25)

Language standardisation, as underlined here, is about achieving the linguistic ideal of one, commonly used, structured model of language that sits at the top of an ordered hierarchy of language varieties which could potentially be used within a nation or a transnational speech community (for example a prestigious national variety within the English-speaking or Spanish-speaking world). This hierarchy is based not on any demonstrable differences in the value or function of linguistic features themselves; any perceived distinction is ‘essentially arbitrary’ (Milroy and Milroy 1999:16). Yet it is to such distinctions that social values are assigned and speakers are consequently ‘judged’ as to their character and the validity of contributions they might make to public discourse. It then follows that if someone is unwilling (or unable) to use the standardised form of the community’s language, then their input and involvement is somehow

inappropriate and deemed to be less valuable than that of someone who uses 'proper' language.

These kinds of judgments are based mostly on experience of spoken language and its inherent phonological variations (accent). Despite the shift of initial communication to much more distant, textual instances (i.e. e-mails, web sites, text messaging), the role of language as social interaction is still initiated largely through speech events. It is in these events that each interlocutor makes judgments about the other's accent, status, role, politics, and character (Milroy and Milroy 1999:2), and so it can be said that language acts as a 'prime and ready diagnostic' (Lippi-Green, 1997:103), determining the attitudes a person takes towards another's adherence to (or rejection of) the standard language.

It is not solely to spoken language that prestige is awarded or denied. Value judgments are made on written language too, and its grammaticality (and therefore its value) is more permanently visible as a good example or a bad one. As an example, a boom of recent publications in the United Kingdom (e.g. Cochrane 2004, Cook 2004, Crystal 2006, Humphrys 2004, 2006, Truss 2003) has sought to address the 'scourge' of bad spelling and grammar in both public and private examples of written English. Value is attached to the appropriateness of a writer's choice of vocabulary, register, style and punctuation, and a number of style institutions and publications are held up as exemplary in such matters (see later discussion, as well as Cameron 1995:78-115).

It can be said that this phenomenon of assigning positive values to a chosen standard language and negative values to all other territorial language varieties acts very little on the basis of linguistic features; much more emphasis seems to be given to desirability of the non-linguistic features associated with a language variety, 'prestige by transfer' as Woolard describes it (1998:21). SLI discourse also works to promote a prestigious language variety by appealing not to reason but to more naturally occurring human 'instincts' such as pleasure, acceptance or worry. As Cameron suggests:

Where verbal hygiene 'works', it works not by controlling our thoughts, but by mobilizing our desires and our fears.

(Cameron 1995:222)

She goes on to cite examples of 'moral panic', defining this as when:

...some social phenomenon or problem is suddenly foregrounded in public discourse and discussed in an obsessive, moralistic and alarmist manner, as if it betokened some imminent catastrophe.

(Cameron 1995:82)

Claiming moral panic to be a tool of verbal hygiene or SLI, Cameron remarks on the 1980s debate surrounding the teaching of grammar in the National Curriculum in the United Kingdom. After various government-commissioned reports commented on the state of English language teaching and proposed a standardisation of the curriculum, the Conservative politician Norman Tebbit made the following comments:

If you allow standards to slip to the stage where good English is no better than bad English, where people turn up filthy at school...all these things tend to cause people to have no standards at all, and once you lose standards then there's no imperative to stay out of crime.

(cited in Cameron 1995:94)

This demonstrates a sort of converse to the 'prestige by transfer' principle, in which a lack of standards in language is seen to equate to a lack of standards in general moral behaviour and thus is transferred onto the terrain of 'bad' English. It would appear that Tebbit and some conservative right-wing policy makers who were most vocal in the debate of the time show characteristics of the 'moralistic' approach to discourse on English language teaching, contributing to moral panic as they do. Indeed, Milroy and Milroy comment

that 'this association of "bad" English with criminality is not really about language at all – it is a plea for obedience to authority in all things' (1999:44). We see then how SLI and its prescriptivist stance on grammar teaching uses the discourse of discipline and authority to support establishment of the idealised standard variety, lauding it as a 'solution' to social and moral decline. Discussions such as these which call for a return to basic moral standards (seen as superior and pre-existent) can be considered parallel to the discussions on returning the language to its 'golden age' state.

Summarising this section in the words of Gramsci:

Every time the question of the language surfaces, in one way or another, it means that a series of other problems are coming to the fore: the formation and enlargement of the governing class, the need to establish more intimate and secure relationships between the governing groups and the national-popular mass, in other words to reorganise the cultural hegemony.

(Gramsci 1985:183-4)

#### *2.4.5 Mechanisms of SLI*

In my discussion of ideology, I posited that anonymous, 'natural' processes are an inadequate explanation for the choice and use of language varieties, and that we should look instead for concrete decisions by identifiable actors in order to discover the activities which affect language use and thus the ideological reasons behind these. Cameron asks 'What are the mechanisms through which people...come to subscribe to what Milroy and Milroy (1985) label the "ideology of standardization"?' (1995:15). In this final part of the chapter, I consider what these mechanisms are, and identify the proponents of SLI who use these tools of verbal hygiene.

Pinker (1995) points to the breadth of backgrounds from which standardisers or 'language mavens' come. Explaining this latter term, he writes:

The legislators of 'correct English', in fact, are an informal network of copy-editors, dictionary usage panellists, style manual and handbook writers, English teachers, essayists, columnists and pundits. Their authority, they claim, comes from their dedication to implementing standards that have served the language well in the past, especially in the prose of its finest writers, and that maximize its clarity, logic, consistency, conciseness, elegance, continuity, precision, stability, integrity and expressive range.

(Pinker 1995:372)

While his comments are useful in alerting us to the variety of circumstances from which 'verbal hygienists' contribute to pro-SLI discourse, it would be a mistake to imagine that the network of ideologues and prescriptivists remains nebulous or uncoordinated. Indeed, there are well-established authorities who count on the support of the above 'informal network', yet do so in the knowledge that they themselves, as institutions old and new, confidently claim real and effective authority weight in matters of standard language. Let us now consider a number of these.

#### **2.4.5.1 Language academies**

It could be said that where language academies have been established, such as in France, Italy, Germany, Sweden and of course, Spain, this geographical trend shows the concept of an authoritative institution set up to 'guard' the national language to be a particularly Western European idea (see Mar-Molinero 2006a). This can be explained by its role as the epicentre of the era of enlightenment, as well as subsequent nationalism. It was in the construction of new 'nations' that the search for one national language took place, and, with the birth in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries of the *Accademia della Crusca* in Italy and France's *Académie Française*, the model was established for an institution which would purify, guard and develop the national language (and hence the values believed to be expressed in it, such as purity, strength and honesty).

Schiffman sees the role of academies as an instrument of corpus planning (1996:86), that is, the body which seeks to *codify* the language, as per Haugen's taxonomy of standardisation. The self-proclaimed mission of the *Académie Française* has, in the past, been to 'veiller sur la langue française et accomplir des actes de mécénat'<sup>8</sup> (Académie Française 2005). To accomplish this:

...l'Académie a travaillé dans le passé à fixer la langue, pour en faire un patrimoine commun à tous les Français et à tous ceux qui pratiquent notre langue. Aujourd'hui, elle agit pour en maintenir les qualités et en suivre les évolutions nécessaires. Elle en définit le bon usage.<sup>9</sup>

(Académie Française 2005)

It is interesting to note that, by its own admission, the role of the Academy has changed. It has previously sought to 'fix' standard French, and in doing so, to create a common national asset for not only native French speakers, but those who would choose to speak 'their' language. Today the Academy continues to guard the qualities of the language as it sees them, while now adapting to the necessary changes, citing a seemingly unchanging framework of 'good usage' within which changes are legitimised by their acceptance.

The language academy is a 'mechanism' of SLI and corpus planning falls within this remit. The *Académie Française* achieves its goals thus:

Elle le fait en élaborant son dictionnaire qui fixe l'usage de la langue, mais aussi par ses recommandations et par sa participation aux différentes commissions de terminologie.<sup>10</sup>

(Académie Française 2005)

The *Real Academia Española*, whose role and activities I consider in more detail in Chapter 4, affirms its objectives as similar to those of its French counterpart. Its original insignia carries the caption 'Limpia, fija y da esplendor', demonstrating again the belief in the fixity of its language. Its purist activities are claimed to be:

...obediente al propósito enunciado de combatir cuanto alterara la elegancia y pureza del idioma, y de fijarlo en el estado de plenitud alcanzado en el siglo XVI.

(Real Academia Española 2005)

This idea that there is a golden age during which the standard language reached its 'peak' is highlighted in this statement, specifying the sixteenth century as the pinnacle of the development of Castilian. The concept of 'fighting' against non-standard influences that might contaminate the purity or elegance of Spanish is also evident, not only in recalling the epoch of its 'linguistic prime', but also in the present when 'dark social forces' (Cameron, 1995:96) are considered to be a threat to Spanish:

La institución ha ido adaptando sus funciones a los tiempos que le ha tocado vivir. Actualmente, y según lo establecido por el artículo primero de sus Estatutos, la Academia 'tiene como misión principal velar porque los cambios que experimente la Lengua Española en su constante adaptación a las necesidades de sus hablantes no quiebren la esencial unidad que mantiene en todo el ámbito hispánico'.

(Real Academia Española 2005)

It is interesting to note that, even beyond nation-building, SLI agents work to maintain the 'essential unity' of a language, and in the case of Spanish, one which is spoken significantly, if not officially, across twenty-one different nations. The potential value of the observable (not to mention the *imaginable*) variations present across the 400 million speakers of 'the' Spanish language does not appear to hold back the Academy nor other SLI adherents from the task of guarding its integrity and continued unity.

#### 2.4.5.2 Educational institutions

Once again, the origins of school as a national institution can be traced back to the Western European nation-building projects which proclaimed free, universal education for all; certainly in theory, even if the practice bore little resemblance to this ideal. Nevertheless, over recent centuries, the importance placed on mostly state-provided, compulsory education within schools cannot be overestimated. A case in point is the way that truancy in the United Kingdom is seen as a crisis requiring strong, authoritarian action in order to return deliberately absent children to the classroom.

With such an official, enthusiastic state-level pursuit of students' full attendance at school, it could certainly be argued that far from advancing beyond the framework of nationalism, the role of educational institutions is still to instruct future citizens and acculturate them into understanding and living the values of the nation. Joseph argues that in this way, culture is constructed:

Acculturation is learning. Culture is a collective abstraction for what is learned by individuals within a society.

(Joseph 1987:53)

He also writes:

Education is the institution wherein all language-related facets of culture are maintained and dispensed in Western civilization, and whether it is restricted to an elite or open to the masses, the presence of this institution is indispensable to the establishment and the maintenance of a standard language.

(Joseph 1987:45)

What emerges clearly is that educational institutions play an indispensable role in the construction, maintenance and progress of nation-states, particularly within – but not limited to – Western civilisation. As such, the direction of educational institutions is unequivocally part of the political process, and

subject to decisions made by politicians, policy-makers, and active policy-influencers. It becomes difficult then to maintain that education is detached from ideologically-driven politics:

Any system of education is a political way of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourses, along with the knowledges and powers which they carry.

(Foucault, 1984:123, cited in Lippi-Green 1997:65)

Foucault appears to argue that in a universally available education system, all learners are subjected to the dominant discourses which govern that system, including those which empower as well as indoctrinate. However, he rejects any notion of the education system as an 'evenly-distributed and power-neutral cultural resource' (Lippi-Green 1997:65).

It is hardly surprising, then, that the teaching of a standard language is well-rooted in the education system, and acceptance of the standard can be seen as a requirement for success in school. Children may be told that non-standard vocabulary or grammatical devices are appropriate in the privacy of their own homes, but at school, it is necessary to 'speak properly' and 'write well'. For all the discourse attributed to the 'common sense' of such an approach and the common basis for communication which opens doors for social success, the fact cannot be ignored that there exists an expectation of what is appropriate within public social relations. Seidlhofer (2004) has called this a 'performance variety', suggesting that in public discourse, the expectation of communicating in a common linguistic variety and style leads interlocutors to see speech events as 'performance'. In this case, education promotes the standard language as the only appropriate public variety by giving prestige to 'correct' usage of the standard, and penalising the use of any other 'incorrect' variety. Hierarchies of language result, as Joseph stresses:

For any number of possible reasons, wherever variants are in competition, one will always be preferred to the other, creating

hierarchies which it is the task of language education to inculcate. The canonical form of such education is ‘Say x, not y’.

(Joseph 1987:16)

He goes on to say:

The prescribers who issue the ‘Say x, not y’ injunctions may be concerned with the maintenance and spread of the standard, but they simultaneously establish and manifest their own social superiority as experts in the dialect they are describing.

(Joseph 1987:17)

The ideology of standardisation is maintained by educational institutions, who – authenticated by their identification with the dominant linguistic group – seek to establish further predominance of the standard through educating young citizens in the primary ‘tenets’ of SLI. This involves lauding a commonality attainable only by education in one standard language, yet which undeniably ignores many axiomatic aspects of linguistic variety and change, and thus maintains an imbalanced social status quo by keeping the standard difficult to attain.

#### **2.4.5.3 Media**

The previous spheres I have examined – academies and educational institutions – can be described with some certainty as the domains of experts or professionals in language matters. These people have authority by virtue of their extensive education in the field of language structure and use. It also means that they have been exposed more than most to SLI, and will be well-versed in its foundations, whatever their own personal background or ideology. However, within the sphere of broadcast and particularly printed media, it becomes clear that ‘official’ qualifications are not necessarily a prerequisite for participation in language discourse.

Of course there are craft professionals as I mentioned earlier: within this domain they are journalists, copy editors, style guide authors and general editors whose adherence to established norms and decisive action on new regulations is fundamental to what is ultimately included in printed publications. These professionals find themselves working within a mechanism of standardisation – knowingly or otherwise – that contributes to a public awareness that there are standards within language, present in dictionaries and education, but also in the press.

Cameron claims that, 'The press is an important forum for language mavenry in general' (1995:viii). She then goes on to describe how three major British publications - The Mirror, The Times and The Economist – not only constructed their own style of usage, but transformed it into a commodity by publishing style guides for public purchase (1995:33-77). It can be argued that these publications commodified their style by the same process of associating linguistic features and non-linguistic values, 'prestige by transfer'. As such, The Times could claim 'excellence' and authority in linguistic matters, The Mirror perhaps claimed to be more closely associated with language and issues of 'real people' and The Economist, Cameron points out, proclaimed its 'allegiance to Orwellian principles of plain English' (1995:45). Of all three, Cameron says:

Their way of using language is as much a part of this [recognizable and consistent] identity as the more obvious features of their format – size, typeface, page layout, etc. Some have attempted to sell themselves on the basis of their style, and even to sell their stylistic secrets directly to the public.

(Cameron 1995:45)

The variability within these style guides is in itself good evidence of how variable notions of a 'standard' can be, even amongst those institutions which would all purport to use 'good English'. In terms of the influence of these guides, though, Milroy and Milroy are reticent to acknowledge such

publications as responsible for the widespread acceptance of SLI and standard language (English in this case). They claim that:

Generally, mass media channels effectively give rise to *awareness* of an innovation, but have little influence in promoting adoption.

(Milroy and Milroy 1999:25, my emphasis)

The latter point regarding media influence over the adoption of language features is somewhat contentious, and I am sceptical that there is convincing evidence to support their claim. The scope of this thesis, unfortunately, does not allow me to investigate this further. On their former point, I have emphasised *awareness* as part of the contribution of the press to SLI discourse because, as was argued earlier:

As soon as language becomes a variable commodity, the variations are subject to value judgments and assignments of prestige just like every other attribute, aptitude, and possession within human consciousness.

(Joseph 1987:30-31)

Awareness of standard and non-standard language varieties as commodities is the necessary step, as Joseph suggests, before evaluation then takes place. Furthermore, the use and promotion of the standard in public discourse goes some way towards ensuring that prestige is attached to it. Where non-standard varieties are used, or where they are sensed to be a 'threat' to effective communication, upward social mobility or even social order itself, it is frequently the case that printed media will join in the 'moral panic' instigated by alarmist comments such as those of Norman Tebbit MP. It follows that the media, as Cameron suggests, has great power to 'manufacture concern' (1995:84).

What is interesting, though, is that within the press, participation in language debates is not restricted to anonymous editorials or regular 'expert' columnists. The *Letters* pages of newspapers and magazines are often an outlet

for closet language mavens to voice their concerns (in standardised form of course) about the state of the language as well as their suggestions as to how such problems might be 'resolved'. Milroy and Milroy (1999:24-46) argue that it is through the complaints tradition of the British press letters page that many 'lay' language users contribute to the manufacture of concern and gain access to wider public discourse without the need for qualification as an academician or expert. By virtue of using language, having read its canonical literature, and observing the lamentable degradation of the language (as linguistic change is almost always interpreted), standard language users emerge from anonymity to make their voices heard in the great mission to 'rescue' language from those factors which 'threaten' it. These 'invading forces' are seen to be slang, sloppiness, 'youthspeak', foreign intrusions, incorrect spelling, text-messaging language and whatsoever 'bad' linguistic features might 'arise from the perversity of speakers or from cognitive deficiency (an inability to learn what is 'correct')' (Milroy and Milroy 1999:21).

Milroy and Milroy cite a classic example of one such letter of complaint, directed against a secretary who had been interviewed on a television news programme. Apparently her first words, 'I looked up and seen two men', caused such deep-felt horror to the complainant that he felt it necessary to publicly muse on how:

with so many young people out of work, ...she could get such a job, but perhaps 'I seen' and 'I done' etc., is the usual grammar nowadays for office staff and business training colleges.

(cited in Milroy and Milroy 1999:31-2)

It would be a mistake to underestimate how powerfully such grass-roots prescriptivism would be received amongst readers, and how letters such as this, which are far from being rare occurrences, contribute to the reification of standard language as a perceived reality and commodity as opposed to an unattainable abstraction. The underlying assumptions of SLI – of one, correct way of speaking; deviations as illiteracies or barbarisms; the necessity of

promoting standard language as 'common-sense'; and rightly discriminating against such language 'abusers' – are obvious. What is certain is that, as Cameron remarks:

There exists a whole popular culture of language, in which many people participate to some degree. Some are occasional and fairly passive consumers, a few are fanatical crusaders, and there is a continuum of interest and commitment between these two extremes. What is clear, however, is that a great many people care deeply about linguistic matters; they do not merely speak their language, they also speak copiously and passionately *about* it.

(Cameron 1995:ix)

#### **2.4.5.4 Political/public life**

We have already seen something of the active involvement of political figures in SLI discourse in Norman Tebbit's comments, as well as the highly politicised debate around English teaching in the national curriculum in which his comments must be contextualised. It could be said that educational policy is an indirect way of legislating for particular language use, and is more characteristic of nation-states such as the United Kingdom or United States where there are neither Academies nor any 'official' direct language policy in the Constitution or elsewhere. However, there are more direct examples of political decisions on linguistic matters in, for example, France or Spain, where French and Spanish – conceptualised as unitary, standardised languages – are declared to be the official, national languages which every citizen is expected to be able to use competently. Either way, normativity is part of life in general, and particularly a fundamental part of language-use, as Cameron emphasises (1995:2). It follows, Schiffman argues, that:

...whether or not there are explicit language policies, there will always be implicit policies, that is, there are cultural assumptions about language, about correctness, about the 'best' way to talk or write, and

even if there is no explicit policy, these assumptions will constitute the implicit policy. That is, there is no such thing as *no language policy* – there is always a policy, whether or not it is explicit. Abolishing the explicit rules about language, or declaring ‘standard’ languages to be nothing but a ‘myth’ or an ideology does not make the cultural assumptions underlying these concepts automatically disappear.

(Schiffman 1996:148)

We have also seen from Cameron’s comments above (1995:ix) that to some degree, there is public discourse on language which attracts popular attention. This is no doubt a reaction in part to politicians’ and experts’ discourse on language, either agreement with statements based on SLI, or disagreement with what has been said. In my case study, I shall consider how ‘standard’ Spanish continues to evoke strong public opinions on language, and how language debates – which are particularly prevalent in Spain – involve not only politicians but other senior public figures including scholars, writers, media figures and royalty.

## 2.5 SUMMARY

This chapter began with an attempt to synthesise some of the definitions of a ‘standard language’ offered by scholars. These tend to focus on a written representation of the language variety which displays minimal variation in form and maximal variation in function across the territory in which it has been elevated to the status of ‘standard’. Underlying the notion of the standard is ‘graphi-centrism’ and the codification of the spoken language of an elite class, inevitably the powerful class whose authority over the apparatus of state enables the consolidation and spread of the standard variety.

The discourse of nationalism has played a vital role in the development of the ideology of standardisation, taking otherwise equal dialects and elevating one as *the* unifying ‘language’ of a nation-state community. In particular I discussed how Haugen’s taxonomy is effective in understanding the process of standardisation through which a dialect passes in order to ‘become’ a language.

This demonstrates that differences in status between language varieties (i.e. definition as a dialect or language) rest on the outcomes of language planning which, in turn, are essentially political goals. The roots of standardisation in nationalist rhetoric mean that the idealised ‘standard’ – codified and returned to people as a prescribed variety – becomes a tool of inclusion and therefore potentially of exclusion too. Of interest to my study will be the degree to which this effect has adapted to or been perpetuated by post-nationalist contexts. Important, too, are the instrumental, communicative and symbolic roles that a ‘standard’ fulfils within a community, be it local, regional, national or even transnational, as in the case of the ‘Spanish-speaking world’.

Standard language ideology above all represents a process, one which espouses constant intervention to ensure the continued unity and cohesion of a language and therefore of the political and ‘fraternal’ communities united by that language. Notwithstanding the normativity that characterises standardisation, language varieties constantly change and develop according to the needs and desires of speakers. As such, while a written standard is, perhaps temporarily achievable, spoken language resists uniformity and the dichotomy of correct/incorrect. Yet ‘verbal hygiene’ efforts continue, primarily through authoritative ‘mechanisms’ of standardisation including the academies and media which are the particular focus of this thesis. My objective, then, is to understand the particular ideologies which shape the discourses and practices of standardisers of Spanish, and also to identify those ideological perceptions of the language community that the concept of ‘standard’ Spanish has come to index. In other words, what moral, social, ideological and political values are iconised and supposedly embedded in ‘standard’ Spanish and its speakers? As I move into the next chapter, I discuss the methods I will be using to determine the particular ideologies of those who construct ‘standard’ Spanish, as well as the discursive strategies of these language authorities.



# 3

## METHODOLOGY AND DATA: ANALYSING IDEOLOGIES IN PRESS DISCOURSE

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

In seeking to identify the ideological underpinnings of standardisation discourse, it will be necessary to take a methodological approach which will enable me to critique firstly the *denoted meaning* within the lexical content of discourse, and secondly identify and critique the *connoted meaning* which is encoded in both the lexical and grammatical choices made in the production of texts. In this chapter I will discuss the approach I intend to take, which is based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). I will spend the first part of the chapter examining the basis of this approach, in a kind of literature review of the field. I will explain to what extent I will be using it as a basis for my data analysis before going on to describe the data I have collected from two daily publications from the Spanish press: the centre-left *El País* and the conservative *ABC*. Following the description of the data will be my analysis of it, and I will conclude this chapter with some brief comments on the three major categories of discourse on which I elaborate in the following analytical chapters: the unity of Spanish and the community of Spanish-speakers, the role and authority of the RAE and other language guardians, and the Spanish language in the world.

I intend to base my analysis on a critical reading of the texts which form my data corpus. By critical, I mean that rather than simply visually reading the text and cognitively absorbing its *denoted* meanings and perspective, I will

consider the connoted meaning by analysing aspects of the text and critiquing these as not simply a mirror of 'the way things are' but as containing ideological assumptions and meanings which construct a certain representation of language (and other topics) in relation to broader discourses and contexts.

The first element of the data which I will analyse is the *content*. This will be a mainly descriptive exercise and will focus on explicit, surface-level features such as topic, focus, subjects, objects and other features necessary for comprehending the text without entering into a critical reading. Wodak's model for analysing contents and Van Dijk's focus on topics (discussed later in section 3.2.7) provide me with insightful tools for identifying the importance firstly of what is evident from a preliminary reading of a text. My particular interest will be in the topics which are discussed within language debates and how these might break down into recurring/ongoing categories of discussion throughout the data corpus. I will examine the content of newspaper reports from *El País* and *ABC* which relate to language debates in which the *Real Academia Española* is either a contributing voice or an object of the article's coverage, and I will do this from two angles: firstly I will examine how the article itself is framed by the journalist, and therefore shows evidence of being a text produced by a particular writer in a particular context with particular constraints (cultural, political, linguistic, institutional); secondly, and perhaps of more relevance to the main thrust of my study, I will focus on the content of quotations from RAE representatives (the Director, office-holders and other well-known and oft-cited RAE members). These two focuses are linked in that when taking the latter 'raw data' from RAE interviews and statements, the process in the former takes place when the journalist then makes decisions about what to include and how to frame direct quotations in the article as a whole, also called *recontextualisation* (Blommaert 2005:46). So my analysis will consider both the general framing, and the way in which the texts (interviews, statements, press releases) themselves encode decisions regarding the conceptualisation and presentation of standardisation by the RAE to the press-reading public.

The second element of the data which I will analyse is what Deborah Cameron calls the 'hidden agendas' of texts (Cameron 2001:123-141). I am interested in the way texts are produced with both explicit meaning – as outlined above – and also implicit meaning which requires a more detailed analysis of the text within its contexts of production and consumption. With this as my aim, I will draw from the field of CDA, and it is to an outline of this approach that I turn in this next section.

## **3.2 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CDA)**

### ***3.2.1 Introduction: development of CDA***

CDA is an approach to textual analysis which developed from the fields of Critical Linguistics (CL) and Critical Language Awareness developed in the United Kingdom from the late 1970s onwards by scholars such as Günther Kress, Norman Fowler, and Bob Hodge (see Fowler et al. 1979, Hodge and Kress 1979). Coming from a systemic-functional linguistics background, these scholars used Halliday's theories on the functionality of language in order to scrutinise institutional language use and its ideological foundations. By the late 1980s, another Hallidayan linguist, Norman Fairclough, had begun to develop this into an approach by which texts could be systematically analysed to reveal the social conditions and process of a text's production and interpretation (Fairclough 1989/2001). It was around this time that Fairclough first used the phrase *Critical Discourse Analysis* as an umbrella term for the similar approaches being adopted by a growing number of discourse analysts.

The emerging CDA 'school' comprised analysts with distinct focuses yet common perspectives and aims. For example, Teun van Dijk had been using a socio-cognitive approach to study elite discourse, the media and racism (Van Dijk 1985, 1991, 1996) as well as works specifically broaching ideology (1998a, 2006); Ruth Wodak came from an interactional studies background and contributed a discourse-historical perspective to CDA (Wodak 1989, 1996, Wodak et al. 1999, Wodak and Chilton 2005); and Paul Chilton applied a semiotic and communication studies focus to mostly political discourse (Chilton 1988, 2004). Contributions to (and criticisms of) the theoretical basis of CDA

continue to grow (Blommaert 2005, Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, Fairclough 2006, Locke 2004, Toolan 2002), as do the number and scope of applications of CDA in academic journals (*Critical Discourse Studies, Discourse and Society, Journal of Language and Politics*), as well as research articles, theses, conferences and so on. For more detailed discussions of the origins and development of CDA, see Blommaert (2005), Wodak (2001), and Van Dijk (2001a).

### 3.2.2 CDA: general definitions and approaches

In an attempt to understand what CDA is, it is perhaps worth understanding firstly what it is *not*. The consensus within the network of scholars who have contributed to its development is that CDA is not a fixed methodology or 'blueprint' applicable to any object of textual analysis. Instead, it is at its most basic level seen as a shared 'perspective on doing scholarship: it is, so to speak, discourse analysis "with an attitude"' (Van Dijk 2001b:96). The supposed 'attitude' taken by analysts has much to do with the socio-political stance of CDA: its starting point is the belief that there are prevailing social problems which are on the one hand *evidenced through* public discourse, but which are also *influenced by* this discourse. As such, where discourse contributes to social problems and/or inequalities, this discourse can be identified either through the *explicit* meaning of content (e.g. racist, sexist or other discriminatory terms), or through a critical analysis of *implicit* meaning and the representation of social relations in *grammatical structure*. In response to the social problems and inequalities manifested in part in both elite and popular texts and discourses, 'CDAnalysts' (a term I have borrowed from Van Noppen 2004) adopt a clear and definite side with the 'underdog', or as van Dijk remarks:

CDA research combines [...] 'solidarity with the oppressed' with an attitude of opposition and dissent against those who abuse text and talk in order to establish, confirm or legitimate their abuse of power. Unlike much other scholarship, CDA does not deny but explicitly defines and

defends its own socio-political position. That is, CDA is biased – and proud of it.

(Van Dijk 2001b:96)

Based on this deliberate stance, CDA analysts become, in effect, activists or even ‘advocates’ (Meyer 2001:15) on behalf of those dominated groups against whom the ideologies of dominant discourse functions. Van Dijk even calls this ‘dissident research’ (Van Dijk 2001a:352), emphasising the position that analysts take against the uncritical acceptance of the establishment and status quo, and their crossing of the political line between academic observation and active pursuit of the rectification of situations of discrimination and inequality.

One foundation of CDA—which we see in Van Dijk’s comments above—is the view that a definite and intricate relationship exists between language, power and ideology and that this interaction of influences – and the social order to which they contribute – should be open to critique. Wodak (2001:2) cites Fairclough (1985) in pointing out that ‘in human matters, interconnections and chains of cause and effect may be distorted out of vision. Hence ‘critique’ is essentially making visible the interconnectedness of things’. Wodak goes on to include this emphasis of critiquing power relationships in the definition of CDA she offers:

CDA may be defined as fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse).

(Wodak 2001:2)

It figures, then, that revealing and analysing these interconnected—indeed, dialectically related—concepts necessitates what Luke (2002) refers to as:

a principled and transparent shunting back and forth between the microanalysis of texts using varied tools of linguistics, semiotic, and literary analysis and the macroanalysis of social formations, institutions, and power relations that these texts index and construct.

(Luke 2002:100)

In view of this, CDA can be seen as *principled* on the basis of its emancipatory objectives, and *transparent* in that—as van Dijk has observed (2001b:96)—it makes no secret of these objectives, nor its basis, approach, interests or general procedures for the analysis of discourse.

### 3.2.3 *Defining discourse*

Up to this point I have assumed an understanding of the concept of discourse, but it is worth exploring briefly how this term is defined by CDA analysts. Many, if not all, CDA analysts follow Michel Foucault in seeing discourse as social practice: it is language – as well as other forms of semiotic signalling and activities – in action, creating and responding to social practices in a dialectical relationship. Fairclough explains the link between language, discourse and society thus:

Linguistic phenomena are social in the sense that whenever people speak or listen or write or read, they do so in ways which are determined socially and have social effects. [...] Social phenomena are linguistic, on the other hand, in the sense that the language activity which goes on in social contexts (as all language activity does) is not merely a reflection or expression of social processes and practices, it is a *part* of those processes and practices.

(Fairclough 2001:19)

For Fairclough, then, there is no (easy) way of conceiving of language and society as discrete: they are absolutely interrelated and they develop in interaction with each other.

Another 'follower' of Foucault is Jan Blommaert, who—in his 2005 monograph *Discourse*—offers an engaging and comprehensive treatment of the subject. In it, he defines discourse as 'all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use' (2005:3). The construal of this connection between 'texts' (discourse) and society as dialectical does not, however, mean that the relationship is seen as direct or deterministic (Van Dijk 2001b:117, Wodak 2001:3). Neither one simply creates or reacts to the other – they are constantly interrelating.

### 3.2.4 *Functions of discourse and the importance of context*

As a social practice, discourse performs the dual functions of both *representing* the world, and *constituting* the world. In terms of representing the world, 'discourses include representations of how things are and have been, as well as imaginaries – representations of how things might or could or should be.' (Fairclough 2005:79). Consequently, conceptions of the world around us are proposed and negotiated using language. Language is understood here to constitute more than just spoken or written forms of communication. In contemporary societies – and not just in the West – images are of increasing importance and play a vital role in communication. On this point, Blommaert maintains that,

[W]hat is traditionally understood by language is but one manifestation of it; all kinds of semiotic 'flagging' performed by means of objects, attributes or activities can and should also be included for they usually constitute the 'action' part of language-in-action. What counts is the way in which such semiotic instruments are actually deployed and how they start to become meaningful against the wider background mentioned above. (Blommaert 2005:3)

So CDAnalysts see speech, writing, imagery, objects and practices as intrinsically linked in firstly representing individual and collective perceptions of the world and consequently in affecting the choices (or lack of them) offered

to and made by people in contemporary *semiotised economies* (Luke 2002:98). It should now be clear how discourse moves from representing the world to constituting it, in that decisions are made, lives are outworked, power is exercised and activities of all kinds are based on the discursive understanding of how society is structured and functions; as Kerr writes, 'ideology has to be performed socially' (2003:135). It is therefore vitally important that CDAnalysts are aware of the social milieu in which a text is produced and consumed, as this context plays a major part in the interpretation of why a text is as it is and what other social, political, economic, etc, discourses are embedded within the text. Fairclough highlights the implications of this for analysts:

So, in seeing language as discourse and as social practice, one is committing oneself not just to analysing texts, nor just to analysing processes of production and interpretation, but to analysing the relationship between texts, processes, and their social conditions, both the immediate conditions of the situational context and the more remote conditions of institutional and social structures. Or [...] the relationship between *texts, interactions, and contexts*.

(Fairclough 2001:21)

Given that texts go through processes of conception, production, dispersion, reception and consumption, all of these involve individuals with many similarities but also many differences in the situations, perspectives, ideologies and purposes they bring to the discursive process. As such, it becomes very difficult to contemplate the myriad influences and the hundreds of relevant units, features and strategies of discourse itself; indeed Van Dijk argues that a full or complete discourse analysis of a text (particularly of a large corpus of data) is impossible (2001b:98-99). Therefore CDAnalysts, according to Huckin, try to '[...] take into account *the most relevant textual and contextual factors*, including historical ones, that contribute to the production and interpretation of a given text' (2007:1, my emphasis). In terms of what factors he considers to be relevant, Huckin goes on to identify these as, 'those features of a text that are

most interesting from a critical perspective, those that appear to be textual manipulations serving non-democratic purposes' (2007:3). The non-democratic purposes of my own data might include the discursive construction of the 'unquestionable' need for standardisation and the legitimisation of this by linguistically structured arguments. Other textual manipulations might include the naturalised practice of taking authority for language away from the speech community in order to perform corpus planning and to return it to them as a normative commodity in the form of dictionaries, grammars and orthographies, as well as prestigious public uses of 'exemplary' language in the press.

### *3.2.5 Discourse and control*

Discourse legitimates and naturalises the perceptions and understanding of society of discourse producers. These producers achieve a place of influence for their views by making them widely available, often dispersing and reproducing them through an increasing number of channels. As a result, such discourse becomes powerful – sometimes through forcing people to accept it by coercion, but more often by 'manufacturing consent' (see Chapter 1). For this reason, CDA focuses on language and power in order to reveal the underlying ideologies held by those in power. By referring to a 'dominant' discourse, I do not mean that it is the only one in circulation or in power: discourses often exist – particularly in democratic societies – in competition, and texts are often 'sites of struggle' (Wodak 2001:11) in which various discourses and ideologies can be founding vying for dominance.

With this in mind, CDAnalysts seek to 'illuminate ways in which the dominant forces in a society construct versions of reality that favour the interests of those same forces' (Huckin 2007:2), which means that a central question of CDA must be 'who has control?' of discourse and the media by which it is made public. Therein lies another question regarding who has access to these means of control. As Van Dijk writes:

[...] groups have (more or less) power if they are able to (more or less) control the acts and minds of (members of) other groups. This ability

presupposes a power base of privileged access to scarce social resources, such as force, money, status, fame, knowledge, information, 'culture', or indeed various forms of public discourse and communication.

(Van Dijk 2001a:354-355)

### 3.2.6 *Agency*

The works I have cited state that language does not always directly or deterministically affect social practice. Van Dijk (2001a:357), taking a socio-cognitive approach, goes on to suggest a number of ways in which discursive and contextual factors of discourse contribute to public control. One of these is through the prestige of the text producer: by virtue of their perceived status as authoritative and credible experts, information emanating from such sources is often received as trustworthy. There are also situations in which participants have no choice over the reception of discourse (e.g. school, work); there is no alternative public discourse (e.g. totalitarian regimes); and/or people lack the awareness or resources to be able resist the messages of dominant discourses.

In order for certain discourses to maintain their position of hegemony, agency can be obscured, meaning that there is, seemingly, no identifiable individual or institution responsible for producing the discourse. The dominant view, through spread and repetition, then becomes naturalised and received as 'what everyone thinks/says/does', 'common sense' or 'the view from nowhere' (Nagel 1986). CDA analysts construe this mystification as a strategic tool which obscures the source of discourse, putting the discourse beyond scrutiny and its producers beyond responsibility (or blame). As a result, naturalisation/mystification also reifies unequal social relations in that there is seemingly no-one to be challenged (as 'everyone' thinks that way); therefore CDA affirms the need to uncover the social actors involved and the processes they are enacting, because:

[...] local situations of interaction enact, manifest or instantiate global societal structures. Participants speak and listen as women, mothers, lawyers, party members, or company executives. Their actions,

including their discursive actions, realize larger social acts and processes, such as legislation, education, discrimination and dominance, often within institutional frameworks such as parliaments, schools, families, or research institutes.

(Van Dijk 2001b:117)

Elsewhere, Van Dijk describes and elaborates on this in terms of 'access', and claims that CDAnalysts must seek to answer the question, 'Who may speak or write to whom, about what, when, and in what context?, or Who may participate in such communicative events in various recipient roles, for instance as addressees, audience, bystanders and overhearers?' (Van Dijk 1996:86). These are questions I will take into account in my press data analysis.

### 3.2.7 *CDA as method*

The theories outlined up to this point shape the CDAnalysts' understanding of the production and function of a given text. In order to reveal these features and interpret them in the light of the CDA's theoretical framing, there are a number of different analytical schemes which can be employed, although there is consensus among CDAnalysts that no single 'CDA method' exists. What we can say is that there are particular features of a text which are scrutinised because they provide a way of linking the 'micro' level of the text with the 'macro' level of the society whose overarching values are reproduced within the text (Luke 2002:100, Van Dijk 2001a:354); as a result there are some systematic approaches to identifying and analysing these features.

Choices must be made by the CDAnalyst about which particular features are relevant to the study being carried out. The objects of analysis are those 'hidden agendas' (Cameron 2001:123-141) and manifestations of power relations that can be revealed in texts, and so:

[...] it only makes sense to study those properties that can vary as a function of social power. Thus, stress and intonation, word order, lexical style, coherence, local semantic moves (such as disclaimers), topic choice,

speech acts, schematic organization, rhetorical figures and most forms of interaction are in principle susceptible to speaker control. But other structures, such as the form of words and many structures of sentences are grammatically obligatory and contextually invariant and hence usually not subject to speaker control, and hence irrelevant for a study of social power.

(Van Dijk 2001b:99)

Van Dijk's list of example features is more easily and immediately applicable to spoken discourse. What is interesting for my study, however, is how some of these features of interaction (in particular lexical style, local semantic moves, topic choice and schematic organisation) are achieved in the press media where there is no spoken interaction as such but where communication is one-way from the writer to the reader, and where those variables of social power act through written features. Van Dijk (2001b:101-113) goes on to refer to the discourse structures which are often useful in his own research of texts.

Firstly he analyses the *topics*, noting that these 'are often expressed in discourse, for instance in titles, headlines, summaries, abstracts, thematic sentences or conclusions' (2001b:102). Text producers foreground certain meanings or aspects of discourse, making them appear more important or urgent than other meanings or aspects which are omitted or glossed over.

Next, *local meanings* demonstrate how authors select their terms and how these invest entities, events or ideas with both denoted/explicit and connoted/implicit meanings through implications, presuppositions, allusions, vagueness and other textual strategies (Van Dijk 2001b:104).

The *context models* relate discourse structures to the structures of local and global contexts (2001b:108). The *local* context includes a critique of the domain, action and participants of a text, as well as their intentions, objectives, knowledge and other discernable ideologies. The *global* context identifies the overarching structures created by influences of politics, society, history, economy and culture. These are of particular importance to both spoken and

written discourse, as 'they often form the ultimate explanatory and critical rationale of discourse and its analysis' (2001b:108).

Finally, in Van Dijk's *event models*, he argues that mental representations of text producers and consumers enable them to select contextually relevant dimensions of discourse (setting, participants, and so on) in order to semantically construct or interpret the event in question. In a way, this is similar to his concept of *local meanings*, but focusing more on the way in which individual and collective knowledge and memory, or 'socially shared mental representations' (van Dijk 1993:257) play a part in the interpretation of events.

Another procedure for unearthing the hidden agendas of discourses is proposed by Fairclough, often designated the 'father of CDA' due to his significant role in the shaping of CDA as a discipline. Whilst Fairclough has also sought to play down any temptation to see any one version of CDA as a transferable 'blueprint' for critical analysis, perhaps the clearest schema he offers—from which I can draw useful suggestions for my own approach—is found in *Language and Power* (2001) and is reproduced in Appendix A of this study. In the schema, Fairclough categorises the analytical questions into three stages: description, interpretation and explanation. The questions that Fairclough asks of discourse relate more to textual data than those of Van Dijk. Indeed, the importance placed on textually encoded data that is subsequently subject to linguistic analysis is viewed by Blommaert as a problematic bias (2005:21-38). Blommaert takes issue with what he sees as Fairclough's reduction of 'critical' analysis to that which is based on Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics:

In short, the linguistic bias restricts the space of analysis to textually organised and (explicitly) linguistically encoded discourse, not to where it comes from or goes to.

(Blommaert 2005:35)

Blommaert goes on to claim that:

[...] if we wish to understand contemporary forms of inequality in and through language, we should look inside language *as well as outside it*, in society, and both aspects of analysis are not separable.

(Blommaert 2005:35)

To some extent, Blommaert's criticism of CDA's linguistic bias seems unnecessary; not because it is untrue but because—in my own understanding of CDA at least—Fairclough does not actually claim that textual data is the only data in which ideologies are embedded. On the contrary, Fairclough is primarily concerned with providing approaches and tools with which to uncover textually embedded ideologies of social inequality; the absence of any 'Faircloughian' approach to multimodal discourse analysis by no means suggests that he limits ideological expression to textual sites only.

In addition to Van Dijk's socio-psychological approach, and Fairclough's Marxist emphasis on textual analysis, the particular focus of Ruth Wodak is on the historical construction of key aspects of discourse. Her work on the construction of national identity lays out a particular methodological approach based on three dimensions of analysis: (1) contents, (2) strategies, and (3) means and forms of realisation (Wodak et al. 1999:30-47). First, the analysis of content focuses on the construction of themes within discourse. In the case of nationalism these include common culture, political past/present/future, and so on. Given the roots of standardisation in nationalist discourse, it will be of interest to examine the extent to which standardisation discourse still relies on nationalist themes, and how, if at all, these have been developed and are constructed in the contemporary context. Second, strategies represent the discursive schemes 'adopted to achieve a certain political, psychological or other kind of objective' (1999:31). The strategy of a text (and its producer) might be to construct or dismantle a particular identity, to justify this, or to transform it from one definition to another through deconstruction and reconstruction. Within the analysis of strategies, Wodak et al refer to *topos/topoi* which they define as:

conventionalised parts of argumentation which [...] take the form either of explicit or inferable premises [...] or 'conclusion rules' which connect an argument or arguments with a conclusion, a claim.

(Wodak et al. 1999:34)

Topoi arise from the data and are not 'a priori', so in the example of Wodak's study of Austrian national identity, topoi of similarity, comparison, authority, threat, and consequence arose. The third analytical dimension – the means of realisation – provides the detailed study of linguistic categories and devices on which themes, strategies and topoi are established. What Wodak's approach usefully brings to my case study of Spanish standardisation discourse is recognition of the importance of themes in the construction of the ideal 'standard'. Of equal importance is the focus on identifying the strategies and topoi employed in order to reach particular conclusions. This will enable me to extract the particular argumentation strategies and comment on how these are being presented for consumption by the press-reading public.

### **3.3 CDA AND LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES**

#### **3.3.1 *Hidden agendas***

Given that my research questions centre around the ideological representation of language by the RAE in the press, Fairclough and Wodak's 'paradigms' provide me with useful sets of questions with which to approach the newspaper article data, and from which I will be able to select relevant questions to help me draw out ideological features, themes and strategies. The primary reason for my choice of CDA as a guiding analytical procedure is that its aim to uncover hidden institutional ideological agendas is shared by researchers addressing language ideologies (see edited volumes of Blommaert 1999c, Kroskrity 2000b, Ricento 2000b, Schieffelin et al. 1998).

Whilst not all scholars in the field of language ideologies employ CDA, nor ally themselves with it as an approach, their analytical work is necessarily 'critical' in the sense that it uncovers assumptions and beliefs which lie below the level of naturalised, mystified discourse. Indeed, the argument could be

made that there are numerous scholars doing ‘critical discourse analysis’ (lowercase) without particularly identifying or engaging with the world of ‘Critical Discourse Analysis’ (uppercase) as explicated in the previous section. Nonetheless, the aims of both CDA and scholarship on Language Ideologies intersect, as Wodak confirms when she writes that, ‘One of the aims of CDA is to ‘demystify’ discourses by deciphering ideologies’ (Wodak 2001:10).

### 3.3.2 *Ideological vocabulary*

In Chapter 1, I noted that ideology is shaped, individually and collectively, by attitudes regarding the historical role, usefulness, value and quality of a language or language variety. I agree with Van Dijk’s view that:

Since people acquire, express and reproduce their ideologies largely by text or talk, a discourse analytical study of ideology is most relevant.

(Van Dijk 2006:115)

The analytical questions (Appendix A) that Fairclough asks of a text at the description stage seek to identify vocabulary choices which reflect the pretext—the contextual factors and ideologies—which inform a text producer at the moment of production. Consequently, guidelines taken from CDA will help me to ask well-structured and specific questions of texts: for example, if there are certain experiential, expressive or relational values attached to or manifested through lexical items, and what evidence there is within these terms of the way that language itself—its history, usefulness, value or quality—is being defined as part of an ideological construction.

### 3.3.3 *Naturalisation*

A critical approach to the media texts I will analyse should also reveal ways in which certain language ideologies become naturalised through phrases or terms which are repeated diachronically throughout the data corpus. Of interest, too, will be the concepts and claims of language guardians which become mystified through obscuring details such as the agents, patients and processes identified

in the texts. The process of naturalisation of a particular topic or discourse obscures the ability of many text 'consumers' to recognise the interest-laden nature of the topic, or certainly the interest-laden way in which it is presented and discussed. As a result, naturalised topics become 'common sense' views which often fail to trigger a particularly critical response, whilst all the time the underlying ideology 'creates and acts in a social world while it masquerades as a description of that world' (Eagleton 1991:19). In critically analysing my data, I intend to be aware of words or phrases which frequently recur in the text in order to determine if the acceptance and meaning of these terms are undergoing a process of naturalisation through repeated use and promotion. Subsequent contextualisation of these terms and texts will allow me—at the stages of interpretation and explanation—to suggest what the effects are of their use by both the Academy members and the journalists reporting on language matters.

### *3.3.4 Sites of ideology*

Research on language ideologies and the approach of CDA both address the sites in which ideological discourse is situated. My earlier discussion in Chapters 1 and 2 of ideological 'siting' included the three contexts that Woolard (1998:9-11) suggests: (1) linguistic practices, (2) metapragmatic discourse, and (3) implicit metapragmatics. Regarding textual discourse, linguistic practices—in multilingual and multivarietal situations at least—include the choice of language variety used to speak or write, as well as the contextual factors such as register and textual genre. In my press data, I am interested in how this is prescribed by the policy and practices (i.e. editorial policy, style guides) which govern each newspaper's production. CDA takes choices at a language variety level to be an important aspect of analysis, as well as the more micro-level lexical choices made vis-à-vis register, semantics, and so on.

Metapragmatic discourse—a central aspect of language ideological debates—will be important to my analysis, in terms of both explicit content and also implicit meaning and strategies in discourse. What I mean by this is that where RAE discourse in the press includes declarations which define the

Spanish language, its speakers, guardians, status, use and abuse, this is interesting to a critical analysis because the very presence of such debates can tell us something about the ideological and discursive practices present in the immediate textual context (Fairclough 1995a:71) as well as the wider socio-political context in which these debates are found. Furthermore, a critical reading of the content and also the grammatical and structural features of language debates will reveal specific details of the underlying ideologies and the common strategies employed in order to present and proliferate these ideologies through mass media.

### **3.3.5 CDA and hegemony**

Critical discourse analysis helps us to understand where language is being used in the construction of hegemonic linguistic ideologies. It was noted in my earlier discussion of ideologies that language debates are rarely about language alone (Woolard 1998:3) and that when they do occur, they have much to do with the social changes involved in reorganising the cultural hegemony over the polity (Gramsci 1985:183-4). Where this reorganisation takes the form of alliances between various official or 'dominant' bodies in the service of greater authority and more hegemonic power, critical analysis of the press coverage of these alliances will help me to see if the processes are transparent or not, and also how these articles are structured in order to reveal or conceal ideological processes and alliances. As Fairclough states, 'Ideology is the prime means of manufacturing consent' (2001:4), and it is in employing critical discourse analysis to widespread media texts that I will identify the ideological foundations of language guardians who manufacture consent to their dominant definition and vision of the Spanish language through ideological means.

### **3.3.6 Differences between CDA and Language Ideology**

Milani (2007) notes that the disciplines of CDA and Language Ideology differ on two significant counts. First, there is a difference in the perceived role that language plays in social processes: on the one hand, CDA focuses more on language as a *medium*, 'through which social inequality and domination are

produced, reproduced and/or contested in a variety of contexts in specific historical moments' (2007:10), whereas scholarship on language ideologies holds that 'social divisions and inequalities are (re)produced and challenged *on the basis of* perceived or presumed linguistic practices – these in turn are processes whereby images of languages are tied to other categorisations such as group identities, aesthetics, morality, and so forth' (2007:10). Second, the role of social theory as a tool for critically analysing language is seen by CDA analysts as key to the emancipatory objective of critical work. In contrast, research on language ideologies, as Milani observes:

[...] not only often sidelines the linguistic aspect of the texts under scrutiny, but it also questions the reliance on a totalising social theory that can explain, and help intervene in, the workings of those 'grand narratives of dominance' that CDA aims to uncover.

(Milani 2007:11)

In spite of these slightly divergent notions of how language relates to social processes and theory, the convergence of both approaches overall does not prevent there being a useful and constructive purpose in bringing the two together. Indeed, the different analytical angles taken towards uncovering ideological discourses together offer a broader explanation than each approach might otherwise do alone of how language is formed, developed and used in the construction of ideological debates and the reproduction of social inequality.

### ***3.3.7 CDA: a guiding tool for ideological analysis***

I have made the case in this section that CDA provides me with the most suitable and appropriate 'stance' and methodical tool for interrogating my corpus of press data in order to uncover evidence of the issues of ideology and standardisation discussed in earlier chapters. In many of the studies conducted under the 'banner' of CDA, analysis is conducted of a few texts (or even just one), often a speech, article or advertisement. It is clear that in focussed studies

such as these, it is possible to systematically describe and interpret the data to a significantly detailed level. However, bearing in mind Van Dijk's observation that a 'full' analysis of even one text is simply not a realistic outcome of CDA (2001b:98-99), larger corpora such as the one I am investigating in this thesis are not so easily dissected in detail, certainly not within the constraints of a three-year solo doctoral project. Nonetheless this does not diminish the effectiveness of aspects of CDA in guiding my analysis, as my aim is to look at themes which occur and reoccur across the corpus of data and to investigate how various salient textual features work ideologically.

Meyer notes that 'a definitive list of the linguistic devices relevant for CDA cannot be given, since their selection mainly depends on the specific research questions' (Meyer 2001:25). It follows that – far from adopting a rigid analytical taxonomy, I will draw from CDA a flexible series of proposals which will enable me to answer my research questions in the following ways: I will identify not only the authors of the texts but also the agents of the processes which are represented and discussed in those texts; I will highlight important aspects of the contexts in which language ideological debates take place; I will discuss how meaning is made through the interplay of various presuppositions and unwritten aspects of discourse; and I will analyse how argumentation strategies and topoi are employed in order to achieve ideological and political objectives through the press media.

This, then, is how I 'hold' the tool of CDA as I approach my data analysis: not as a rigid taxonomy, but as offering helpful hints as to textual features which encode ideological functions of discourse.

### **3.3.8 *Metaphor analysis***

Another aspect to the analysis will be that which deals with the use of metaphors. While this is by no means central to the thesis, metaphor does emerge in the data and discussion to such a degree as to require some explanation at this point.

Scholars and indeed the majority of language users agree that metaphors are common in everyday language. Metaphorical constructions are employed

in language in order to help – or even *make* – us view objects, concepts and processes in quite particular and unconventional ways. Andrew Goatly defines metaphor as the case in which an unconventional reference to an object, concept or process is understood on the basis of some similarity, matching or analogy involving the conventional referent and the current unconventional, ‘metaphorical’ referent (1997:8). George Lakoff, who has authored a number of seminal works on metaphor theory (Lakoff 1993, Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 2000), refers to metaphor as a ‘cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system’, that is a way of understanding the conventional ‘target domain’ in terms of an unconventional ‘source domain’ (Lakoff 1993:207). He emphasizes that metaphors are widely used not just in poetic/figurative language, but for our understanding of abstractions, many of which have considerable impact on our knowledge of and consequent response to everyday phenomena, including language itself.

It is a system of metaphor that structures our everyday conceptual system, including most abstract concepts, and that lies behind much of everyday language. [...] as soon as one gets away from concrete physical experience and starts talking about abstractions or emotions, metaphorical understanding is the norm. (Lakoff 1993:204).

The resulting argument here is that how we come to define and conceptualise language (including through metaphorical representations) will have consequences on how we use it and deal with it.

Metaphors – as my data will show – are also common in institutional discourse, and if this is the case then CDA is certainly useful in seeking to understand how often-powerful institutions use metaphors ideologically to promote particular hidden agendas. An important reason for this is that theorists have shown how metaphors have the potential to produce a biased understanding of the metaphor’s target domain, due to what Goatly calls the ‘selective perception and selective ignoring of aspects of the world’ (Goatly 1997:3). Consequently, the choice of Academicians and the press to emphasise

or omit particular aspects of – in this case - the linguistic world will obviously contribute to a very specifically constructed view of that world. Furthermore, metaphors in language ideological discourse can implicitly achieve certain social, psychological or political objectives in ways other than through reasoned argument, as Bermel points out:

If cognitive theory of metaphor is correct, then metaphoric usage will play quite a different role in creating discourse than overt argument [...] [Metaphor] appeals to innate or deeply embedded ways of understanding and perceiving, and can persuade without reference to argument.

(Bermel 2007:262-3)

The deeply embedded understandings take us beyond Lackoff's predominantly cognitive framework to see metaphors as Nerlich, Hamilton and Rowe (2002) do, as social and cultural phenomena. In terms of what metaphors achieve in society, Nerlich et al argue that:

[...] metaphors are not only cognitive but social and cultural phenomena. They tap into a nation's cultural imagination, they naturalise social representations and they shape social policy.

(Nerlich et al. 2002:90)

It follows that if metaphors have ideological as well as cognitive consequences, then language ideological discourse becomes a very fruitful domain for a critical metaphor analysis in order that we 'raise awareness of the latent ideologies within' (Goatly 1997:79).

In my later analysis of language ideological discourse about Spanish, it will be my aim then, where metaphors occur in the data corpus, to link the use of metaphor to particular social representations and to identify their corresponding influence on social and linguistic policy.

### 3.4 DATA

#### 3.4.1 *Rationale*

Upon exploring and considering the context of Spain's language debates, it is clear that the media—and the newspaper press in particular—is one of the vehicles in which RAE policy is most widely published, commented upon and diffused. Articles written by members of the Academy regularly feature in the press, and in particular the 'quality press' which prides itself on its good use of the Spanish language .

As one Professor of Journalism has written (in the press about the press):

Los medios audiovisuales tienen un mayor consumo popular en la cultura hispana y, sin duda, sus efectos sobre el sistema lingüístico, y en general sobre la sociedad, son los más cotidianos y persistentes. Sin embargo, aún cabe a la prensa un papel importante en los procesos de normalización y control, función que corresponde más concretamente a los diarios de calidad o de influencia rectora que se caracterizan por su capacidad de inducción de pautas de regeneración cultural y social, acordes con la evolución del pensamiento y de los hábitos de un momento dado.

(Bernardo Díaz Nosty, *El País*, 07-04-1997)

In contrast to Milroy and Milroy's comments (1999:29) that the mass media exercises little influence over the adoption of linguistic norms and innovations, Díaz Nosty's analysis is that in the Spanish context, the effects of the audiovisual media on linguistic practices are considerable. This influence includes a continued and significant role for the press, particularly the quality press of which *El País* and *ABC* are the most widely read. The socio-economic categories into which most readers of these newspapers would fall include some of the most educated and influential groups in Spanish society, which clearly has significant consequences for the reinforcing and reproduction of hegemonic ideologies.

If 'ideology is pervasively present in language' (Fairclough 2001:2), then the powerful position of the newspaper press to inform and influence readers through the written medium is a particularly interesting vehicle of ideological transmission – a point that numerous scholars have recognized and explored (see Cameron 1995, Fairclough 1995b, Fowler 1991, Richardson 2007, Van Dijk 1998b). Fairclough's view is that:

media discourse should be regarded as the site of complex and often contradictory processes, including ideological processes. [...] Media texts do indeed function ideologically in social control and social reproduction, but they also operate as cultural commodities in a competitive market[...], are part of the business of entertaining people, are designed to keep people politically and socially informed, are cultural artefacts in their own right, informed by particular aesthetics; and they are at the same time caught up in—reflecting and contributing to—shifting cultural values and identities.

(Fairclough 1995b:47)

The Spanish newspaper press – as in the majority of democratic nation-states – reaches a large readership across a wide geographical and social territory, even beyond its national borders now with the publication of newspaper material online. These media texts perform an ideological role in society because journalists' writings do not simply recount facts about interesting events within (and beyond) that society. Journalists and editors firstly make decisions about what is 'newsworthy' or important enough to include for their readers; they then make decisions about how these articles should be presented in terms of the space allocated to them and the section of the press under which the news should be categorised (e.g. national, international, culture, business, etc); linguistic decisions are also made at the writing stage about how news should be framed, described, interpreted and 'delivered' for the consumption of a readership which both is subject to, and generates, the 'shifting cultural values and identities' Fairclough identifies above.

Richardson believes that 'journalism exists to enable citizens to better understand their lives and their position(s) in the world' (2007:7) and, in favour of this idealist vision, shuns the idea that any one of entertainment, propaganda or mere profit-making can be the primary goal or end product of newspaper journalism:

When the work of journalists emphasises entertainment, or the activities and opinions of the powerful, or the pursuit of profit in themselves or above the primary function of journalism – to help citizens understand the world and their positions in it – it stops being journalism.

(Richardson 2007:8)

The seemingly noble goal of journalism that Richardson proposes does not exclude the possibility – or the inevitability – of ideological underpinnings permeating the news-producing process. In seeking to help citizens to understand their lives, it is common for a newspaper to reinforce views of what 'their' citizens' lives are like, and *should be* like: the reproduction of the model citizen or model reader. The relation between the 'consuming' reader and the 'producing' newspaper sets the latter up as an institution, and thus its ideological foundations and output can be seen as *institutional ideologies*, as Van Dijk observes:

[...] the ideologies and opinions of newspapers are usually not personal, but social, institutional or political.

(Van Dijk 1998b:22)

Thus we see that the newspaper press is a particularly rich and important site for propagating (and therefore locating) many different ideologies. Among these are language ideologies, which—as I showed in Chapter 1—are frequently institutional, and for this reason I chose to examine the Spanish press as an outlet for the institutional ideologies of the *Real Academia Española*. In particular, I chose to focus on two daily newspapers, *El País* and *ABC*.

### 3.4.1.1 *El País*

This national daily newspaper was established in 1975 and has become a symbol and ‘dominant reference’ (Imbert et al. 1986) of post-Franco democratic Spain. It declares itself as:

un periódico independiente, nacional, de información general, con una clara vocación europeísta, defensor de la democracia plural según los principios liberales y sociales, y que se compromete a guardar el orden democrático y legal establecido en la Constitución.

(El País 1998:17)

Politically, its analysis is generally left of centre, and while it has previously supported the socialists—particularly during their time in government in the 1980s—it has taken a step back from such close support and is now a more distant critical voice. The media conglomerate *Grupo Prisa* owns *El País*, along with other significant Spanish media companies including the sports newspaper *As*, the radio channels *Cadena Ser* and *Los 40*, and *EP3*, an online guide to music, cinema and other cultural activities. It is the second bestselling daily newspaper in Spain after *Marca* (a tabloid-esque sports newspaper) with a current average readership of over 2 million every day (AIMC 2007:7).

*El País* was quick to produce its first *Libro de estilo* just two years after its foundation, and with a strongly enforced in-house style, the newspaper is something of a model of linguistic correctness. This is not entirely unrelated to the fact that its former editor and ongoing *Prisa* board member is Juan Luís Cebrián, a member of the RAE; another regular *El País* columnist until his death was Fernando Lázaro Carreter, the Spanish Academy’s former director. The *Libro de estilo* is now in its 16<sup>th</sup> edition (2002) since the first one less than 30 years ago, which demonstrates its propensity to rapidly reflect linguistic innovations.

### 3.4.1.2 *ABC*

The strongly conservative *ABC* has been running since 1905 and is, in the words of its parent company Vocento, a ‘diario nacional con una elevada presencia e

influencia entre líderes de opinión y personas relevantes en la vida social, empresarial, y política española' (CMVocento 2007). In spite of its influential reach into the Spanish establishment and senior business community with the vast majority (82%) of readers coming from the upper/upper-middle social classes (CMVocento 2007), numerically it currently only has the sixth largest readership of any Spanish daily newspaper, with approximately 695,000 readers (AIMC 2007:7). In contrast to *El País*, *ABC* is fervently right-wing in its analysis and pro-Catholic in moral tendency; as such it is still associated by many with Francoist times and values.

*ABC* also has its own style guide (2001, 1995) which – perhaps surprisingly – only takes the tone of strongly recommending the application of its content, a less compulsory stance than *El País*'s mandatory in-house norms (Stewart 1999:27-28). The style guide is one of the links between *ABC* and the RAE, in that the Prologue of the first edition which ran from 1995 to 2001 was authored by Fernando Lázaro Carreter, and the Epilogue by Luís María Anson, former editor of *ABC* and an Academician since 1998. As in *El País*, the association with the Academy by no means stops with just one or two regular writers or editors: other Academicians are frequently invited (or invite themselves) to contribute opinion articles, interviews and comments on Spanish language matters.

### 3.4.1.3 Readerships

In figure 1 below, I have collated and tabulated statistics from surveys of the Spanish media which show the readership figures for *El País* and *ABC* over the ten-year period from which my press data come.

	1997	2001	2004	2005	2007	% Change
<b>ABC</b>	Not available	771	852	865	695	-9.9
<b>El País</b>	Not available	1,590	2,191	2,025	2,099	+32

Figure 1: Average readership (000s) of two newspapers studied, 1997-2007 (key dates) Sources: AIMC, Estudio general de medios, reports of corresponding years.

What these statistics show is that readership of the printed version of *El País* has experienced considerable overall growth during this period, with a peak in 2004

of almost 2.2 million readers, dropping in 2005 and then rising again in 2007 to just under 2.1 million. During this same period, *ABC* experienced an increasing readership until 2007, when figures are seen to drop to 695,000 readers daily. One explanation for this might be the growth in the use of the internet (fig.2):

	1997	2001	2004	2005	2007	% Change
Daily Newspapers	37.7	35.9	41.1	41.1	41.3	+3.6
Internet	0.9	9.0	16.8	19.7	23.2	+22.3

Figure 2: Market penetration (%) of media types, 1997-2007 (key dates)  
Source: (AIMC 2007:3).

The number of Spaniards aged over 14 years accessing the internet has increased more than 22% in the last ten years, which along with the ongoing development and expansion of both *El País* and *ABC*'s websites has meant that more and more people who do read these particular newspapers are able to access the same news online. Furthermore, the fact that news can be made available far more quickly via constant updates on the internet, rather than waiting for the next day's print-run, may have an effect on readers' choice of medium. In the case of *ABC*, this internet growth appears to correlate to a drop in the readership of the printed version, whereas with *El País*, readership numbers continue to increase.

Nonetheless, the choice of news media for this study was not based on issues of availability as such, but on the differences of position these newspapers take (political left-right, pre- and post-Franco) as well as their similarities (amongst the most read newspapers, nationally available, considered to use prestigious Spanish). The purpose of the statistical data here is to inform my analysis by situating the source data in its socio-political context and to demonstrate that the selected newspapers are data sources which represent a high percentage of the press-reading Spanish public. Accordingly, the kinds of ideologies present within these publications can be taken as representative of the political and ideological positions of a broad and representative portion of Spanish society.

#### 3.4.1.4 Periods of study

In figures 1 and 2, it will have been noted that not every year between 1997 and 2007 was included, but only five. These represent the years on which my data collection was based, and centred on events which took place in those five particular years which I consider to be important junctures in the ongoing public language debates in Spain and the Spanish-speaking world. The events were:

- April 1997 – I *Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española* (Zacatecas, Mexico)
- October 2001 – II *Congreso* (Valladolid, Spain)
- November 2004 – III *Congreso* (Rosario, Argentina)
- November 2005 – Publication of *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*
- March 2007 – IV *Congreso* (Cartagena de Indias, Colombia)

The series of *Congresos Internacionales de la Lengua Española* (CILE) are organised as a major forum for reflection and dialogue on the status, problems, and challenges that the Spanish language is considered to face. As such, these offer a window into the current workings and priorities of the language guardians, and provide exceptional media coverage for these guardians to publicise their discourse on language matters. The publication of the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* was important because it represented the first official publication by Madrid and the sister Academies since the launch of the Panhispanic Language Policy.

#### 3.4.2 Data collection process and methods

Based on the selected dates, I conducted searches on the online versions of *ABC* and *El País* using their 'Archive' functions. I used a number of search terms which I considered would be sufficiently general and most useful in locating articles dealing with language debates on any topic. These terms were:

- Real Academia Española
- real academia lengua
- RAE

- lengua
- lingüística

I did not specify that the search engine should only explore particular sections of the newspaper, but left this open to include articles from all sections including the Culture sections (in which the majority of articles appeared), Opinion, and general news sections.

Initially, the dates selected included the month of the event itself (from the list above), the preceding month and the following month, meaning that three months of data were captured around each event. However, the result was that my corpus of data reached 570 articles which was simply too large a corpus for one person to work with within the time constraints of this doctoral project. In order to resolve this, I restricted the data search even further by only analysing those articles which, firstly, were published in the same month as the key event itself, and secondly, contained direct reference to or citations from the RAE and/or its members. This meant rejecting articles which, whilst relating to contemporary Spanish language debates, were not likely to offer any evidence of how the RAE itself was involved in those debates. Although such articles did not form part of the critically analysed corpus, they were still useful for identifying the context in which RAE debates take place, and certainly inform the contextualisation of this study as a whole. By cutting down the corpus in the way described, I was able to reduce it to a more manageable size of 188 articles.

### ***3.4.3 Data Categorisation***

The corpus was then grouped according to a number of categorisations which arose from the general prevalent themes and topics of the articles; the ‘language ideological debates’:

- Panhispanism, Globalisation, Spanish in the world, language spread
- Language and economic value
- Unity of language and community of speakers

- Corpus planning, linguistic deficit, neologisms, Anglicisms, borrowings
- Role and authority of RAE/other guardians
- Other languages (of Spain/Latin America), language contact
- Historical perspective of Spanish language
- Contextual debates

The data were then uploaded to the NVivo 7.0 software programme. NVivo is a data analysis programme for researchers who need to organise and analyse textual data from any language, and is designed for use in a variety of methods including discourse analysis, conversation analysis, ethnography, and literature reviews. The programme allows words, phrases, paragraphs or entire documents to be codified with user-defined codes, which allowed me to identify recurring themes as I progressed through the data, and to add these themes to the list of possible codes. The benefit of coding was that once all data was loaded, analysed and codified, I was then able to produce reports which drew out the codified features from across the corpus of 188 articles in order to identify patterns and easily compare data from the whole corpus or from selected categories.

I codified the data according to a number of features which can be seen in Appendix B. Textual features formed the bulk of the categorical entries, as can be expected at this descriptive stage of analysis. I coded articles according to the category of the whole text, as discussed above. I then linked the text to particular contextual events (Congresses, Dictionary and other publication launches), before going into more detailed analysis in which I coded selected phrases or paragraphs which showed evidence of the grammatical, vocabulary and/or structural features used ideologically in discourse. Given that textual content is important as well as text construction, I also added a series of codes in order to identify—across the corpus—topics within Spanish language debates which recur or are frequently foregrounded, and might point to naturalised themes on which the RAE and other language guardians repeatedly comment and seek to guide debate. Finally, I listed the agencies regularly involved in the data through responsibility for writing the articles (as in the

case of RAE Academicians, Cervantes directors), presenting speeches which are reproduced in full in the press (royalty, government figures), or through being featured as an important agent in a given article.

While the eight categories arose from analysing the corpus of articles, it became apparent that there were too many to be able to sufficiently analyse each of these within the constraints of this thesis. Ultimately I have made the decision to restrict the critical analysis of the data and to structure the discussion of this within three main categories: (1) Linguistic unity and the Spanish-speaking community, (2) the role and authority of the RAE and other language guardians, and (3) the Spanish language in the world. These are salient themes not only because under these headings are incorporated the majority of the data articles collected, but also because they represent some of the most prominent and polemic language debates which take place in Spain but whose impact extends far beyond the Iberian Peninsula.

### 3.5 SUMMARY

My aim in this chapter has been to give an overview and justification of the methodology and analytical framework which, I have argued, is most suited to the design of this project and to answering my particular research questions.

I began by outlining the need for a critical analysis of the content of discourse, something which is a first step in the CDA models of Fairclough, Wodak and also Van Dijk. CDA is based on the claim that prevailing social inequalities are both *evidenced through* public discourse, and *influenced by* such discourse. As such, analysis of this discourse draws on the *explicit* meaning of content as well as the *implicit* meaning which can be revealed through the microanalysis of linguistic and structural features of texts. The subsequent relation of these microstructures to the macrostructures of social institutions and power relations reveals how hegemonic ideologies are evidenced in texts and discourses. I noted how I will be using CDA in my own study to expose the hidden agendas of those who dominate language debates and authority by consent rather than coercion. A critical analysis of my data will uncover aspects of the dominant discourse of language authorities in which, for example, their

standardising role is reinforced and authority is centralised further in the hands of experts rather than dispersing authority amongst language users.

CDA – I have noted – is not a single analytical framework that can be applied to any data, but instead there are various models or approaches with which scholars have sought to interrogate specific data. For the purpose of answering my research questions, I have found it useful to draw from Wodak et al (1999), Van Dijk (2001b) and Fairclough (2001). The particular value of their approaches comes from the focus on value-laden content, agency in processes and events, context, and the various argumentation strategies and topoi employed in discourse.

Following the initial explanation of CDA, I related how it is a highly appropriate tool for uncovering hegemonic language ideologies which are embedded in discourse. This comes from the fact that CDA pays attention to the hidden agendas of text producers and the ideological vocabulary which forms part of referential strategies in their discourse. CDA also uncovers how ideological aspects of discourse can, through repetition and other strategies, become naturalised, ‘common-sense’ views which no longer need to be questioned.

In the final part of this chapter, I discussed the powerful influence of the press in carrying and proliferating ideologies of all kinds, including language ideologies. In particular, the spread of *El País* and *ABC* across a vast geographical territory and social spectrum represents a primary motive for the selection of these as data sources. I detailed the process of collecting data from these newspapers and the categorisation of the corpus using NVivo, as well as the need to cut down both the initial number of press articles collected and also the number of article categories for subsequent detailed analysis.

Having constructed my theoretical framework in Chapters 1 and 2, and discussed the methodology in this chapter, I turn in Chapter 4 to a discussion of the context of this study: that of language(s), authorities and debates in contemporary Spain.



# 4

## CONTEXT: LANGUAGE(S) IN SPAIN

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to trace the evolution of what is understood, today, to be the Spanish language. I shall chart the key developments in the history of the languages spoken in the Iberian Peninsula from Roman times to the present day (due to the scope of this thesis, I shall mostly confine my discussion to the Peninsula itself, with some brief remarks about the spread of Spanish to Latin America in 4.2.3). Having established earlier the need to reject ‘anonymity’ in processes of linguistics change and control, I shall seek to identify throughout the authorities who have exercised an influence on the development of Spanish, and analyse how they have played a role in the ideology and process of standardisation. In doing so, I will seek to answer my research question ‘who controls and influences the standards for spoken and written Spanish?’ Of particular importance is the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) and I will focus on its foundations, purpose and activities. As it approaches the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its inception, how have the institution and the mission of the RAE developed since its beginning? And what exactly is its role at a time when the Spanish language boasts approximately 400 million speakers worldwide?

### 4.2 SPANISH TODAY

#### 4.2.1 *Linguistic configuration of Spain*<sup>11</sup>

The close of the fifteenth-century is widely recognised as the birth of modern Spain. Prior to this, conquests and previous empires had brought Celtic-based,

Greek, Carthaginian, Germanic, Basque and ultimately the dominant Latin influences to bear on the configuration of language varieties on the Peninsula. The fall of Granada in 1492 and the ejection of both the Moors and the Jews marked the reconquest of Catholic Spain, and with the joining of distinct kingdoms through *los reyes católicos* and imperial expansion westward to the Americas, nation-building activities of the nature that we discussed in the last chapter were established. One of those activities – the consolidation of a standard language – was to some degree well under way. Toledo had become the capital of Castile in 1085, and two centuries later, Alfonso X of Castile and León promoted the speech of Toledo's upper classes as a model for standardising Castilian, formerly marked by considerable regional variation (see Penny 2002). The subsequent employment of standard Castilian in works of science, literature and administration led to great prestige, which benefited even more from its southward spread from Toledo during the reconquest and its use in the nation-state and empire-building projects of 1492 onwards. In the midst of this, Antonio de Nebrija published *La gramática de la lengua castellana* (1492). Although never a great success, Nebrija's grammar was nevertheless important in its use of the print medium as a step towards creating a unified national language.

During the century that followed, the so-called 'Golden Age' of Castilian literature did much to level variation in writing and consolidate not only a standardised code but also a linguistic culture for the ever more numerous 'community' of Castilian-speakers. While a centralised administrative state in Spain was still a long way off, Castilian became the language of literature and of the educated classes as far as Galicia in the north-west and Catalonia in the north-east. As such, it could be said that at this point the distinction between 'castellano' and 'español' with reference to the national language becomes somewhat ambiguous.

If any such ambiguity remained at the start of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the establishment in 1713 of the *Real Academia de la Lengua Española* played a part in clarifying the view that nation and language were linked, and in the Spanish nation, the language too was Spanish. As I return to a fuller discussion of the

RAE later in this chapter, I will at this point simply comment that the decision of Philip V (the first of the Bourbon kings) to give the royal seal to the Academy came just 90 years after a secret memo was passed to his predecessor, Philip IV, by Conde Duque de Olivares, outlining how the king should:

trabaje y piense con consejo maduro y secreto por reducir estos reinos de que se compone España al estilo y leyes de Castilla sin ninguna diferencia.

(Siguán 1992:25)

The consequence of political and cultural hegemony was to be a necessary linguistic unity as its vehicle, and the standardising activities and publications of the RAE served this goal. In the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, as part of the state's efforts to instil in Spaniards a more standardised education as well as a greater sense of national identity, Charles III issued a decree relating to public administration and education, 'para que en todo el reino se actúe y enseñe en lengua castellano' (cited in Siguan 1992:28).

By the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there was a definite sense of 'Spanish-ness' and a tangible concept of the Spanish nation. This can be understood in part as resulting from Charles III's language policy. At the same time, this solidarity was undoubtedly experienced as a result of French invasion under Napoleon in 1808, in which local linguistic and cultural identities were further obscured for the cause of defending Spain as a whole. No sooner was Napoleon beaten, however, than Spanish America began to fight its wars of independence from Spain, and all became republics during this century. During the same period on the mainland *madre patria*, peripheral languages had experienced something of a resurgence (notably Catalan, Basque and Galician), in spite of the fact that the Napoleonic invasion had been the catalyst for significant linguistic and national unification. As Mar-Molinero observes:

...these cultural movements signalled new or increased literary outputs, and required focusing on the written language for the first time in many

centuries. This period, then, also saw significant work in the area of codification and elaboration of the non-Castilian languages.

(Mar-Molinero 2000a:88)

The last of the wars was lost in 1898 and with the loss of income from the colonies – not to mention the demise of its former imperial glory – Spain now faced great economic, political and cultural difficulties. A group of intellectuals at the time, now usually referred to collectively as the '98 Generation, engaged in lengthy debates regarding the state of the nation and how Spain might move forward to recover from its identity crisis (see Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002a). On the theme of language, they regarded 'Castilian' and 'Spanish' as synonymous, and also regarded it as the only valid national language, particularly during the time of crisis. Although the authors Unamuno and Baroja, for example, were Basque, they scorned non-Castilian languages as divisive, and in their own work would only use Castilian. Cultural and linguistic unification was the way to national progress, they argued, and this would happen through reviving a sense of Spain's greatness which they and others understood to originate in Castile (Mar-Molinero 2000b:25-27).

Thus as Spain entered the 20<sup>th</sup> century, ideologies of linguistic unification and standardisation had existed for several hundred years. At that point in time the objective of such an ideology was less to codify Castilian into a functional language and was more to symbolise Castilian as a marker of 'Spanish-ness'. The expected revival of Spanish greatness did not, however, materialise: political upheaval and economic strife gripped Spain until after the Civil War, apart from a short phase of economic progress during the First World War (Mar-Molinero 2000b:26). The conflicts still inherent in Spanish society led to three years of Civil War and subsequently to dictatorship under General Francisco Franco for almost forty years. Strong state centralisation ensued, with repressive measures towards peripheral communities falling outside of Castilian hegemony. It became a fineable offence to speak a minority language in public and the adverse effects of such measures were seen in the loss of strength that some of these languages had built up during the cultural

renaissances of the 1800s. Later in the dictatorship, such measures were relaxed, and while no public money was used to provide school-level education in any language other than Castilian, private endeavours to teach minority languages were, at least, permitted. Furthermore, publishing was also permitted in minority languages, although this can be understood to be motivated by confidence in the dominant language rather than any positive belief in the validity of non-Castilian languages, as Mar-Molinero suggests:

To some extent this reflects the confidence of the Franco regime, as it judged that it had little to fear from unflattering views published in non-Castilian languages, given the inevitably limited readership. The regime deliberately encouraged a certain type of media coverage in non-Castilian languages of a sort that might in fact seem to trivialize their cultures – reports on dance competitions or local fiestas or how to cook local dishes – leaving ‘serious’ news and politics to be reported in Castilian.

(Mar-Molinero 2000a:98)

#### 4.2.2 *Language policy in Spain*

After Franco’s death in 1975, a period known as the *Transición* saw the establishment of a democratic Spanish state under King Juan Carlos. The new constitution was given approval by the government and citizens of Spain in late 1978. What differs most from the Francoist vision of the state is the provision for the existence of seventeen autonomous communities. Beyond the core national legislation laid down in Madrid, these *Comunidades Autónomas* may govern and legislate their own regional affairs to differing degrees. From a linguistic perspective, this clearly has important implications for the use of non-Castilian languages in official contexts and their role in the public education system of each Community.<sup>12</sup> Article 3 of the Constitution currently states:

1. El castellano es la lengua española oficial del Estado. Todos los españoles tienen el deber de conocerla y el derecho a usarla.

2. Las demás lenguas españolas serán también oficiales en las respectivas Comunidades Autónomas de acuerdo con sus Estatutos.
3. La riqueza de las distintas modalidades lingüísticas de España es un patrimonio cultural que será objeto de especial respeto y protección.

(Boletín Oficial del Estado 1978)

By referring to Castilian as the 'official Spanish language' of the State, clause 1 gives recognition firstly to the existence of other Spanish languages: if there is an 'official' language, there are hence other Spanish languages (made explicit in clause 2); secondly, 'Castilian' and 'Spanish' are not seen as coterminous but treated distinctly: the former as a particular code to be 'known' and used by all citizens of the Spanish state, and the latter as not one particular variety but an adjective used as an umbrella term to include Castilian as well as 'the other languages' (*las demás lenguas*) of clause 2. What is also remarkable is the move away from the Francoist notion of *the* Spanish language spoken in *the* Spanish nation. In fact the concept of nation is not used in Article 3; language is linked to the State, leaving room for a pluralist concept of nations. In Article 2, while reference is made to 'la indisoluble unidad de la Nación española', in the same sentence it also refers to 'las nacionalidades y regiones que la integran'. So while this legislates for an overarching Nation (notably written with a capital 'N') in which all citizens have the Castilian language in common, peripheral national identities and their languages are given a degree of recognition. Interestingly, at a national level, no comment is made as to whether regional languages are subject to any 'duties' or 'rights' as is the State language. Such decisions are left to the autonomous communities to legislate upon within their territories, with any ensuing duties or rights accorded to citizens of the region 'de acuerdo con sus Estatutos'. (For a fuller discussion of the problematic terms and issues surrounding these Constitutional Articles, see Mar-Molinero 2000b:86-92).

### 4.2.3 *Spanish in the world*

My disclaimer in the introduction to this chapter said that I would be focusing the discussion almost exclusively on the Iberian Peninsula. At the same time, any discussion of the role of the RAE must acknowledge the fact that the vast majority of native speakers of the Spanish language it serves to 'protect' live outside of the language's historical birthplace, Spain. Recent estimates put the total number of Spanish-speakers somewhere between 360 million (Moreno Fernández and Otero 2008) and 500 million (Molina, *El Mundo* 26.04.2007), with only 40 million of those being residents of Spain. The remainder are found in Spain's former American and Caribbean colonies, as well as in the US and a few thousand speakers still in the Philippines (SIL International 2005).

Migration, technology, multinational companies and many other aspects of globalisation processes are having considerable effects on the international profile of Spanish (see García 2008, Mar-Molinero and Stewart 2006, Marcos Marín 2006). Of particular interest to the demography of the Spanish-speaking world are the situations in the US and Brazil. In the former, this is due to the growth of Hispanics/Latinos as an ethnolinguistic group and the largest immigrant community in the US (made up of first, second and third generation immigrants). The vast majority of these are bilingual English-Spanish, although inter-generational transmission of Spanish is very low (Mar-Molinero 2000b:178) and has led to programmes to promote Spanish as a 'heritage language'. In Brazil, a recent law establishing Spanish as a compulsory subject in secondary education is leading to an elevated requirement for Spanish-language materials and teachers (see Del Valle and Villa 2006).

Since Colombia founded the first of the language academies outside of Spain in 1871, all other Spanish-speaking American republics have followed suit and in 1973 the final one – the *Academia norteamericana de la lengua española* – opened.<sup>13</sup> More will be said about the relationship between Madrid and what it sees as its 'academias hermanas' (Real Academia Española 1999:xiii) in my later discussion of the data. Suffice it to say here that debates concerning the supposed 'centre' of the language versus the 'periphery' have been persistent.

The earliest efforts to standardise Spanish, as we shall see, promoted the central Peninsular spoken variety which consequently became the model for written language. After the colonisation of the Americas, different varieties of Spanish developed and were held in greater esteem after the American states gained their independence from Spain. The Academies' roles in the development of prestigious national 'standards' in Latin America were mixed – some contested the hegemony of the Madrid Academy and sought to strengthen their national variety of Spanish, while others argued that while politically independent from Spain, there was still much to be gained from linguistic unity with it. Arguably, however, the prestige of the Peninsular 'standard' endured and became the plumb line against which variation – or deviation as it was generally considered – was measured. In time, however, the post-colonial formation of national identity – and the important role of language variety within this – allowed American Spanish varieties to flourish and gain a degree of prestige. More on the development of Spanish as a language with pluricentric standards can be found in Thompson (1992), Mar-Molinero (2000b) and Torrent-Lenzen (2006). I return to a fuller analysis of the Academy's reaction to pluricentric standards in particular in Chapter 7.

### **4.3 THE REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA**

In the section that follows, I shall outline the history of the *Real Academia Española*, detailing its foundations and development throughout three centuries of its existence. In doing so, my aim is to construct a framework in which to understand the current purpose of the RAE and how this determines the activities in which it engages. Of particular interest is how the Academy has seen the need to adapt to different concepts and ideologies of language as well as to the increasingly global context in which the Spanish language interacts with neighbouring language varieties as well as global languages.

#### **4.3.1 Foundations**

It was in August 1713 that a group of 11 gentlemen first met together, drawn from the spheres of state, scholarship and religion, in order to discuss the

perceived threat of an encroaching influence of French which, with the arrival of the Bourbon dynasty to the Spanish court, had begun to permeate Spanish culture. The convenor of this meeting was Don Manuel Fernández Pacheco y Zúñiga, a member of the Castilian aristocracy, whose father had been a viceroy of Navarre and of *Nueva España*. Born in 1650 and orphaned by the age of just two, Pacheco was raised by his uncle, a Bishop. As a consequence, Pacheco's lifestyle as a youth was shaped by the high value his uncle placed on books and education, leading the boy to become educated in classical languages, literature, and the sciences. Later in life, he came to occupy various military, diplomatic and political roles and indeed his life was one of distinguished service to the Monarch.

The *tertulias* hosted by Fernández Pacheco had a specific aim: to work towards the production of a dictionary which would document and enrich the Castilian language in the same style as the dictionaries of other European national languages (e.g. French, Italian, Portuguese). At the same time, part of the background and motive for 'fixing' the language was the cultural upheaval experienced by Spain following the arrival of the Bourbon dynasty, bringing the adoption of many French facets into the Spanish way of life as well as into the Spanish language. It was the sense of urgency felt by the founding Academicians, the sense that something 'had to be done' to protect the Spanish language from the corruption caused by linguistic contact with French, that cultivated an ideology espousing the 'fixing' of the language. As a result, the Academicians turned to the language of the sixteenth century to find a 'pure' Castilian and a plumb line against which to measure variation from a supposed linguistic ideal. Not only had the sixteenth century witnessed an output of literature (e.g. Cervantes, Lope de Vega, San Juan de la Cruz, Quevedo) which was valued on its own literary merits and is held as canonical even today, but there was also the factor that the sixteenth century was—at that time—the last historical period during which Castilian was considered as 'pure' before the perceived invasion of French culture and language. Consequently, the literate elite of the time felt compelled to latch onto a synchronically defined 'Golden

Age' variety which could serve as a point of focus and an ideal standard to which users of Castilian could hark back:

Consideraban los contertulios que era justo 'fijar la lengua'.

Consideraban que, habiendo tenido la lengua española a 'la latina por madre y después, con la variedad de dominios, padecido la corrupción que es notoria, se había pulido y adornado en el transcurso de los tiempos hasta llegar a la última perfección en el siglo pasado. Y no era decente a nosotros, que, logrando la fortuna de encontrarla en nuestros días tan perfecta, no eternizásemos en las prensas su memoria, formando un *Diccionario* al ejemplo de las dos celebradísimas Academias de París y Florencia.'

(Zamora Vicente 1999:25)

It is important, then, to note that from the very beginning, the focus of the RAE has been on protecting Castilian from the outside influences of foreignisms and borrowings, reflecting its belief not only in a period or status of a 'linguistic prime' but also that such a language is a vital part of the construction of a nation. The foundations of the RAE can, then, be described as expressions of linguistic nationalism.

#### 4.3.2 *Function*

The first Statutes, published and given royal assent in 1715, determined that the Academy existed to:

cultivar y fijar la pureza y elegancia de la lengua castellana, desterrando todos los errores que, en sus vocablos, en sus modos de hablar o en la construcción ha introducido la ignorancia, la vana afectación, el descuido y la demasiada libertad de innovar. Será su empleo distinguir los vocablos, frases o construcciones extranjeras de las propias, las anticuadas de las usadas, las bajas y rústicas de las cortesanas y

levantadas, las burlescas de las serias y, finalmente, las propias de las figuradas.

(Fundación y Estatutos de la RAE (1715), cited in Zamora Vicente 1999:35)

In the first part of this Article, establishing the motives for the Academicians' work, we see evidence of the belief in a perfected golden age Castilian whose spoken and written forms were suffering distortion by the ignorance and excessive variation evident amongst its users. In the latter part, we perceive the belief less that language change was wrong *per se*, but more that it should be carefully managed by the *Académicos* who were capable (and keen) to distinguish foreign, antiquated, low-class, 'ridiculous' and made-up terms (incorrect) from those which were native, commonly-used, high-class, serious and 'real' (correct). In other words, language variation—certainly through borrowings from French—was glossed as entirely negative and was brought about by the seemingly 'undesirable' practices of common Castilian speakers, whereas the purity and elegance of a carefully managed standard language was a goal to be sought and laboured for by the expert Academy.

Closely bound to the ideology of a pure, uncorrupted language is that of a single unified nation bound by the common 'national' language (see Haugen 1972). The founding Statutes even suggest who exactly might have the necessary skills and authority to be an Academician:

Todos han de ser...sujetos de buen juicio y fama, y personas decentes, aficionados a la gloria de la Nación y lengua, y capaces de trabajar en el asunto que se propone esta Academia.

(Fundación y Estatutos de la RAE (1715), cited in Zamora Vicente 1999:35)

Members of the Academy served more than a merely linguistic goal: this was a nation-building project by Royal appointment requiring allegiance to one harmonious vision of nation, state and language. Furthermore, with Madrid now the centre of not only an ever more unified Spanish state but also a vast American colony, the language of the literary, economic and political elite of the

capital region spread throughout the Peninsula carried by its prestige. As a consequence, the discourse of the Court and Academy was widely (though not universally) received as authentic in legitimising the form of a standard language. As can be seen, the function of the RAE in its early years was clear: through the codification of Castilian and the setting-in-motion of Dictionary and Grammar production, it contributed to the forming of a common national (and in this case, political) identity based on the language: in other words, *linguistic nationalism* (see, for example, Lodaes 2002, Mar-Molinero 2000b).

Over nearly three centuries, the RAE Statutes have been fully revised four times (1848, 1859, 1977 and 1993) reflecting the changes in the Spanish political and cultural context as well as in the internal workings of the *Corporación*. That the most recent Statutes represent a more radical step forward in the evolution of the Academy's function than in previous Statute versions is clear from reading even the first Article:

La Academia es una institución con personalidad jurídica propia que tiene como misión principal velar porque los cambios que experimente la Lengua Española en su constante adaptación a las necesidades de sus hablantes no quiebren la esencial unidad que mantiene en todo el ámbito hispánico.

(Real Academia Española 1995:7)

What we have here is, to some degree, an acknowledgement of the linguistic change which contemporary linguists widely consider to be a 'linguistic fact of life' (Lippi-Green 1997: Ch.1). However, embedded in this mission statement is the presupposition that the 'essential' unity of language across the Spanish-speaking world (however and by whoever that might be measured) is of greater importance than the function of a language to meet the diverse communicative needs of its users through natural innovation. As such, the RAE currently defines its role as the guardian and guarantor of this linguistic unity throughout the worldwide community of Spanish-speakers (a 'panhispanic' approach, as I discuss in Chapter 7). The RAE's original motto of 'limpia, fija y da esplendor'

appears to have given way to an adapted version which aims to ‘unifica, limpia y fija’ the Spanish language. Nevertheless, the concept of the splendour of the language has not entirely disappeared from Academic discourse. Article 1 of the Statutes goes on to say:

Debe cuidar igualmente de que esta evolución conserve el genio propio de la lengua, tal como este ha ido consolidándose con el correr de los siglos, así como de establecer y difundir los criterios de propiedad y corrección, y de *contribuir a su esplendor*.

(Real Academia Española 1995:7, my emphasis)

Having formerly aimed to ‘give splendour’ to Spanish, the RAE now ‘contributes’ to its splendour, meaning either that this splendour has been mostly achieved and there is a perception that very little remains to be done, or that linguistic splendour has had to give way to the more functional concept of ‘unity’.

### 4.3.3 *Status*

In a letter sent by Felipe V to the RAE after its foundation, he ordains and gives royal assent to not only the institution, but its members too:

Y a fin de mostrar mi Real benevolencia y de que se empleen los académicos con más aliento y continua aplicación al cumplimiento de su instituto, he venido en concederles, como por la presente les concedo, todos los privilegios, gracias, prerrogativas, inmunidades y exenciones que gozan los domésticos que asisten y están en actual servicio de mi Real Palacio.

(cited in Zamora Vicente 1999:28)

The prestige which comes with such association with the Crown needs little explanation. While members of the RAE no longer enjoy such titles and Court privileges as they once did, the contemporary Academy as an institution still

has the King as its Patron. Other traditions preserve the royal link, for example, the King (or occasionally the Minister for Education) is the only outsider permitted to enter the weekly plenary meetings. The King is also the Honorary President of the *Fundación Pro Real Academia Española*, the Academy's fundraising body; his presence at language-related conferences and at every *Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española* (CILE) is guaranteed, and – as the data shows in Chapter 7 – he is something of a spokesperson for the Spanish language itself.

While this relationship continues to lend a degree of prestige to the RAE, there is by no means universal acceptance of the Academy's authority. Some would agree with Stewart who believes that, particularly during the last century, the RAE lost much of its kudos and was generally considered to be out of touch with contemporary language use (Stewart 1999:15). This is echoed in, to take one example, the introduction to an English-medium Spanish grammar book used widely in British universities. The authors Butt and Benjamin claim that:

...the Academy has lost prestige, and even in Spain its most solemn decrees are hardly taken seriously... The question of what is 'correct' Spanish is therefore nowadays really decided, as in all living languages, by the more or less conscious consensus of native speakers of Spanish.

(Butt and Benjamin 2000:vii)

While a general observation of British trends and attitudes towards language authorities (English having no official Academy) may show a decrease in people's adherence to, for example, 'BBC English' pronunciation, and in written language, a greater acceptance of informal styles (including text-message abbreviations and grammar), it is not obvious as to whether similar conclusions can be drawn about the Spanish context. Despite the comments of Stewart, Butt and Benjamin, there is in fact a continuing demand for the RAE's activities and publications. The *Ortografía de la Lengua Española* (1999) and the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* (2005) as well as various speeches by Academicians all

make reference to the hundreds of queries that the RAE receives on a daily basis from the Spanish-speaking public who seek its decisions on matters of ‘correct’ language use. As one RAE member seeks to explain this:

Cuando la lengua plantea dudas o despierta curiosidades, la Academia aparece con toda naturalidad en el horizonte mental del hispanohablante.

(Francisco Rico, cited in Grijelmo 2001:368)

To emphasise this further, the RAE director Víctor García de la Concha has stated that ‘los hispanohablantes quieren oír la voz de las academias’ (*El País* 10-11-2005a), a statement which echoes the words of Álex Grijelmo, former chief editor of *El País* and current director of the news agency EFE:

Los hablantes del español están deseando siempre oír la voz de la Academia. Porque debajo de las críticas superficiales—a menudo fundadas, sin embargo—permanece un espíritu de profunda admiración a la indudable altura intelectual de sus integrantes.

(Grijelmo 2001:369)

Perhaps it was this sense of deference to the intellectual superiority of the *Académicos* which led the late Alonso Zamora Vicente to speak of his faith in ‘el porvenir de la Institución, en augurar, en todo el ámbito hispanohablante, una gozosa obediencia a sus decisiones’ (1999:11). Interestingly, one of the accusations brought against the RAE by some critics is that it is too tolerant of variation, does not sufficiently ‘cleanse’ the language of archaic or duplicate terms and does not take sufficient action against perpetrators of ‘bad’ Spanish. One such publication entitled *Limpiemos nuestro idioma* represents a sort of reciprocal call for the voice of the people to be heard in the Academy:

Demos por válido que nuestra palabra es la voz de un simple ciudadano de a pie, la voz del pueblo, llamando a la Academia. Entonces – y aunque estén para nosotros muy distantes ciertas alturas – si es verdad

que 'vox pópulo, vox dei', ¿nos escuchará la Academia? Confiamos que así será.

(Domínguez Calvo 1993:13)

In his epilogue, Domínguez Calvo reminds the Academy of its purpose as an authoritative guardian, and, states optimistically that:

Confiamos que la docta Casa que rige nuestro idioma se dedicará de lleno a este tema de tanta trascendencia y que, como resultado de ello, **muy pronto veremos a nuestra querida Lengua Española ¡MÁS LIMPIA, MEJOR FIJADA, MÁS ESPLENDOROSA!**

(Domínguez Calvo 1993:172, original emphases)

By reiterating its mission statement, Domínguez Calvo underlines the Academy's obligations to the Spanish language. However, this publication serves not to discredit the RAE; instead it affirms a degree of confidence in firstly the role and prestige of the RAE itself, and secondly in its publications as the proper forum for the solution of the author's criticisms.

While Domínguez Calvo – in the complaint tradition (Cameron 1995) – focused particularly on lexical items in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> editions of the RAE's *Diccionario*, a short but more scathing volume by Iglesias Díaz (Iglesias Díaz 2000) attacks the Academy's inability to halt the deterioration of Spanish orthography, grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. Indeed the title itself, *La Real Academia Española es la máxima responsable de la degradación del lenguaje*, encompasses the author's hypothesis that the Academy should be doing much more to put an end to the linguistic deficiencies currently tolerated amongst Spanish-speakers. Furthermore he is clear in laying the blame on primarily the RAE but also the institutions that collaborate with the Academy:

No soy ningún docto, sino un mero estudioso de la lengua, preocupado por el gravísimo deterioro que está sufriendo y cuyo máximo responsable, a mi juicio, es la propia Academia de la Lengua, así como el

sistema de enseñanza que impera en nuestro país, cuya responsabilidad corresponde al Gobierno y a las Cortes y, también muy mucho, al Ministerio que ejerce la potestad de la instrucción pública, al que incumbe velar por la cultura, como deber y atribución especial.

(Iglesias Díaz 2000:30)

In his discussion of the supposedly falling standards of language, Iglesias Díaz displays moral panic similar to that of Norman Tebbit's discourse (see Chapter 2 for the full discussion). Describing how he had sent two letters to the RAE about his concerns, neither of which received a reply, he laments that:

Es tal la degradación que sufre nuestro país, en todos los órdenes, que ni siquiera se respeta la urbanidad.

(Iglesias Díaz 2000:12)

That these two works take a stronger approach than even the RAE to the process of corpus planning and language standardisation is evident. However, it must be understood that these are small-scale specialist writings, unlikely to enjoy wide publication or readership. As a result, it remains a speculation as to how widespread such beliefs are, particularly amongst 'lay' language users (and this lies beyond the scope of this thesis). At an 'expert' level, and in spite of the weaknesses perceived by the authors mentioned above and in his own critiques of the Academy, Álex Grijelmo holds that:

La Academia disfruta aún...de un sólido prestigio en todo el mundo hispanohablante.

(Grijelmo 2001:368)

My discussion of the press data in Chapters 5 to 7 will consider how the RAE perpetuates this prestige through the discursive construction and naturalisation of its authority and the essential work it carries out.

#### 4.3.4 Publications

##### 4.3.4.1 Dictionaries

The most important and visible product of the Academy is undoubtedly its *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* (hereafter: DRAE). Upon foundation of the Academy, work began immediately on the initial *Diccionario de Autoridades*; it was the ‘tarea primordial de la flamante Academia’ (Zamora Vicente 1999:18) and was published in six volumes between 1726 and 1739. Since then, the Academy has produced one- or two-volume editions of the DRAE, and almost three centuries later, Article 2 of its Statutes affirm that it is still the ‘constante ocupación de la Academia perfeccionar su *Diccionario* común de consulta general’ (Real Academia Española 1995:8). The latest edition of the Dictionary is its 22nd and it should be noted that – in keeping with the times – the sources of entries, the process of collating them, and channels of publication have all changed radically.

The DRAE, as well as the other publications to be discussed below, draws from the extensive *Banco de datos del español* created by the RAE in recent years by means of its updated technological resources. The *Corpus diacrónico del español* (CORDE) and *Corpus de referencia del español actual* (CREA) contain over 270 million lexical entries (Real Academia Española 2001:x) which are logged electronically and therefore easily searchable and manipulable. The sources used to collate the corpora are wide-ranging and include the press, radio and television programmes, internet, and suggestions or queries which come directly from the Spanish-speaking public to the Academy, via letter or increasingly by e-mail.

Multiplicamos por eso las ventanillas de consultas que ahora nos llegan a diario – no es exageración – a centenares; ensanchamos las ventanas para escrutar también a diario mediante programas informáticos adecuados, centenares de periódicos, y abrimos los oídos, en los registros de nuestro corpus oral, a las emisiones radiofónicas y televisivas.

(García de la Concha 2006)

Another benefit of collating these corpora electronically is that the latest two versions of the dictionary have been produced for distribution – as consequently all future versions will be – as a CD-ROM and an online dictionary as well as the hardback and paperback copies.

It is worth noting that the Dictionary has proved to be significant in sealing the RAE's authority in standardising vocabulary, as is claimed in the Preface:

El Diccionario de la Real Academia Española...tiene universalmente reconocido un valor normativo que lo hace único en su género.

(Real Academia Española 2001:x)

This normative authority extends to the title of the language that the DRAE purports to represent. For almost 200 years its title was always the *Diccionario de la lengua castellana*, but then in 1925 it became the *Diccionario de la lengua española*, a change that Zamora Vicente documents as 'un hecho capital' (1999:373).

The inclusion of regionalisms, particularly from Spanish America, has been increasing since the latter part of the twentieth century. Díez et al write about the 19<sup>th</sup> edition published in 1970, and note that:

También se ha pretendido, dentro de lo posible, que sea realmente un diccionario de todo el mundo hispánico y para ello se ha prestado especial atención a los americanismos.

(Díez et al. 1977:231)

Following this line, the Preface of the 22<sup>nd</sup> edition elaborates on the continuation of this policy:

Es de justicia destacar en este caso la colaboración de la Academias hermanas de América y de Filipinas, tanto en el trabajo general como en el específico de la revisión o incorporación de voces y acepciones propias de cada país.

(Real Academia Española 2001:x)

What is interesting to note here is the sense of a 'panhispanic' direction in the Academy's work: not only are regionalisms included in the DRAE, but it also depends on the collaboration of the 'sister Academies' for the incorporation and acceptance of such terms into the lexicon. The same preface goes on:

El paso que se ha dado es muy importante: se ha más que duplicado el número de americanismos en artículos, acepciones y marcas, que en este momento superan las 28000. Con ello nos situamos en el camino correcto para conseguir un diccionario verdaderamente panhispánico, reflejo no solo del español peninsular sino del de todo el mundo hispanohablante.

(Real Academia Española 2001:x)

Thirty years and three editions after Diez et al.'s observation regarding the RAE's efforts to represent Spanish from around the world, the RAE itself claims to be on the path *towards* production of a dictionary of Spanish from beyond just Spain. The 28,000 *americanismos* form approximately one-third of the lexicon (c.83,000 entries) and so must be seen as representing a significant proportion of the working vocabulary. The question remains, though, as to whether the other 55,000 terms are indeed 'panhispanic' and part of the vision of a unified lexicon which is comprehensible throughout the Spanish-speaking world, or whether there are terms which are particular to the Spanish Peninsula and should therefore be marked as *regionalismos* too. Presenting '*peninsularismos*' as unmarked suggests they are either common to all Spanish-speakers, or core to a vision of standard Spanish; either way, this decision is based on a particular ideology of the Spanish language which places Spain

firmly at the centre of the Spanish-speaking world in prestige, even if not in numerical weight.

Regionalisms represent one aspect of variation within Spanish for which the RAE has drawn criticism. Another aspect is that of gendered language, and the way in which the masculine and feminine features of Spanish are represented in dictionaries and how these come to represent social realities in particular, gendered ways. A number of general studies have been published which consider the institutionalisation of sexism within the structures and usage of Spanish (e.g. Calero Fernández 1999, Garcia Meseguer 1988, García Meseguer 1994, Lledó Cunill 1992). These have shown that the use of the masculine as generic (e.g. *el hombre* for humankind), asymmetrical references to women (e.g. *Don Luis y Señorita Ana*) and the use of masculine titles for professional women (e.g. *la primer ministro*) are established sexist language practices by which women and femininity are not treated equally to men and masculinity, and are even invisibilised from particular aspects of discourse (Stewart 1999:31-35). Other studies go further in suggesting that the RAE itself – and in particular its flagship *Diccionario* – fulfils a role which is far from being simply the notary of the Spanish language. These authors argue that in sanctioning some lexical and grammatical terms, and prohibiting/discrediting others, the male-dominated RAE is responsible for the perpetuation of sexist language practices which are highly ideological in the worldview they construct (Bengoechea Bartolomé et al. 1998, Lledó Cunill et al. 2004). These debates about the use of gendered language in Spanish are ongoing within the intellectual world, the RAE, the press, and the Spanish government. Such debates bring various language ideologies into conflict, chiefly those which propose linguistic reform in pursuit of non-sexist language, and those which reject ‘tampering’ with the language for such a purpose.

In addition to the DRAE there are a number of other dictionaries. The *Diccionario escolar* or *Diccionario del estudiante*, published in several editions since 1993, is aimed at secondary-level school pupils, and as well as seeking to include a reduced core Spanish vocabulary (devoid of archaisms and Peninsular and American regionalisms), includes a short grammar and

orthography section. One of the assumptions on which the motivation for and development of this dictionary is based is that:

...el correcto uso de la lengua es un instrumento indispensable para que la persona acceda con éxito a los estudios superiores y se desarrolle plenamente como individuo capaz de expresarse con precisión y eficacia.

(Real Academia Española 2006a)

The aim of the *Diccionario manual e ilustrado* was originally to present an updated summary and supplement to the DRAE, so that acceptances and norms could be laid down on any terms adopted between publications of the main dictionary. Nevertheless, it took over a century from the first plans to final publication in 1927, and although plans faltered several times along the way, it has since been revised and is now in its fourth edition (1989). The other dictionary to suffer several abandoned attempts is the *Diccionario histórico de la lengua española* which was begun prior to the Civil War. The first two volumes were unfortunately destroyed at the publisher's during a bombing of Madrid in 1933, and the second attempts at reconstructing and developing these volumes waned and lost momentum as resources for the project ran low. The project has recently been relaunched with government funding (*El País* 04-03-2005) and a team of workers from the Academy's Instituto de Lexicografía (Pascual Rodríguez 2006).

One final dictionary of particular interest is the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* (hereafter: DPD), published in 2005. The idea for this new dictionary is that it 'soluciona las dudas lingüísticas de los hablantes de hoy mediante respuestas claras y argumentadas' (Real Academia Española 2006c) and arose during the 1999 *Congreso de la lengua española* in Zacatecas. It sees as its market 'todas aquellas personas interesadas en usar adecuadamente la lengua española' (Real Academia Española 2006c), and yet offers no direct explanation of what exactly is meant by 'adequately'. It could be understood that if any speaker follows the decisions presented and explained in the DPD, it will permit them an 'adequate' use of the language. Equally though, there is little

discussion of adequacy in terms of different purposes, registers, situations, and so on.

Some of the topics covered within the DPD refer to written language only, such as dubious spellings, accents, abbreviations and capital letters; others offer solutions to queries about spoken language, e.g. stress, neologisms, borrowings, gender and agreements. The solutions to these queries are presented as recommendations rather than imperatives, and yet this reveals something of an ambiguity in its approach to the 'descriptive' versus 'prescriptive' goals of dictionaries. On the one hand, the queries contained in the DPD are generally answered with a phrase beginning 'Se recomienda...', which displays a careful approach to the exercise of linguistic authority. At the same time, the queries are introduced with bold headings asking '¿Es correcto decir...?', '¿Es correcta la forma...?', '¿Se dice...o...?', and in one of the slogans which appear intermittently throughout the DPD at the top of certain pages, the statement is made that:

El *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* es **un diccionario normativo**, pues basa sus juicios y recomendaciones en la norma que regula hoy el uso correcto de la lengua española. Las formas incorrectas o desaconsejadas se marcan gráficamente con el símbolo ®.

(Real Academia Española 2006b, original emphasis)

The Academy hails the DPD and other recent publications as 'descriptive', or 'normative without being prescriptive'. However, descriptive publications – by the very fact that they are presented for public consumption, and eagerly sought (by speakers who want to hear the voice of the Academies, as discussed earlier) – are, I would argue, essentially still prescriptive and are regarded as such by both the producers and the consumers. As Cameron asks:

Why would anyone seek guidance from a text that did nothing more than describe their own behaviour?

(Cameron 1995:48)

The Academy also seems to be making an effort to present this dictionary (and all its current activities and products) as panhispanic, produced with the full collaboration of the twenty-one sister Academies in the Americas.

Su contenido está avalado por **el acuerdo unánime y la autoría conjunta de las veintidós Academias** de la Lengua Española.

(Real Academia Española 2006c)

El *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* es **un diccionario panhispánico** no solo porque en su elaboración han trabajado, codo a codo, las veintidós Academias, sino porque, además de dar cuenta de la norma común a todo el ámbito hispanohablante, reconoce, cuando existen, las diferencias entre la norma española y la norma americana, o entre la norma de un determinado país o conjunto de países y la que rige en el español general.

(Real Academia Española 2006b)

We see here the image of the Academies working side by side and drawing together the norms of what are defined as the two major Spanish varieties (Peninsular and American). Noteworthy, too, is the reference to ‘el español general’ which equates to ‘correct’ Spanish, and even the ‘unified’ Spanish which we discussed when commenting on the RAE’s objectives. The vision of standardised Spanish which the RAE holds is extending to include firstly, much of what is common to the Spanish spoken/written across the Spanish-speaking world, and secondly, many of the regionalisms which are particular to certain countries or regions and which can be termed *americanismos* alongside *peninsularismos*. This amounts to a broadening of the normative net in order to encompass a wider lexicon in the DPD (and the DRAE) than might previously have been understood to comprise ‘standard Spanish’.

#### 4.3.4.2 Orthography

If the DRAE and its sister dictionaries can be seen to make up one ‘pillar’ of standardised Spanish language, then it could be argued that the Orthography is another, having been the second publication to materialise from the Academy in 1741. Unlike the DRAE and *Gramática*, publication of the Orthography guide is not specifically enshrined in the Academy’s Statutes, but it is a work which the Academy has consistently published, albeit as an integral section of the *Gramática* for many years. However, given that the release of the *Nueva Gramática* has taken far longer than originally planned (Zamora Vicente 1999:379), a low-cost publication of the Orthography alone has been produced and updated a number of times. The *Ortografía* was, interestingly, the channel by which the Academy first alluded officially to its recent and innovative *panhispanic* language policy (Real Academia Española 1999: Prólogo). Of the historical role of the Orthography, Zamora Vicente says this:

Conviene subrayar que un soterrado espíritu de reforma ha presidido siempre las ideas ortográficas de la Academia, que no se ha opuesta jamás a cuanto pudiera producir facilidad, sencillez, claridad, respetando, claro es, la correcta fonética y sin desdeñar del todo la ladera etimologizante.

(Zamora Vicente 1999:379)

#### 4.3.4.3 Grammar

The last of the three major ‘pillars’ of the Spanish language as envisioned and regulated by the RAE is the *Gramática*. This particular line of activity is again enshrined in the latest Statutes, where it states that:

Asimismo será ocupación constante de la Academia tener al día su Gramática. La Academia fomentará, y en su caso acogerá o publicará, obras gramaticales de particulares, sean o no miembros de ella. Finalmente, podrá publicar compendios y epítomes de su propia Gramática, acomodados a los distintos niveles de enseñanza.

(Article IV, Real Academia Española 1995:9)

The first RAE Grammar was not published until 1771, even though work on it had begun immediately after completion of the Dictionary some thirty years previous (interruptions have, evidently, plagued the Academy's processes since its earliest days). By 1780, the long-awaited volume was given even more authoritative status than its Academic roots might have otherwise provided it, when King Carlos III decreed that Spanish grammar should be taught throughout the education system, simultaneously naming the RAE *Gramática* as the compulsory text (see Fries 1989:84)<sup>14</sup>. Since then, the Grammar has been revised and published more than forty times, though many of these revisions have been minor.

The latest full Grammar produced by the RAE was in 1931, and while subsequent publications serve as supplements (*Nuevas normas de Prosodia y Ortografía*, and *Esbozo de una nueva Gramática de la lengua española*), these by their own admission do not carry normative authority and so the *Nueva Gramática* itself, originally due for publication in 2007, is long-awaited in terms of significance. Part of this is due to the fact that, in the same way as the Orthography and DPD were released and promoted as panhispanic in both production and authority, the new Grammar will also have benefited from the full co-operation and labour of all the Spanish Language Academies. Indeed, the impetus for this overdue Grammar to be produced came from the Chilean Academy, during the 1998 congress held by the *Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española* (not the same as the CILE). What is interesting is that the resulting Grammar – which claims to be both descriptive *and* normative – reflects a broad, panhispanic conception of Spanish at the same time as focusing on Spanish American varieties:

Atenderá especialmente a la **descripción de las principales variedades americanas del español**. ...Combinará los ejemplos construidos expresamente para ilustrar algún esquema...con los extraídos **de textos literarios**, tratando siempre de que esos ejemplos reflejen el estado actual de la lengua y dando especial peso a los usos americanos.

(Real Academia Española 2006d, original emphases)

A number of points remain unexplained from currently available statements such as this: firstly, which are the 'principal varieties' of American Spanish? And on what basis might these varieties be defined as such? It might be due to the number of speakers, or the levels of society and power in which that variety is spoken, or it may be due to the proximity of linguistic features to Peninsular Castilian; no explanation is offered here, and it remains to be seen when the Grammar is finally published. Secondly, literary texts are given primacy as a legitimate source of examples in order to explain grammatical points, without making clear whether these are purely contemporary texts (in order to reflect the current status of the language) or historical ones too; nor is there any indication of whether other sources (official documents, reports, journalistic items, etc) are used to describe (and arguably, prescribe) grammatical structures in use. Finally, is the intention to give particular emphasis to American usage akin to 'affirmative action' in order to balance out a previously Spain-centric policy? The answers will lie in an analysis of the new Grammar when it is published.

In terms of the *Nueva Gramática's* objectives, it purports to:

Describir opciones gramaticales que se consideren cultas en el español europeo y en el americano, así como reflejar adecuadamente las variantes sintácticas y morfológicas que una determinada comunidad pueda interpretar como propias de la lengua culta, aun cuando no coincidan enteramente con las opciones favorecidas por otras áreas geográficas.

(Real Academia Española 2006e)

Here we see something of the recurring tension of maintaining clear, normative standards, and allowing for a measure of diversity which is in no short supply within the Spanish-speaking world. To speak of grammatical 'options' marks a transition from previous approaches which saw norms as uniform. In the above statement, however, European and American conventions which may differ on certain points are given equal normative status, and where one

particular 'community' has preferable norms to another, the RAE now suggests that neither norm is any less valid than the other. What is clear though, is that while there is little or no perceived value difference between *norms*, these norms are based on standardised, learned language and not just any given usage that may exist. In general, the vision of language we can expect to see reflected in the *Nueva Gramática* is the same as that of the DPD:

Por su carácter de lengua supranacional, hablada en más de veinte países, el español constituye, en realidad, un conjunto de normas diversas, que comparten, no obstante, una amplia base común: la que se manifiesta en la expresión culta de nivel formal, extraordinariamente homogénea en todo el ámbito hispánico, con variaciones mínimas entre las diferentes zonas, casi siempre de tipo fónico y léxico.

(Diccionario panhispánico de dudas 2005:xiv)

So in accepting a variety of norms encompassing the lexicon, orthography and grammar of Spanish, the RAE is still clear and stringent as to the construal of such norms. Sociolinguistic axioms tell us that where language varies most is in specific, local, micro-social situations, and where there is most similarity is in wide, trans-local, international and macro-social situations where the need for greater 'commonality' of linguistic features and usage exists. As a result, I would suggest that although the RAE is widening the net as to which features of Spanish are adopted as part of the 'standard', and importantly where the sources are of such linguistic features, it is not as wide as might initially be thought. The panhispanic standard Spanish (or *Spanishes*?) collated in the RAE's latest publications – as detailed above – is predictably still the normative variety of a very particular type of language user – one who is likely to be exposed to educational resources and texts which are national or international in scope, with regular access to people, books, and technology such as the Internet. The discourses which take place through the vehicle of international (globalised) linguistic norms generally do so through educated, often professional, middle-/upper-class language users. So when we speak of a

'panhispanic' collection of norms, we are still only dealing with the norms of the *educated classes* of a number of countries. I shall return to a discussion of the RAE's construal of panhispanic norms in Chapter 7.

#### 4.3.4.4 Boletín de la RAE/Anejos

One final publication to consider briefly here is the Academy's *Boletín*, which was first published in 1914 and which continues to be issued two to three times per year (for more, see Fries 1989, Zamora Vicente 1999). Its publication is not mentioned at all in the Statutes, nor in the Regulations, but several sections feature regularly in the *Boletín*: firstly the '*Enmiendas y adiciones a los diccionarios de la Academia aprobadas por la Corporación*'. The future of this particular section may be uncertain, given that the DRAE is now available online and any updates can easily be added and made available on the RAE website. It may be that the Academy continues to publish its summary of acceptances and amendments, but this cannot be taken for granted at a time when the Academy is changing its methods and processes dramatically. Secondly, there is an '*Información académica*' section giving the latest updates of important events in the life of the Academy. The remainder of the publication consists of frequent obituaries for deceased *Académicos*, texts of speeches made during significant conferences and articles which deal with philological studies, linguistic history and literary criticism, making the *Boletín* mostly a philological journal. Whenever the philological studies are of particular interest, and would be too large for the *Boletín*, a special issue of the *Anejos al Boletín* is published. To date, there have been fifty-three such *Anejos* on wide-ranging topics, for example, *El Evangelio de San Marcos según el manuscrito escurialense*, *Las definiciones de los elementos químicos en el DRAE*, and *Los hispanismos en el francés clásico* (Zamora Vicente 1999:406-7).

## 4.4 OTHER LANGUAGE AUTHORITIES

In this section I wish to consider a number of the social institutions that are involved in language ideological debates in Spain, particularly where some of these institutions work collaboratively with the Real Academia Española. As I

do so, I have in mind Woolard and Schieffelin's argument that 'social institutions...hinge on the ideologization of language use' (1994:56). In mapping out a network, then, of organisations who have economic, 'political', or other interests in the work of the Academy, I will identify the influential institutions with which the RAE works.

#### **4.4.1 Government and education**

The Statutes of the RAE establish a number of links with the Spanish state: Article XXXVIII deals with the Academy's income,<sup>15</sup> establishing that it is based firstly on an ordinary allocation from the State budget<sup>16</sup>; additionally, extraordinary allocations may be made by the government (as well as private donors) as and when they wish to particularly help the Academy in its activities<sup>17</sup>. In Article XLI, the Academy is required to provide the Government with accounts for those State monies<sup>18</sup>. Beyond purely financial links, Article XLV also sets out that any changes to the very Statutes on which the Academy's existence and functions are based, once they have been proposed and approved by the Academy's *Junta de Gobierno*, must be sent for approval by the National Government<sup>19</sup>. If approved, Statutory amendments take effect upon publication in the *Boletín Oficial del Estado*<sup>20</sup>. The Academy is also required to publish notices in the *Boletín Oficial del Estado* in the case of: (1) any official announcement of contests for prizes awarded by the RAE<sup>21</sup>; (2) a vacant chair amongst the *Académicos de Número*<sup>22</sup>.

One important recent project that falls under the category of 'extraordinary' financial allocations is that of the *Diccionario histórico del español*, referred to in the discussion above. The Spanish government has promised 'el apoyo rotundo y permanente' (*El País*, 04.03.2005) in the form of funding for what is, according to Víctor García de la Concha, a 'State project'. No figures are given explicitly in the press article, but readers of *El País* are informed that the contract between the *Ministerio de Educación* and the RAE will provide sufficient finance to guarantee continuation of the project for fifteen years.

In Chapter 2 I noted that the state education system is one of the domains through which the national community is imagined and by which the standard

language of the nation-state is acquired by ‘instruction, correction, imitation, assimilation, acculturation’ (Joseph 1987:19). In the Spanish education system, Article 3.1 of the Constitution is put into operation to ensure that all children exit their schooling able to comply with the constitutional duty to know standard Castilian Spanish, the official State language (as well as the right to use co-official languages in communities such as Catalonia, the Basque Country, Valencia and Galicia) . Not only does schooling reinforce the hegemonic status of Spanish over all other languages of Spain (rendering it impossible to be monolingual in any language but Spanish), but it emphasises a standardised Spanish as essential to a student’s success and measures their grasp of the standard variety through language exam grades.

The status of the RAE’s Grammar as an official text in Spanish education was enjoyed from the end of the eighteenth century until the start of the twentieth. Following the Civil War of 1936-39, the *Ley de Instrucción Pública* which accorded the RAE Grammar its privileged use was never reinstated (see Zamora Vicente 1999:381-2). In the absence of compulsory RAE texts in Spanish schools, the Academy has produced and marketed the *Diccionario escolar* and *Diccionario del estudiante* for students throughout the Spanish-speaking world. These, as I showed earlier in section 4.3.4.1, presuppose that an education in the ‘correct’ use of language is a gate through which students must pass in order to progress to higher studies and to develop as a capable and literate citizen.

One language critic, the late Juan Ramón Lodares, suggested that education, while traditionally an effective vehicle for the promulgation of the Academy’s norms, is perhaps less standardising than it once was:

Digamos que la tolerancia normativa es mayor hoy que ayer, o viceversa, que es menos el rigor con que se pueden imponer los criterios académicos en uno de sus tradicionales clientes: la escuela.

(Lodares 2005:113)

This has inevitably led to criticisms of laxness in education, including in debates found in my data corpus in which the RAE express moral panic over proposals

to ease orthographic criteria in Spanish university entrance exams (*ABC* 13-04-1997b; *El País* 14-04-1997, 22-04-1997, 30-04-1997b). Even though both institutions pursue similar goals to strengthen standard Spanish, the relationship between the RAE and the public education system has become marked by criticism.

#### 4.4.2 *Instituto Cervantes*

The Instituto Cervantes (IC) was founded by the Spanish government in 1991 with the aim of creating an agency for the spread of Spanish language and Hispanic culture. In its short and recent existence, it has expanded rapidly and now has 72 institutions across four continents (Instituto Cervantes 2008a). The IC has the King of Spain as its honorary president and the incumbent President of the Spanish government as its Executive President, demonstrating its strong links with the Spanish establishment (for a fuller discussion of the role and ideological underpinnings of the IC, see Mar-Molinero 2006a, 2008).

The IC seeks to achieve its objectives through activities including language classes, online language learning, language teacher training, cultural programs and an online television channel. In 2007 two key new tools were created: (1) the *Plan curricular del Instituto Cervantes: Niveles de referencia para el español* which specifies objectives and content for the teaching of Spanish as a foreign language in accordance with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, and (2) the *Sistema Internacional de Certificación del Español como Lengua Extranjera*, a common accreditation system for Spanish as a foreign language, for which the IC has recruited numerous educational authorities and universities around the world. The inevitable homogenizing of Spanish that the IC's activities create, by imposing one variety from Spain amidst the diversity of the language across the Spanish-speaking world ('el español peninsular central', Instituto Cervantes 2008b), is evident from a critical analysis of its declared aims, objectives, and practices.

Arguably, the status planning of Spanish in the world is led more by the IC whose status as a government agency means that state language policy guides its activities. This policy reinforces the hegemonic position of Castilian

over other languages of Spain, even when—as in 2006—it enters into agreements to provide language classes for Galician, for example. While including minority language teaching in its worldwide programme demonstrates a perceived willingness to recognise the linguistic diversity of Spain, this ‘simulated’ linguistic equality actually reifies an ideology of linguistic hierarchy through which the IC exercises a degree of control over how Spain’s linguistic configuration is perceived around the world.

In terms of the relationship between the RAE and the IC, former RAE Director Fernando Lázaro Carreter is quoted as saying:

Somos ministros de una misma iglesia; nosotros somos los padres conciliares y ellos los misioneros.

(García de la Concha 2005b:5)

The metaphor used is rooted in the cultural foundations of Spain’s establishment, based largely on the monarchy, government, and Catholic Church, not to mention the strong historical influence of the Spanish Empire. This metaphor shows how establishment ideology continues to affect the conception of the language authorities and their linguistic ‘proselytizing’ mission.

However, the activities of these two corporations do not divide so clearly into the ‘standardising’ of the Academy and the ‘language spread’ of the Instituto. For example, the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* was produced by the RAE and the *Asociación de Academias* with the co-operation of the IC. The IC’s name and increasingly recognised logo appear on the front cover of the DPD and are therefore linked with a dictionary, a product which is traditionally the preserve of the Academy. There is undoubtedly a level of prestige for the IC which comes from having worked with the Academy on the high-profile DPD.

Overall, the IC functions in a similar vein to the British Council, and is particularly involved in strengthening the international profile of Spanish in response to the global dominance of English. In two key areas – Brazil and the

US - the IC is especially active: it provides teaching materials and personnel in response to the Brazilian government's decision to make Spanish a compulsory part of the secondary education curriculum (Bertolotti 2007); and has centres in four major US cities<sup>23</sup> to meet and promote the demand for Spanish as a second/foreign language.

#### **4.4.3 Media**

In Chapters 2 (section 2.5.4.3) and 3 (section 3.4) I examined the vital role of the press in language mavenry and the proliferation of ideological views in society. The vast increase in the use of a wide range of communications media in recent years – the development of a so-called 'information society' – has meant that language is used in an ever-increasing number of ways within this media. Given, too, that each medium potentially reaches a different section of society for differing purposes, we can expect to find that the 'formal' presentation of information and entertainment makes use of a broader than ever range of registers and language varieties. In this section I will be considering some of the media channels involved in the information society as it has impacted Spain, and how language ideological debates have arisen from, and been hosted by, the different media. I do so, mindful of the fact that the influence of communications media as a site of engagement with and construction of contemporary language ideologies should not be underestimated, as Lodaes points out:

Los medios de comunicación se han convertido, a su vez, en jerarquías lingüísticas relativamente autónomas. Hay que considerar que la gente que lee periódicos o escucha la radio y la televisión es mucha más que la que lee gramáticas y ortografías.

(Lodaes 2005:114)

Lodaes offers a noteworthy reminder here of which the RAE is also aware – that the Spanish-speaking public will not just be informed of language debates and ideas through the prologues and epilogues of RAE publications.

Consequently, the press and audiovisual media are vital sites for locating language ideologies throughout Spain and Latin America.

#### 4.4.3.1 Television and film

A study by the *Asociación para la Investigación de los Medios de Comunicación* (AIMC 2006) shows that 88.6% of Spaniards regularly watch television, with a statistical average daily viewing of 221 minutes. This supports Lodaes' observation of the primacy of audiovisual media, and it is clear that television broadcasters hold considerable influence over the way that news is presented, current affairs are debated, and the kinds of entertainment and sports coverage which are offered. This does not mean, however, that viewers are merely passive consumers with no influence: broadcasters constantly conduct market research to ensure that their programming meets a demand and will obtain maximal viewer ratings. Nevertheless, the format, structure and presentation of television material all reflect particular institutional ideologies. Lippi-Green comments that:

The broadcast news industry takes a proprietary interest in the spoken language. It promotes its own language as the only possible language of an educated, informed mainstream. It is in part by means of claiming authority in matters of spoken language that it establishes itself, over and over again, as an important public institution – and one as crucial as the educational system to the well-being of the nation-state.

(Lippi-Green 1997:137)

As a linguistic authority, television producers often promote a 'neutral', central Castilian variety spoken by many news presenters. Furthermore, news broadcasters reinforce their position as important public institutions by producing their own style guides. Stewart (1999) discusses the various guides produced by, for example, *Radio Televisión Española* (RTVE), *Canal Sur*, *Telemadrid* and *Telenoticia*. She writes that RTVE's style guide – produced in 1985 under the direction of RAE member Valentín García Yebra and with a

prologue by the RAE's Fernando Lázaro Carreter - contained little specific reference to spoken Spanish (Stewart 1999:25). Nonetheless, the oral nature of news broadcasting means that spoken language on RTVE is based on the written norms, so again the standardised written language serves as the model.

Another area of television broadcasting which has merited much attention from verbal hygienists has been that of *culebrones/telenovelas*: soap operas. Gregorio Salvador, vice director of the RAE, published a book whose title demonstrates the ideological basis of its argument: *Un vehículo para la cohesión lingüística: el español hablado en los culebrones*. Salvador describes how his interest in this topic was sparked by Humberto López Morales' reference to the 'influjo cohesivo de las telenovelas, a la trascendencia que tal género podría tener en orden al mantenimiento de la unidad lingüística' (Salvador 1994:5).

Many soap operas are exported widely around the Spanish-speaking world, and exposure to these can consolidate linguistic unity in grammar, lexis and even pronunciation. There is also exposure to linguistic variants which can also result in the adoption of terms in one country which were previously specific to another. Lodaes (2005:120) recounts how Manuel Alvar, a respected dialectologist, travelled to Cuba with another linguist to collate data for a 'linguistic atlas' of the Americas, and was surprised to find that three 'typical' Cuban terms for a street vendor were not used at all by the surveyed speakers; instead, all used the Mexican term 'merolico'. Alvar later discovered that a Mexican soap had been screened in Cuba one year previously, in which one of the main characters was a street vendor, or 'merolico'. The term had subsequently supplanted all other terms in Cuba. Salvador, echoing Lodaes' point above regarding the greater influence of television producers than grammar producers on contemporary language, reflects that:

Guionistas, asesores lingüísticos, estilistas, un conjunto de nombres perdidos en los títulos de crédito, están en condiciones de hacer, con buen sentido, mucho más por el porvenir del idioma, no ya que filólogos y escritores sino que todas las Academias de la Lengua juntas. Y lo digo yo que soy el presidente de la Comisión Permanente de la Asociación de

Academias, único organismo supranacional hispánico que tiene potestad e intenta ejercerla en todo lo que atañe a nuestra lengua común.

(Salvador 1994:24)

While I cannot offer a full discussion here, it is worth drawing attention to the recent boom in *reality shows*<sup>24</sup> which feature 'ordinary' people as the main protagonists, meaning that unpolished, regional and colloquial voices have been given more airtime than previously. More research is necessary to determine whether the increased appearance of non-professionals on Spanish television is affecting attitudes to language variation or whether viewers continue to hold 'professionals' in high esteem concerning 'appropriate' models of Spanish on television.

A final area to briefly mention is that of films, and in particular the way that for much of the twentieth-century, foreign-language films were dubbed into Spanish. Of course in theory this might have necessitated choices regarding the variety of Spanish into which these films were to be dubbed; in practice, however, the fact that a large proportion of the period in question was dominated by Franco's dictatorship meant that there was, in effect, only one option: standard, central Peninsular Castilian. After Franco's government made dubbing compulsory in Spain in 1941, the State not only controlled the variety of language but equally its contents were subject to censorship through manipulating the translation of screenplay (Bravo 2006:233). By the time film censorship was abolished in Spain in 1977, the concept of an 'acceptable' Spanish language and accent had become thoroughly naturalised, and this continues today within the context of a much larger Spanish-speaking world in which there are pluricentric norms. A limited number of these norms are widely accepted as prestigious, and where films are still dubbed (primarily children's films now), the most common practice continues to be the levelling of linguistic distinctives in pursuit of a 'neutral' Spanish that might be understood throughout the many Spanish-speaking territories in which films are broadcast and marketed. Equally, the popularity of *telenovelas*, as mentioned above, can partly be explained by the use of a uniform 'panhispanic' Spanish vocabulary

which is largely unmarked by geographically and culturally-specific terms. Common to these various stages through which the broadcasting industry has passed is the fact that allowing a small number of 'neutral' and 'prestigious' Spanish varieties represents a deliberate attempt to keep a standardised Spanish at the forefront of media and cultural representations of the Spanish-speaking world. As such, we can clearly see the imposition of dominant language ideologies, because the domains of television and film 'use language variation and accent to draw character quickly, building on established preconceived notions associated with specific regional loyalties, ethnic, racial, or economic alliances' (Lippi-Green 1997:81).

#### 4.4.3.2 Radio

Much of what has been said above regarding television as a vehicle for/site of language ideologies could equally be applied to radio broadcasting. Issues of language *form* in formal (e.g. news, current affairs) and informal (e.g. chat shows, popular stations) programming are similar to those discussed in relation to television.

In terms of the *content* of radio broadcasts, there are a number of programmes which debate linguistic issues (i.e. 'metalinguistic discourse', Woolard 1998). The state-run RTVE channel, Radio 5, broadcasts a daily programme, *Hablando en plata*, which examines words, phrases and errors and promotes the 'good' use of Spanish through clarifying linguistic doubts (RTVE 2006). Also broadcast by RTVE, *Un idioma sin fronteras* is geared more towards an international audience and second-language learners of Spanish. It is repeated four times daily on *Radio Exterior de España*, with regular features relating to the Spanish language in the world, its culture, literature, poetry and music. Academicians, writers and authors from the Hispanic world are frequently interviewed on the programme. It is clear then that national radio includes two strands of metalinguistic discourse promoting particular ideologies of language: firstly, the programme aimed at a national audience contains explicitly prescriptive metalinguistic discourse, taking an approach of 'don't say this...but say...'; the second, more international approach engenders

a vision of a unified language presentable to international learners of Spanish and does so through promoting the model of Spanish used in the programme (ideology in linguistic practices) and listing the merits of this 'commodified' language in its varying outputs (i.e. poetry, essays, literature, music, pedagogic materials).

#### 4.4.3.3 Internet

Computer technology and the development of the information society are of immense importance at the start of the twenty-first century, and it should come as no surprise that language exists in a dialectical relationship with technology: it both shapes and is shaped by modern resources and their driving organisations. Almost any given set of statistics will show English to be the 'language of the internet' in terms of the language in which the majority of sites are produced, programming and other online training is given, and chat-rooms are conducted. The leadership of the US markets explains much of this linguistic prominence: Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, IBM are all titles initially associated with the USA, even if much of their production has subsequently been translated into many other languages. Given the vast population of Spanish-speakers globally (it typically ranks between the second and fifth most spoken language, depending on inclusion of non mother-tongue speakers in the figures), it stands out that the volume of internet space in Spanish is little more than 5% (see Marcos Marín 2000, 2006). While it should be acknowledged that there is a trend towards an increasing non-English internet presence (Mar-Molinero 2004:11), what particularly interests us in this discussion is how the low overall Spanish internet content contrasts with the impressive amount of language ideological debate that has been triggered. All of the major verbal hygienists highlighted in this chapter have a presence on the web: the RAE, the IC, *Fundéu*, RTVE, through more minor organisations such as the *Instituto Castellano y Leonés*, down to the plethora of personal pages dedicated to the defence and promotion of the Spanish language. One such webmaster states that, far from being a language expert, 'No soy más que un ingeniero de Teleco dedicado a Internet y preocupado por la defensa y dignificación del idioma

español', yet he endows the site with the grand title of 'Pagina de la Lengua Española' (2006). This is typical of the strength of feeling many Spaniards display when it comes to the treatment of 'their' language (see Stewart 1999: Ch.1). A simple search on the Google website anecdotally demonstrates this point further: entering the phrase 'defensa lengua española' unearths half a million references.

The internet is a locus of ideological debate, on the one hand, *about* the Spanish language; on the other hand, it is also the subject of much debate concerning its *effects on* language. Stewart observes that language contact on the internet leads to linguistic change (1999:61). Indeed, with almost 60% of internet sites in English (Marcos Marín 2000), it is inevitable that by nature of language contact, lexical terms will experience migration from one code to another (more frequently the dominant to the subordinate variety). This is already taking place and is causing concern amongst numerous verbal hygienists. One prominent defender of Spanish, Álex Grijelmo, complains of an 'invasion' of anglicisms and English calques from the technical jargon associated with the use of the internet, for example *e-mail*, *linkar*, *deletear*, *estar online*, *password*, *pluguin*, *chatear* and *cliqear* (2001:221-259). The resulting *espanglish* is receiving considerable criticism due to what is seen as the dilution of 'proper' Spanish. Moreover, many believe that beyond linguistic borrowings, globalisation as a whole is in fact simply bringing about a 'norteamericanización' of world structures, societies and languages (Grijelmo 2001:221). It is partly in reaction to this dominance that language purists such as Grijelmo are both vocal and active in their determination to maintain the integrity of the Spanish language as it adopts its own technological neologisms (Haugen's *elaboration of function*) and seeks to encourage loyalty amongst speakers to 'true' rather than 'diluted' Spanish (Haugen's *acceptance*).

As for the RAE, a discussion of its approach will come later through analysis of press debates where its position is made clear. For now, it is interesting to note that the rise in technology has led the RAE to adopt technological machinery and methodology in the collection of data for its contemporary and historical corpora. As mentioned above, it benefits from its

own website which already hosts not only details of its activities, members and products, but also free, fully searchable versions of the two Corpora, Orthography, the *Diccionario Panhispánico de Dudas*, its current DRAE, and all previous versions of the various RAE Dictionaries via the *Nuevo Tesoro Lexicográfico de la Lengua Española*. It is clear that in many ways the RAE is rising to meet the challenge of an increasingly technology-literate society, and notably it is doing so with the backing of a number of major organisations in the information technology market. IBM was one of the founding members of the *Fundación Pro-RAE*, and has been instrumental in sponsoring the Academy's overhaul of computing resources and training staff in applying these to RAE processes.

#### 4.4.3.4 Fundéu

The *Fundación de Español Urgente* (Fundéu) was set up in early 2005, its principal aim being to:

...colaborar con el buen uso del idioma español, especialmente en los medios de comunicación, cuya influencia en el desarrollo de nuestra lengua es cada vez mayor.

(Fundéu 2006)

It was established under the joint auspices of Spanish news agency EFE, and the major Spanish bank BBVA:

...dos instituciones, que conscientes del valor y la importancia que tiene el español en el mundo, quieren contribuir a su cuidado y prestigio internacional.

(Fundéu 2006)

Fundéu focuses particularly on language in the media, a sector of society which, as I have noted, often comes under fire from verbal hygienists for its mistreatment of Spanish. The foundation's response to the significant influence of the media on contemporary language use is to establish uniform criteria for

what constitutes 'correct' Spanish, so that those media bodies who wish to submit to its recommendations might also contribute to the unity and defence of the language. Fundéu has also developed a *Certificado del calidad lingüística*, a seal of linguistic approval awarded to those media organisations who, in their reports, manuals and other publicity, comply with the criteria of Fundéu, as outlined in its style guide, the *Manual de Español Urgente* (for more, see Style Guide section below).

Already in its short existence, this high-profile organisation has signed agreements with, amongst others, RTVE, Telecinco (largest private television broadcaster), *20 minutos* (most popular free daily newspaper), and several universities (notably in locations with significant historical links to the development of Spanish: Madrid, Castilla-La Mancha and Alcalá de Henares) and so can be seen as an active player in debates about the use of language in Spain, in the media and more generally in society.

Part of its remit is the production of a quarterly magazine, *Donde dice...*, made available freely on the [www.fundeu.es](http://www.fundeu.es) website. The magazine includes a *firma invitada* article usually written by a high-profile language expert, reports on the various seminars and conferences that Fundéu organises, and recommendations on common linguistic errors within the themes of each issue. Recent themes have included the language of youth, the Internet, sport, non-sexist language, and soap operas.

There are a number of links to the RAE, the first and most visible being Víctor García de la Concha, who serves as President of Fundéu. Another is that the criteria for correction are based on the Academies' DPD, and this was one of the founding policies:

La fundación se guiará por los criterios del *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* y aceptará consultas. TVE y RNE se someterán también al control de la fundación, que estará abierta a 'todos los medios públicos y privados' que quieran incluirse mediante la firma de convenios.

(*El País*, 20-11-2004c)

As Fundéu submits to the RAE's norms, so the state-run media were the first to submit to the guidance of Fundéu in its mission to bring what its Director Álex Grijelmo calls 'control de calidad' (*El País*, 20-11-2004c) to the language of the Spanish media.

#### 4.4.4 *Style guides and affordable books*

As I have shown above, style guides are common amongst the different producers of television, radio and press media. These guides approach language debates from a particularly prescriptive stance, usually presenting problematic terms in A-Z form, and setting out which items are unacceptable, along with their accepted versions. The aim may legitimately be to shape a certain 'house style' as part of their corporate identity and target market; for example, an organisation aiming to reach middle to upper-middle class clients might prescribe vocabulary which is of an educated level, whereas more popular media might proscribe the same vocabulary as 'too elevated' for the house style and prescribe more popular phrases (for further discussion of style guides, see Stewart 1999).

It is worth noting that style guides themselves are usually meant for a professional audience whose role it is to present language in the form of reports, etc, for consumption by an audience. It could be said then that these guides are unlikely to attract much of a 'lay' audience. However, this lay market is provided with similar publications aimed at a wider, more general readership than style guides, similar to those British titles I listed in Chapter 2 (section 2.4.4). Some notable titles (and authors) include: *El dardo en la palabra* (1997) and *El Nuevo dardo en la palabra* (2005) by Fernando Lázaro Carreter (RAE); *El genio del idioma* (2004a), *Defensa apasionada de la lengua española* (2001), *La seducción de las palabras* (2004c) and *La punta de la lengua* (2004b) by Álex Grijelmo (EFE, Fundéu); *Gente de Cervantes* (2001), *Lengua y patria* (2002) and *El porvenir del español* (2005), by Juan Ramón Lodares to name a few<sup>25</sup>. Common to the cover blurb and content of all of these publications is the general idea that the Spanish language is not used as well as it should be by its speakers. The invasion of Anglicisms and neologisms, injudicious semantic shifts, poor

grammatical knowledge and widespread lack of pride in and care for Spanish are recurring themes in these commentaries. On this, Del Valle & Gabriel-Stheeman note that:

Just as Bello had justified the need for his grammar on the basis of improper use and the danger of fragmentation, contemporary speakers are constantly reminded – through the press and affordable publications – of their linguistic ignorance... That is precisely the reason why a group of illustrious philologists, grammarians and men of letters are presented as the legitimate and zealous custodians of the linguistic order.

(Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002b:201)

Bello's arguments find resonance in some present-day 'popular' books on the Spanish language. Lodaes in particular argues for the idea of a Spanish linguistic community, and prophesies its breakup should Spanish-speakers fail to recognise the importance of 'taking care' with their language and conforming to the standardised Castilian variety (2002, 2005). On the other hand, Lippi-Green argues that the marketing of popular publications about the English language, in which responsibility for a possible linguistic fragmentation was laid squarely at the feet of 'bad' language-users, actually constructed a general discourse of linguistic inferiority and a perceived need for language authorities and guides to help 'lay' speakers improve their speech or writing:

Any successful entrepreneur will validate the simple fact that the first step in any venture is either to find a hole in the market – a real need which has not been filled – or to create a need in the mind of the public for a new product. Some place along the way such a need for a better, more efficient language was created in the minds of English speakers (and speakers of many other languages). This followed not because speakers of English were suddenly no longer able to communicate with each other, but because they were told that they would soon not be able to communicate with each other if they didn't do something about their

language, given the new technology and the demands that technology put on spoken language.

(Lippi-Green 1997:137)

Style guides, then, are another vehicle of standardisation – usually of media language – in which we see the desire for a particular style of language use or ‘brand’ competing with the need to reach a wider audience through a common linguistic code. The more popular commentaries talk of empowering individuals to be more confident and responsible members of society if only they would follow ‘the rules’ of language use. What both professional and lay readers of the style guides have in common is that they are subject to a genre in which an idealised standard language is iconically linked with the desired traits of those who speak it – first-class journalists, skilful commentators, educated citizens or literate and eloquent employees.

#### **4.5 SUMMARY**

My aim in this chapter has been to trace how the Spanish language has come to be known as such, and to follow the strands of social, historical and linguistic factors which have led to the contemporary language configuration of Spain. Conflicts, conquests and unifying nation-building projects have all been fundamental in the development of the Castilian dialect and its elevation to become synonymous with the Spanish language. The role of Spanish in uniting the nation – according to linguistic nationalism – implicated the need for a common tongue, and language planning efforts dating back from Alfonso X, through Nebrija, *Los reyes católicos*, and anti-Napoleonic movements to General Franco and now the globalisation of Spanish have proved inseparable from the socio-political ideologies and activities of the times.

Throughout the development of the language, the ideology and process of standardisation has sought to capture Spanish in a ‘preferred’ state, most notably linked to the Golden Age of Spanish literature. In previous centuries one could liken this process to that of painting an object or scene. The dynamic nature of language change and innovation due to myriad influences on it has,

however, meant that by the time the 'painting' of a standardised language had been finished (e.g. a dictionary or grammar), the 'scene' had changed considerably. In the present-day context, advances in technology have transformed the ways in which language is captured, and consequently the challenge of standardisers – and the Academy in particular – is now perceived to be the maintenance of linguistic unity across the speech community which is now vastly larger and more dispersed than when the RAE was founded.

I also set out in this chapter to examine not only the RAE but also the network of other domains and institutions which can be considered language authorities. While the objectives and practices of these authorities are diverse, there is an identifiable core of institutions and tools (the Constitution, public education, Academies, cultural institutions and the printed and audiovisual media) which serve to make Spanish what it is today and determine how it is perceived, learned and imitated by native and non-native speakers. These institutions perpetuate the ideology of standardisation through creating 'pillars' of the language (Dictionaries and so on) and propagating the dichotomy of 'correct' and 'incorrect' Spanish with its consequences of inclusion in, or exclusion from, the benefits of the standard language speaking 'community'. Standardisation and its discourse begins in the education system but carries on beyond this and is disseminated through public debates and practices on the television, radio, internet and printed press. In all of these media, institutions and practices, we see they act as sites of ideology: some as sites in which ideology is discerned through linguistic practices (what is said/written as a model), others through particularly metalinguistic discourse (talk about what should or should not be said/written), and others through implicit metapragmatics (embedded signalling of how the communication is to be interpreted).

Having ascertained who the primary agents are in controlling and influencing the standards of spoken and written Spanish, I will in the remainder of the thesis focus on the oldest of these institutions (with the exception of the press): the RAE. While some aspects of the Academy have changed since its inception (such as its revised primary mission to maintain

linguistic unity in the Spanish-speaking world and its procedures for achieving this), other fundamental ideologies and practices of standardisation remain the same. In the next chapter, I begin my analysis of the press data which will advance our understanding – beyond what I have outlined here – of the Academy's contemporary public discourse.



**THE UNITY OF THE SPANISH  
LANGUAGE AND COMMUNITY  
OF SPANISH-SPEAKERS**

**5.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter, I begin to interrogate the nature of the ideological debates and discursive contestations surrounding 'standard Spanish'. I will analyse my data in order to understand how the Real Academia Española – as well as other language guardians – define the Spanish language in public debates. A critical analysis of the ways in which Spanish is referred to is interesting and important because, as Wodak shows (Reisigl and Wodak 2001, Wodak et al. 1999), the linguistic strategies employed by agents of linguistic ideologies contribute to the achievement of particular social, political or psychological aims. It is equally vital to understand how language guardians 'struggle to control language by defining its nature' (Cameron 1995:8) and so in this case study I first wish to understand how Spanish is named, conceived, defined and referred to, as well as the characteristics, qualities and features which are attributed to it by those involved in debates about Spanish. Secondly, I will seek to examine the same features of discourse but with reference to Spanish-speakers around the world. I will pay attention to the vocabulary choices of language guardians in their contributions to public language debates as well as the effects of any instances of mystification or naturalisation of particular ideologies or discourses.

## 5.2 UNITY OF THE SPANISH LANGUAGE

In spite of its considerable and recognised variety across the Spanish-speaking world (see for example Alvar 1982, 1999, Alvar et al. 1991, Castro 1961, Lipski 1994, 2008, Moreno de Alba 2003, Roca and Lipski 1993), the Spanish language is repeatedly described as being just one cohesive language. This is a vision reinforced on many occasions by expert linguists writing in the press, and little if any space is given over to the exploration of dissenting views. In particular, the RAE seeks to manufacture consent for a vision of *linguistic unity* and the idea of an international *community* to which all Spanish-speakers belong.

### 5.2.1 *One common, unified language*

On the unity of Spanish vocabulary, this claim is made by Humberto López Morales, Secretary General of the *Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española* (ASALE), in an interview for *El País*:

‘El 80% del vocabulario es común en el mundo hispánico’ aseguraba López Morales.

(*El País* 14-11-2006)

Here, the use of statistics to legitimise López Morales’s point, strong verbs such as ‘assure’ and the indicative mood ‘is’ all point to a projected certainty of the truth claims being made, and serve to reinforce the authority of the interlocutor in texts such as this. In another interview in *El País*, the RAE’s deputy director, Gregorio Salvador, claims that:

[A]lgo que nos ha quedado claro es que, con las dudas que hemos despejado y con las que queden, es cierto que **el español es la lengua más cohesionada del mundo.**

(*El País*, 10-11-2005c)

In the absence of any further evidence or substantiation, Salvador’s position as an Academician and authoritative public figure on language supposedly

validates and legitimises the truth of the statement<sup>26</sup>. The use of phrases such as ‘es cierto que...’ can also tend to obscure debate and block dissent, establishing the speaker’s conclusion as ultimately authoritative. Furthermore, the declarative verb form (el español **es**) and the use of the definite article to indicate the superlative position of Spanish amongst unified languages (**la** lengua más cohesionada) both have experiential value, i.e. they represent the text producer’s experience of the natural and social world. Together, these linguistic uses form a predicational strategy which reinforces the positive traits and hierarchical position that Spanish is reported to possess.

The next extract is from an interview in *El País* with the Academician and philologist José Manuel Blecua:

Pregunta: Pero hay españoles distintos. Y es más bonito el de los campesinos ecuatorianos que el de la tele. Respuesta: **Sí, pero el español, al final, es sólo uno:** el que nos une al mundo, el que denomina la vida, el amor, la muerte y las pequeñas cosas.

(*El País* 19-10-2001f)

What is important to note here is that we see the evidence of the competing ideological views in which Spanish is seen as either ‘one’ or as ‘distinct Spanishes’ (comparable to the debates around global English and ‘Englishes’). Some examples from this vast literature are Jenkins 2007, Kachru et al. 2006, Kirkpatrick 2007, Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008, Moore 2001, Parakrama 1995, Pennycook 2007, Platt et al. 1984). Challenged with the perspective that there are numerous, distinct varieties of Spanish, Blecua first makes an ‘apparent concession’ that this is the case, then immediately introduces a contrary argument by naming ‘*the*’ Spanish language, and reiterating the view that there is only one Spanish<sup>27</sup>. Along with similar traits attributed to Spanish such as homogeneity<sup>28</sup>, solidity, and clarity<sup>29</sup>, this naturalisation of discourse on a unified standard Spanish reflects Crowley’s assessment of standard language as ‘offering unity and coherence to what otherwise appears diverse and disunited’ (2003:84). The examples above show how language guardians seek to ensure

that Spanish is not represented primarily as diverse or disunited, but as harmonious and unitary.

Another key designation to be repeated across the discourse of Academicians and other guardians alike is that of Spanish as the '*lengua común*'<sup>30</sup>. However, this term is ambiguous. In some instances, this is used to reinforce the status of Spanish as the state language *within* Spain, especially in very recent debates regarding increased Catalan education in Catalonia, the supposed '*persecución del castellano*' and the reiterated need for a common state language. Equally, Spanish as a common tongue has, in public debates, related to the language of all 400 million plus mother-tongue speakers across Europe, the Americas and those who remain in Equatorial Guinea and the Philippines. This way of referring to Spanish builds on the point made above in that, if Spanish is to be seen as a single, unified language, it can then be presented as the same variety which unifies all those who speak it. Furthermore, the common Spanish language is modified by the adjective '*neutro*'<sup>31</sup> by the Academician José Antonio Pascual, signifying an unmarked variety not particular to any one nation-state. Reflected in such an idea is what Woolard calls the ideology of '*anonymity*' (comparable to Nagel's (1986) concept of 'the view from nowhere', 2007), closely linked to the idea of a panhispanic norm or '*total Spanish*' which I discuss in Chapter 7.

In references to *la lengua común*, social relationships are constructed and enacted via text in discourse (Fairclough (2001) calls these the *relational values* of words). Relational vocabulary (i.e. *lengua común*) and relational grammar (i.e. *nuestra lengua común*) are combined to construct a sense of a community of speakers. In the same way that a national community is imagined in Anderson's (1983) sense, a language community – though sharing the practical and tangible feature of language – is potentially constructed and imagined prior to being experienced first-hand. A language community such as the one constructed in this discourse goes beyond the national barriers of those individual nation-states where Spanish is official to construct a sense of belonging on a transnational level. The concepts of '*language community*' and '*speech community*' (Silverstein 1996, 1998) help to explain the competing

discourses at work here. A language community – such as the *comunidad hispanohablante* – is founded largely on the belief that community members share a language, whereas the various identifiable speech communities within the geographical and linguistic space denoted by the *comunidad* (e.g. speakers of ‘Chilean Spanish’, ‘Andalusian Spanish’ etc) are ‘people [...] who produce, share, and exchange orders of indexicality’ (Blommaert 2005:215).

To reinforce this sense of belonging, Spanish is also referred to as part of the ‘heritage’ of the perceived Spanish-speaking community. Heritage is another part of the discursive construction of nationalist sentiments in that it appeals to another shared aspect of the national community, so it is significant that Spanish is designated the ‘*patrimonio común*’<sup>32</sup>. Equally significant is the fact that in all but two of the cases from my data, it is the King of Spain who uses this term in his speeches to the Academy or at one of the CILE events. This reinforces his position as a ‘spokesman’ not just for the Spanish State of which he is head, but also for the Spanish language, with the consequent effect that the shared language of all Spanish-speakers is associated with the historic royalty of Spain and language variety /-ies of that particular territory.

A similar referential strategy is used by the Directors of the RAE and the Cervantes Institute when they speak of Spanish as the ‘*patria común*’<sup>33</sup> – a metaphorical representation of language as a common native land. The allusion to territory is significant in that it adds another aspect of nationalist ideology to the kinds of ideas expressed by language guardians: language forms the basis of a community comparable to a nation with its set of common ties but going beyond the existing individual nation-states to form a supranational community of Spanish speakers. Interestingly, this includes Portuguese-speaking Brazil which has adopted Spanish as a compulsory element of the education system and hence has reinforced the idea of an Iberian-American ‘common territory’<sup>34</sup>.

### 5.2.2 *Spanish as a factor of unity*

Spanish, then, is commonly referred to as a language which first *is unified* in its structure, and second *unifies* people into a community through a shared system of communication. The case for Spanish as a unifying tool is legitimised by

argumentation strategies which draw on values of democracy, common purposes, peace and global fraternity. This can be clearly seen in the following extract of a speech given at the *Instituto Cervantes* (IC) just one month after the terrorist attacks of 11<sup>th</sup> September 2001 on New York:

*El Rey aboga por el español como 'cauce de concordia y tolerancia'*

El Rey defendió ayer, durante la reunión del patronato del Instituto Cervantes, que presidió, el español como **'un cauce de concordia y tolerancia'** cuando el mundo vive momentos de inquietud y preocupación'.

[...] Don Juan Carlos se refirió al nuevo contexto internacional. 'La lucha que España e Iberoamérica comparten debe unirnos en estos tiempos críticos y turbulentos, en los que fuerzas sin rostro desatan el terror en el corazón mismo de **nuestra civilización'**, aseguró. 'Los movimientos de personas mezclan razas, lenguas y cultura en todos los países, y el terror se hace también universal y nos golpea con una violencia que jamás habríamos imaginado'.

En la lengua como fuente de civilización y como referente confía también Aznar. 'El español ha de servir **para transmitir consigo un código de valores** ante las dificultades de la comunidad internacional estos días. Seamos conscientes de que **nuestro idioma es una oportunidad para expresar la opción fundamental por las formas de vida propias del modelo democrático**. El recurso al terror, simplemente conduce a la barbarie cultural', dijo.

(*El País* 11-10-2001c)

King Juan Carlos discursively constructs a positive 'us' against whom acts of terror are being waged (even though this was prior to the direct attacks on Spain in March 2004), and a negative, faceless 'them' who are the terrorists. He includes Spanish-speaking America alongside Spain when referring to those countries engaged in the current struggle, and talks of 'nuestra civilización' based on language. A couched warning follows regarding the mixing of races,

languages and cultures that results from the free movement of people made easier and more common with processes of globalisation. The incumbent President of Spain then more explicitly associates the Spanish language with the transmission of democratic values. Just days later, at the inauguration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> CILE, Colombia's president called Spanish 'the language of the third millennium because it is the language of solidarity and peace'<sup>35</sup>. Spanish is designated a language of friendship<sup>36</sup>, understanding, harmony, concord, sharing, and unity<sup>37</sup>; a language which breaks down barriers, draws together purposes and creates a flow of shared values and aspirations<sup>38</sup>, and which – due to its democratic credentials – carries moral authority<sup>39</sup>.

So intense is this naturalised discourse that historical events have been misrepresented in pursuit of lauding the positive values of Spanish. A speech delivered by King Juan Carlos (but written and approved by the *Partido Popular* government of the day) stated that:

Nunca fue la nuestra lengua de imposición, sino de encuentro; a nadie se le obligó nunca a hablar en castellano: fueron los pueblos más diversos quienes hicieron suyo, por voluntad libérrima, el idioma de Cervantes.

(*El País*, 25-04-2001)

The polemic provoked by this statement came from both Latin America (where entire populations, cultures and languages were wiped out in the conquests) and Spain itself<sup>40</sup> where minority languages have been repeatedly outlawed and persecuted, most recently under Franco. This statement negates those discourses which say that Spanish was imposed on Iberian and American peoples, in order to achieve a perception of Spanish as a language chosen by the free will of people groups desiring to encounter other groups. Explicit contestations of language history and ideologies also take place in press debates, as in this article by the director of the ASALE, Humberto López Morales:

España fue la única potencia que cristianizó su proyecto histórico para legitimar la conquista. **No es verdad que la lengua fue compañera del imperio.** Se fomentó el bilingüismo. El propósito fundamental fue la evangelización y para ello los frailes aprendieron lenguas indígenas, que propagaron y fortalecieron. La lengua que supuestamente dominaba, tras la independencia floreció y se expandió más que nunca.

(*El País* 09-11-2005a, my emphasis)

López Morales reformulates the existing Nebrijan argument<sup>41</sup> that language was a tool of empire, but directly negates it and draws on topoi of history, religion and bilingualism to present a competing, positive interpretation of Spain's *conquista*. Earlier in the article the tone is set so that López Morales 'revisa los falsos mitos del español en América'<sup>42</sup> and whatever follows is then expected to be in the same vein. His defence of the historical spread of Spanish comes at a time when numerous language debates seek to problematise (or legitimise) the ideologies and practices of the current spread of Spanish throughout the world.

### 5.2.3 *Strengths and weaknesses of Spanish*

One of the consequences of defining Spanish as a single, cohesive, unifying language is that this definition becomes an object of protection and consequently another debate legitimises the ongoing process and work of guarding and maintaining this linguistic (and hence social, political, diplomatic) unity. The verb *velar* (to keep vigil, watch, look after) is frequently employed to describe the task of guardians of linguistic unity, not only in the press<sup>43</sup> but also in the Statutes of the RAE itself:

La Academia es una institución con personalidad jurídica propia que tiene como misión principal velar porque los cambios que experimente la Lengua Española en su constante adaptación a las necesidades de sus hablantes no quiebren la esencial unidad que mantiene en todo el ámbito hispánico.

(Real Academia Española 1995:7)

'Defence' and 'unity' are also often collocated in RAE discourse,<sup>44</sup> particularly around the time of the Congresses, suggesting first that there is a sufficiently standardised 'unified' Spanish to speak of (an existential assumption); secondly that there are processes and/or agents attacking this unity; and thirdly that it is the job of certain guardians to defend this unity.

The General Director of EFE lauded the arrival of the Academy's *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* which, she claimed, would prevent Spanish from becoming 'a barely understandable chaos' due to the 'invasion' of lexical borrowings<sup>45</sup>. Here the perceived threat(s) to the Spanish language are named explicitly, albeit through metaphors. The 'battle' is being fought against borrowings from other languages, particularly English, and especially in the field of technology<sup>46</sup>. The boundaries of 'what is Spanish' are being crossed by 'enemy troops': lexical borrowings from English which are deemed to be unnecessary and for which Spanish words (or English words with pronunciation and spelling following Spanish norms) should be used. To reinforce the idea of foreignness and 'othering', Anglicisms are generally presented in italics or inverted commas; this happens in press articles just as it does in the Academy's dictionaries where a word in italics (*bastardilla*) signifies a 'bastard', foreign, illegitimate word<sup>47</sup>. The etymology of *bastardilla* serves well the ideological objective of othering in Academic discourse, reifying the concept of 'our' language with its legitimate terms and neologisms born of Spanish phonetic and orthographic norms, in opposition to 'their' language whose illegitimate terms enter 'our' language and must be rejected or assimilated into 'our' norms. Of course, the themes and arguments above – while salient to my

discussion of Spain and the Spanish-speaking territories – are notably characteristic of the discourse of linguistic purism in many contexts.

That language guardians should work to guarantee the ongoing essential unity of Spanish is an apparently logical conclusion to the threats presented in this discourse<sup>48</sup>, and as such constitutes an assumption on which the role and authority of language guardians is established, discussed and consolidated (I elaborate on this in Chapter 6).

In contrast to debates about the perceived threats to Spanish, there are also debates in which it is often described as being in ‘excellent health’<sup>49</sup>, employing medical discourse to metaphorically evaluate the state of the language. The classification suggests that the language – personified as a ‘patient’ – currently faces few or no problems and can thus be ascribed a clean bill of health. It is an accepted social norm in western culture that medical experts have authority to make declarations like this concerning the status of a patient’s health; here, that authoritative position is taken by verbal hygienists. This excellent health is attributed to a number of factors, including the global number of Spanish speakers, the high birth-rate within the Spanish-speaking world, use of the language in communication technologies, and the unity of Spanish<sup>50</sup>. As such, the aim is to offer convincing evidence of the positive status of Spanish in a kind of ‘eulogy’.

Another discourse feature is the *comparison* of Spanish to other languages in order to promote the former and downplay the importance of the latter, as in the following examples:

Anson bromeó sobre **la buena salud del español, ‘tan buena que es insultante’, [...]** ‘**la lengua francesa ha comenzado su retroceso. Eso no es así en las naciones de habla española**, y eso es lo que nos permite afirmar con rotundidad que el español es el segundo idioma del mundo’.

(ABC 10-04-1997a)

Para Fernando Lázaro Carreter, es impensable eliminar las reglas ortográficas porque ‘se aniquilaría el lenguaje; además, la ortografía es

uno de los grandes bienes de la lengua, que facilita la unidad y que **otros idiomas, por ejemplo el portugués, no tienen y les produce conflictos.**'

(ABC 13-04-1997a)

Barcia no deja que cerremos el cuaderno: 'Ponga usted que **lo que tiene la lengua española** es una unidad básica muy fuerte y su fonética tiene una rotundez y sencillez que **no tiene ninguna otra lengua**'.

(*El País* 11-11-2005c)

The strength and unity of Spanish are portrayed as superior to those of most other languages, justifying its position in the world, and these characteristics mean that Spanish merits special care and protection. It follows that if the standardising work of language guardians is seen to safeguard the traits and position of Spanish, then their work appears unimpeachable.

The healthy status of Spanish is also asserted through the use of language rankings which again set up a framework of comparison in which Spanish is seen to be doing better (or worse) than other languages. Seemingly the most frequent ranking which appears in both RAE and non-RAE texts is that which puts Spanish in second place in terms of being an international/world/global language<sup>51</sup>.

It is clear is that the predominantly positive evaluation of the language, in particular being contrasted with other major international languages in a hierarchy, contributes towards the apparent status of the language. The more these rankings are used frequently in the media, the more naturalised they become and the more their truth is taken for granted. Obviously in terms of numbers, Spanish and its varieties do indeed have a very large number and international spread of speakers; what is ideological is the use of these 'facts' for purposes of status planning, to increase the prestige of the language based on topoi of numbers and advantage. This status planning takes place not just with reference to international Spanish but – by virtue of appearing in *Spain's* press – also with relevance to debates concerning the relationship of Spanish to the regional languages of Spain's autonomous communities. The projection of

Spanish as the second most important global language provides an easy reference when arguing for its importance to Spain's educational, commercial and diplomatic policies, and the maintenance of its hegemonic position in activities of State.

#### 5.2.4 *The economic value of Spanish*

It is almost impossible to read contemporary language debates in Spain without coming across representations of the language in economic terms. This strand of language ideological discourse uses the recurring metaphor of Spanish as a commodity, classifying Spanish as a profitable economic resource or industry:

*La lengua española, **industria** del siglo XXI ... Es la mayor **industria** del siglo XXI, nuestra principal **materia prima**.*

*(El País 02-03-2007)*

Nuestro idioma [...] puede servir de base a un **comercio común, cultural, económico y laboral**. (Director of RAE)

*(El País 30-03-1997)*

La voluntad del congreso, o de quienes lo han organizado, es lograr una integración para articular estos dos mundos de la búsqueda de perfiles propios, de peculiaridades, de rasgos regionales y, por otro lado, esta necesaria expansión de la lengua, con elementos generales, elementos internacionales **para que pueda competir en un mercado, inclusive el lingüístico, con otras lenguas como el inglés**.

*(El País 14-11-2004b)*

*La riqueza de la lengua '...el turismo idiomático es la **industria** más limpia, no contaminante y próspera de los próximos años.* (Director of Cervantes)

*(ABC 19-12-2006)*

‘Resulta obvio que la **empresa multinacional** que nos espera es la promoción del español bajo criterios de **rentabilidad**, con base estadística y exigencia estratégica’.

(ABC 23-10-2006)

These metaphors of ‘language is commodity’ and ‘language is business’ are supported by other linguistic features and strategies. In referring to the Spanish language industry as ‘our main raw material’, the use of inclusive ‘our’ by the directors of both the RAE (*El País* 30-03-1997) and the IC (*El País* 02-03-2007) points again to the linguistic nationalism consolidated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Nation and language are bound inextricably to each other, and there is an implied ownership by Spain’s authorities of this commodified language. As a modern exporting economy, there is an assumption – based on contemporary capitalist economic models and seen here in its intertextual ‘borrowing’ from capitalist discourse – that Spain as the ‘producer’ of the Spanish commodity should receive the benefits of the raw materials it ‘owns’, wherever these might be traded. The metaphor is employed to define the profitable nature of Spanish, i.e. ‘el petróleo del español’ (ABC 23-10-2006), from whose rich well Spain ‘extracts’ a considerable percentage (15-18%) of its Gross Domestic Product<sup>52</sup>.

As important as what is included in the discourse is what is omitted, and no mention is made within the discourse of my corpus of the economic benefit of Spanish as a commodity/industry to any country other than Spain, reinforcing not only the Euro-centric and Spain-centric perspective of the Spanish press (even in an era of the increased global focus of national media), but also making clear the similar concerns of the language guardians in their public discourse<sup>53</sup>.

The commodification of language taking place in Spanish press discourse is one of what Coupland recognises as the key processes of globalisation which impact on language; the others are interdependence, compression across time and space, and disembedding (Coupland 2003:467, for further discussion of these processes in the Spanish context, see also Paffey and Mar-Molinero 2009).

If ideological brokers such as the RAE and other language authorities are able to define the nature of Spanish as, among other things, a multinational enterprise (ABC 23-10-2006) and to widely, publicly and influentially promote this definition, then they also seem able to apply the norms of international commerce to language. These norms include unquestioned capitalist approaches to advancing language teaching and cultural propagation from Spain as the symbolic 'oil' of the Spanish language (ABC 23-10-2006), not to mention drawing people to Spain itself for language tourism (ABC 19-12-2006). These norms also include defining the context and shaping the conditions under which other business organisations – with their particular interests in transnational expansion – become involved in language standardisation and its public activities., i.e. private business or government sponsorship of publications (i.e. *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* – Telefónica), ongoing projects (*Diccionario historic del español* – Government of Spain) or conferences (*Congreso internacional de la lengua española* , International Seminar on the Economic Value of Spanish – numerous communications, financial and energy companies). There is an increasing amount of transnational commerce which takes place *through* the medium of the Spanish language, and as the number of Spanish-speakers and Spanish-speaking areas increases around the world through high birth-rates, migration and language learning, so do commercial opportunities through the vehicle of the Spanish language. Spain-based multinationals that invest in opening doors for linguistic spread and explicit policy activities find the largest economies in the Americas being opened up to them.

In summary, what should be evident here is that although the characterisation of Spanish as an economically valuable commodity is made possible through the discursive conception of the language as such, the dialectical relationship between ideology and social practice means that prevailing capitalist practices of commodification heavily influence the tendency to view the language as a commodity in the first place.

### **5.3 THE COMMUNITY OF SPANISH-SPEAKERS**

Press discourse reveals further evidence that the RAE defines and refers to speakers of Spanish in a way which builds on the ideology of linguistic unity and

manufactures consent for the idea of an international community to which all Spanish speakers belong. There are a number of different terms used for this same collective of people:

la comunidad de hispanohablantes<sup>54</sup>

la comunidad hispanohablante<sup>55</sup>

la comunidad iberoamericana (linked to *lo panhispánico*)<sup>56</sup>

una comunidad de cuatrocientos millones de hablantes<sup>57</sup>

la comunidad de naciones hispánicas<sup>58</sup>

una comunidad plural<sup>59</sup>

la comunidad de naciones que utiliza el español<sup>60</sup>

el Mundo Hispánico<sup>61</sup>

habitantes de una misma realidad lingüística<sup>62</sup>

These terms refer to those who possess Spanish as their language or who are members of nations which use Spanish, suggesting the inclusion of second-language speakers of Spanish, for example members of indigenous groups in Latin America as well as Catalan, Basque and Galician mother-tongue speakers. The repetition of these terms naturalises the ideology of the common Spanish language as a basis for a (Pan-)Hispanic community, and such an idea is then accepted as a 'common-sense' reality by influential bodies such as the RAE, ASALE, Spanish Royalty and the media institutions through which their discourse appears.

Other linguistic strategies serve to further strengthen this ideology such as the use of the definite article to refer to **the** unified, transnational Hispanic community, and the use of relational grammar to create and enhance a sense of belonging. Firstly the definite article **el/la** presupposes that such a concept exists, and further implies consensus and authority to define the concept:

El Mundo Hispánico es efectivamente eso: un mundo;

(ABC 18-10-2001b)

*Discurso de Víctor García de la Concha* ...gracias a eso [nacimiento de las Academias americanas] se aseguró la unidad de una lengua que es **el** elemento vertebrador de la actual comunidad de naciones hispánicas.<sup>63</sup>

(ABC 15-11-2005)

**la** comunidad de hispanohablantes

(*El País* 30-04-1997a)

**la** comunidad hispanohablante

(*El País* 18-11-2004e)

**la** unidad iberoamericana

(*El País* 30-03-2007a)

**la** comunidad iberoamericana

(*El País* 31-03-2007a)

**la** comunidad de naciones que utiliza el español

(ABC 17-10-2001c)

Secondly, relational grammar denotes possession, belonging, or a common perspective (nosotros, nuestro, -amos/-emos/-imos verb forms). It can both align the position of the writer with that of the assumed reader and it also further assumes the authority to speak on their behalf:

[...]los hombres cultos del siglo XXI tendrán que estar alertas para evitar que el español deje de ser **la lengua común de todos nosotros**

(ABC 08-04-1997b)

El español es ya el patrimonio más valioso de los países y de los cientos de millones de personas que «**formamos** una comunidad plural, abierta a todos y a la que precisamente une e identifica la lengua común», sostuvo El Rey.

(ABC 11-10-2001)

*Discurso íntegro del Rey*

La lengua española, por tanto, consolida su dimensión de patrimonio común de **nuestras naciones**. [...] entre **todos los que poseemos el español** en condominio deben ser las herramientas básicas de **nuestra labor común**. [...] una herencia histórica y cultural hondamente enraizada en **nuestros pueblos**. [...] **Nuestro idioma** es el medio en el que se desarrollan los contactos y las relaciones en el seno de esa vasta comunidad de personas [...] las posibilidades de proyección exterior de **nuestra lengua** [...] **nuestro futuro** como comunidad de hispanohablantes.

(ABC 17-10-2001c)

‘La decisión del Gobierno brasileño acerca de la obligatoriedad de la enseñanza del español en escuelas públicas y privadas es muy importante y **fortalece esa idea de que consideremos a Iberoamérica como patria común**, dentro de su diversidad’, dijo Molina.

(*El País* 09-11-2005b)

(For further examples see note <sup>64</sup>)

Strongly present in these statements (and in other headlines) is the idea that, in spite of many distinctive points amongst Spanish-speaking nations, there is sufficient commonality of language to allow—or perhaps to *cause*—speakers to conceive of one transnational, panhispanic language and identity, based primarily on language, to which every Spanish-speaker belongs.

In the examples above, we see the construction of an ideological concept that Del Valle (2007b) has referred to as *la hispanofonía*, echoing the discourse of unity of *La Francophonie* based on French as a ‘native’ as well as an ex-colonial language. Del Valle also relates this ideology of a transnational Spanish-speaking community to Anderson’s theory of an ‘imagined community’ in that not only is the communion of its many members imagined rather than necessarily experienced, but it is based on a language which is equally

'imagined' to be common to all members (Del Valle 2007b:37). This imagination – in the sense of an ability to conceive of one's commonality with other members of *la hispanofonía* beyond the personal experiences and interactions of any one 'member' – is fed by press statements in which the unity of Spanish is frequently collocated with a positive evaluative discussion about the context of an overall assumed *panhispanic* community, as can be seen in these extracts:

El director de la Academia Española aseguró que 'creemos que con ello estamos prestando **un servicio cuyo interés rebasa lo estrictamente lingüístico** para situarse en **un valor importantísimo** en la **integración de Comunidad Iberoamericana de Naciones**, y creemos que esto se realiza como el mejor **servicio al robustecimiento de la unidad del español**, pero con el **respeto más absoluto** a las realizaciones variadas que ese **español unido** tiene en cada una de las regiones'.

(*El País* 15-09-2005)

García de la Concha highlights how the interests and effects of the Academy's standardising publications go beyond linguistic ends to serve a vision that integrates the nation-states of the *Comunidad Iberoamericana de Naciones* (CIN). This political 'community' – comparable to the British Commonwealth and *La Francophonie* – pursues the political, economic, social and cultural development of its member states (SEGIB 2008), and consists of 22 nation-states<sup>65</sup> including 19 where Spanish is the/an official language, and another three (Portugal, Brazil and Andorra) where Spanish is the dominant language in all the surrounding nation-states as well as a compulsory subject in parts of the education system in two of these three countries (Brazil and Andorra). In associating linguistic processes and standardising publications with an international political association like the CIN, the role of Spanish is linked explicitly to the successful functioning of the CIN's goals. Furthermore, the concept of a unified Spanish is highlighted and reinforced as necessary, and is represented as completely compatible with the regional varieties of Spanish which are assumed to be derivatives of 'ese español unido'. Connecting regional varieties with the

overarching unified Spanish in this way reifies the RAE's vision of a community in which speakers of the *lengua común* or the *realizaciones variadas* constitute an identifiable supranational community. This in turn reinforces the RAE's legitimacy as spokesperson in matters pertaining to the Spanish language on a global level, and allows the RAE and the ASALE a very public and widespread voice in the definition and discussion of a perceived community of global Spanish speakers.

The concentration on Spanish as the unifying factor of *La Comunidad Iberoamericana* tends to obscure discussion of the role of the other languages present in the CIN nation-states: Portuguese in Brazil and Portugal, Catalan in Andorra, Spain's regional languages and the hundreds of indigenous languages spoken throughout the Latin American member states. The consequences of portraying a transnational political unity as linked to just one of the many languages present across the cohort of members include a clear downgrading of the perceived prestige of non-Spanish languages, particularly in terms of their ability to unite people beyond the nation-state paradigm. Even the process of 'othering' whereby these languages are discursively grouped together as 'the other languages' of their respective countries (and of the CIN) and conceived of as less important raises questions about the value of non-dominant languages and cultures in an era of globalisation. As political, social and commercial movements tend towards greater unification across nation-state borders, and as authoritative discourses reinforces this trend in terms of promoting fewer, more widespread global languages, so non-dominant languages and cultures continue to face the challenge to legitimise their continued protection and value. Often they are included in discourse concerning the value of diversity, and the cultural (rather than political, educational or social) role that they play in smaller-scale communities. The above citation from *El País* (*El País* 15-09-2005) also shows one instance of how discourse on total Spanish co-exists with the ideological and policy line which emphasises *unity in diversity* – another concept which throughout contemporary Spanish language debates has been naturalised into the common ground of linguistic beliefs through repetition in influential media<sup>66</sup>. The phrase itself is not by any means specific to Spanish

rhetoric but can be found in a number of different political, philosophical and religious domains: it is the motto of nation-states such as South Africa and Indonesia as well as the supranational European Union, and is a significant part of Christian and Baha'i discourse. In appropriating this trope into standardisation discourse, Spain's language authorities tap into what is widely considered in liberal thinking to be an unimpeachable cause.

However, it is worth noting that even in contexts where linguistic diversity is acknowledged, it is generally a topic which is backgrounded, i.e. given little prominence and discussed in scant detail. Furthermore, this topic is recurrently collocated with discourse on the 'essential unity' of the Spanish language, and 'unity in diversity' which are foregrounded topics, suggesting that these are the more pressing and prominent themes for communication.

#### **5.4 UNITY AND COMMUNITY IN STANDARDISATION DISCOURSE**

What then are some of the implications of the ways in which the RAE and other guardians refer to Spanish and Spanish-speakers? As Cameron points out (1995:8), defining the nature of language and its particular varieties is part of the struggle to control language. As such, the definition of Spanish as one language with between 80-90% common features across its varieties means that this common language is more easily controlled by a few guardians. In spite of the fact that regional varieties (i.e. Argentinean Spanish, Honduran Spanish etc) have more recently been accepted in positive terms through discourse on the 'diversity' and 'richness' of language within their respective territories, they continue to be firmly bound within the overall category of the Spanish language through defining their richness as contributing to the wealth of the Spanish language: there is no discussion of the value of *argentinismos*, *hondurenismos*, and so on, in or of themselves. If linguistic diversity were to further develop into stronger regional varieties, this would be seen as a cause of the fragmentation of Spanish. Any perceived greater role for the national Academies or other territorially-based verbal hygienists in developing these regional varieties would be to the detriment of the currently hegemonic role that Spain's language guardians have in international Spanish language

standardisation. It is, then, in the interests of the RAE to continue defining the language as largely one (as in Blecua's expression that 'el español, al final, es sólo uno'), and also to affirm this as a natural state of affairs with no other future alternative than the continuation of its standardisation and its unifying role, an ideology identifiable in Juaristi's claim that 'no tenemos otro destino que nuestra lengua común'.

Another consequence of the discourse strategies examined above is that by controlling the definition of Spanish as one unified language, a common identity as a community of Spanish-speakers can also be imposed and reinforced. This top-down strategy of referring to speakers of Spanish as a 'community' of 'inhabitants of the same linguistic reality' reinforces what is common to all those being referred to. Whilst not ignoring the diversity of identities and other communities present within the 'Hispanic world', the persistent collocation of terms which refer to diversity with those terms underlining cohesion (*un mundo diverso, una comunidad plural*) takes place within debates which are positively framed by discussion of unimpeachable values of unity and accord. This framing strategy manufactures consent for the ideology that unity of language trumps diversity across the Hispanic nation-states, and that diversity should not legitimise any sense of community fragmentation; diversity should instead continue to be discursively framed and practically considered as a less powerful force than unity, which should not impede moves towards greater interconnectedness of political, economic and social life between nation-states.

The resulting belief in the unity of language and the community of its speakers allows language guardians to carve out and reinforce an important discursive space in which theirs are the voices of authority and expertise in matters of the Spanish-speaking community and the language which binds it together. I will discuss in depth in Chapter 7 the role and authority that the RAE and other language guardians claim for themselves through their press discourse. However, it is important at this point to note that the discursive construction of the language, the community and the guardians of these on an international level carries similar effects and consequences as the construction

of a national standard that I discussed in my theoretical framework. Portraying the 'common language' as a perceived unitary reality means that there is a named supranational variety in which particular localised usages of lexis or grammar are either rejected, or – if they become absorbed into the overall common variety – lose their identification as 'particular'. It follows that the *lengua común* does not then consist of marked 'localisms' but can be considered a standardised variety: one which has undergone Haugen's processes of selection, codification, elaboration, and acceptance (1972). In this way, a supranational language variety is constructed through *panhispanic* dictionaries, grammars and orthographies, and it therefore exists as another 'standard' of Spanish by which speakers can be judged to speak it either 'well' or 'badly'. If citizens of Spanish-speaking countries use language which contains some clearly local (in this case 'national') features, it raises the question of whether they are considered to truly form part of the community of Spanish speakers, if the basis and 'native variety' of this community is 'common' Spanish. And if, then, one is not considered to speak the common language variety, will the consequences be the same as for speakers of non-national standard varieties of languages who:

find that his or her social mobility is blocked and may, for example, be refused access to certain types of employment without any official admission that the refusals depend partly or wholly on his or her use of language.

(Milroy and Milroy 1999:2)

The linguistic discrimination against speakers of Spanish varieties not regarded as common across *la hispanofonía* would most likely affect those whose work would bring them into contact with members of other Hispanophone countries or with the international Spanish media, given that the prestige of a common international Spanish would be most guarded in these domains. Milroy and Milroy argue that linguistic discrimination is liable to occur against, for example, 'A person who speaks English perfectly effectively, but who has

occasional usages that are said to be 'substandard' (e.g. omitting the initial [h] in words like *happy, hair*, or using double negatives)' (1999:2). Comparable areas in which Spanish-speakers might face accusations of 'substandard' usage include the aspiration of word-final [s] (e.g. [en esto<sup>h</sup> do<sup>h</sup> paise<sup>h</sup>], [en esto<sup>ø</sup> do<sup>ø</sup> paise<sup>ø</sup>] use/omission of *vosotros*, *dequeísmo*, *laismo*, etc). It remains to be seen – and merits further research – as to how the emerging standardisation of global Spanish will classify these usages, and how in practice their perceived prestige will have an effect on the social/professional progress of those who use them in spoken Spanish.

One factor which will to some extent determine the relationship between 'español común' and its use as a 'gatekeeping' tool in professional contexts – allowing or hindering access to these – will be the relationship between language guardians and key transnational businesses. In order to define and promote the Spanish language and community of speakers, language guardians have entered into numerous agreements with transnational businesses in the sponsorship and production of standardising dictionaries, grammars, and the important International Congresses. Given that the concept of Spanish as a unified global language is based on the ever increasing scope and unity of its standardisation criteria, the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* (Real Academia Española and Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española 2005) is one example of a number of important steps towards this. Its producers – the RAE, ASALE and IC, with the sponsorship of Telefónica and the support of 'the most important media organisations in the Hispanic Community'<sup>67</sup> – intended the DPD to serve as a normative tool for the standardisation of common Spanish in both Spain and Latin America<sup>68</sup>. In this way, companies such as Telefónica come to have a role in language standardisation practices<sup>69</sup>. Furthermore, the way in which discourse on collaborations between language guardians (IC, RAE, ASALE, Fundéu) and businesses from the banking (BBVA, Santander), communications (Telefónica), media (Prisa, Vocento) and energy industries (Repsol, Iberdrola, Endesa) are framed very positively ensures that these companies are then seen to be favouring and assisting the unimpeachable values of wider and better communication, increased sharing of knowledge and

educational resources, and increased commercial co-operation and international trade. What will be interesting, though, will be the extent to which these companies adopt the linguistic norms they are helping to spread, and how access to the global work market or national jobs involving communication with speakers of other national varieties of Spanish – particularly through the companies above – will depend on one's ability to communicate in 'el español común'.

The outcome of this last point will provide crucial evidence of how economic, social and political movements have an increasing effect on language practices, definitions, requirements and norms in this contemporary era of massive global interconnectedness. What I mean by this is that – as I noted in Chapter 2 – the phenomenon of 'iconisation' (Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002c) links an abstractly defined standard language with the imagined national community whose native tongue it is. It also makes a link between 'non-standard' or 'sub-standard' language use with groups of people who are discredited because they do not use the common national language as the ideal citizen 'should'. It is therefore possible that the iconisation which occurs under nationalist ideologies of standardisation similarly occurs within ideologies regarding language beyond the nation-state. Fairclough (2006:34) has suggested that the phenomenon of globalisation has brought about a 'rescaling' of relations in which the global scale has potentially become 'an ultimate horizon for action' for nation-states and multinational organisations. I argue that this rescaling is also taking place for the RAE, and that its domain of activity – according to its statutes and publications – is no longer limited to nation-states, nor its activities to those of 'cleansing, fixing and giving splendour' to a nation-state based variety of Spanish. Instead, the focus of the RAE and its language debates now goes beyond this to what can be considered a transnational 'standard' or 'total Spanish' (Del Valle 2007a, b) based on global linguistic unity. If, then, this transnational level language variety has become the legitimate unit of iconisation, 'misuses' of language which would previously have been linked to 'dialectal' features under the nation-state paradigm will from here on be linked to 'national' varieties of language under the global paradigm. It is true

to say that national varieties of Spanish and their ‘-isms’ (*españolismos*, *chilenismos*, *mexicanismos*, etc) are discussed in far more liberal terms in contemporary RAE discourse, and – as I have noted – are seen as factors which enrich the Spanish language as a whole. However, what does not seem to have changed is the way in which greater prestige is given to a particular variety which occupies the ‘highest level’ of the language (now international), and which is considered to be free of features which are particular to the ‘lower level’ (the national variety ‘ismos’). This prestigious international variety – as should be clear from the discussion in this chapter – is debated by guardians as ‘el español común’, and its speakers form a cohesive international community.

## 5.5 SUMMARY

In this chapter I have engaged in a critical reading of the press data in which language authorities – primarily the RAE – define, debate and reinforce particular visions of Spanish. I have considered how the theme of unity permeates most RAE discussions about Spanish, portraying a harmonious linguistic unity which promotes and is embedded in values of democracy, globalisation and common identity. Furthermore, the unitary nature of ‘*la lengua común*’ is presented as *panhispanic*, and hence not traceable to any particular nation-state or any of the speech communities therein. Instead, the Spanish spoken throughout the transnational language community is viewed as a Spanish from nowhere, a view based on the language ideology of anonymity.

It was argued in this chapter that *linguistic nationalism* continues to play a part in the discursive construction of Spanish. Aspects of this philosophy include visualising the language as a ‘*patrimonio*’ and ‘*patria común*’, defining it as ordered, unified and common across the ‘community’ of speakers, and aspects of ‘othering’ in which linguistic frontiers are crossed when ‘their’ linguistic forms and uses invade ‘our’ language through Anglicisms and ‘excessive’ neologisms. The ideology that those sharing the language form a community is naturalised to become a ‘common-sense’ argument, reinforced by the inclusive language of ‘us’, ‘our’ and ‘we’.

Portions of Spanish language history which do not fit with the positive values mentioned above are omitted from contemporary accounts which present Spanish as a language of encounter, harmony and democracy not just in its present and future, but in its past too. While claims by the King of Spain that the language has never been forced on anyone might be true amongst the substantial number of people benefiting from the cultural boom of Spanish and language tourism, contesting accounts of history are hardly, if ever, recognised in the discourse of language authorities. The voices and perspectives of those who would contest the King's version of history - ethnolinguistic groups eliminated by the *conquistadores*, indigenous communities in Latin America whose languages and cultures continue to be undermined by Spanish hegemony, Catalan, Basque or Galician speakers repressed under the Franco dictatorship, as well as speakers of less prestigious varieties of Spanish – are backgrounded and invisibilised.

Nevertheless, the continuing spread of Spanish is a recurrent theme in RAE discourse, and in particular, neo-liberal discourse concerning the 'invisible hand of the market' and 'inevitable market forces' is drawn upon to legitimise this spread. Enabling and fomenting the further spread of Spanish is seen as the only option, and discussions of this are framed positively in terms of the economic value of Spanish, its profitability and its metaphorical representation as a valuable industry of Spain.

Finally, the critical analysis in this chapter has highlighted key aims of the discursive strategies employed by the RAE and associated language authorities. These aims included the establishment of an ideological space in which the unified Spanish language of the united Hispanic community is guided by panhispanic norms. Such norms are purported to be representative of all Spanish-speaking nation-states yet the standardisation practices continue to be led by Madrid's Academy and largely funded by Spain-based development agencies and private businesses.



# 6

## THE ROLE AND AUTHORITY OF THE *REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA* AND OTHER GUARDIANS OF SPANISH

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 4, I contextualised this study by looking at the development of the Spanish language and the particular organisations which – historically and more recently – have played a significant role in the ideology and production of ‘standard’ Spanish. In particular I focused on a discussion of the RAE as the primary agent of language standardisation, and situated its practices amongst those of other agents with whom the RAE has cooperated increasingly in recent years. This demonstrated a key point that the RAE is by no means solely responsible for language standardisation and the direction of linguistic debates; however, it does arguably occupy a position of *primus inter pares* in relation to not only the other Spanish Language Academies but also the institutional language guardians of Spain and the Spanish-speaking world.

Having moved on in Chapter 5 to consider what the data corpus tells us about the ideologies of unity and community embedded in RAE discourse, I will in this chapter interrogate my data further – primarily that which I have collected from the press but also the policy documents of those institutions in question – in order to provide answers to two of my research questions. First, what is the role of the RAE (and to some extent the other language guardians) in the process of producing and maintaining a ‘standard’ variety of Spanish?

and second, how exactly does the RAE discursively legitimise its role and authority in the process of standardisation?

Answering the first question will involve considering the language guardians' activities as these are publicised, as well as their reflective metadiscourse on what they do and what they are perceived to be doing by fellow guardians, journalists and other commentators. The limitations of this thesis and the nature of the data collected necessarily mean that the focus will be on the RAE, and that my analysis and reflection on the practices of other selected language guardians will be less in-depth. I will, however, draw from some of the evidence which shows how the role and strength of certain other guardians is closely linked to their collaborative practices and relationship with the RAE.

In order to answer the second question I will focus specifically on discourse authored by the RAE in which their activities and their authority to carry these out are explained, justified or defended, and how the content and form of the language they use work together to create strategies of legitimisation. Of interest too will be others' evaluations of the RAE, and how this intertextually reinforces or contests the discourse of the RAE. Throughout the chapter, I will draw on examples of some textual analysis of the press discourse which, I have argued, is the most public and most widespread medium through which the RAE is able to make its ideas and activities known to Spanish-speakers and the wider public.

## **6.2 THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE GUARDIANS IN STANDARDISATION**

### **6.2.1 *The Real Academia Española***

My earlier discussion in chapter 4 detailed the history of the RAE and how it has achieved the prestigious status of the supposedly 'natural' guardian of the Spanish language. In particular, I noted how the function of the Academy has come to differ somewhat from the motto 'limpia, fija y da esplendor' which appears on its crest to this day. Indeed, Lázaro took each of the three founding goals and stressed how the RAE actually no longer sought to fulfil these:

Lograr la unidad es, según Fernando Lázaro Carreter, el gran objetivo de la Academia, 'que ya no limpia, fija y da esplendor, porque limpiar sería terrible, ya que hay que traer muchas palabras que son la civilización moderna; fijar haría un lenguaje paralítico, muerto, y esplendor lo da unas veces o no, porque en realidad, los que dan esplendor son los grandes escritores, pero no la Academia, que tiene como objetivo conseguir que todos los hispano-hablantes tengan un punto de referencia'.

(ABC 13-04-1997a)

Lázaro echoes the Academy's recognition in its revised Statutes (Real Academia Española, 1995:7) that language change is axiomatic, and he further claims that it is imperative to bring in words which reflect contemporary society. It is not made explicit here whether he is talking about neologisms or borrowings from other languages, but the RAE's discourse and practices in recent years show that neologisms which conform to the orthographic and phonetic rules of Spanish (or borrowed words which are adapted in order to do so) are preferred to what the Academy sees as 'el exceso de préstamos' (Pascual Rodríguez 2006) from other languages. Following this, Lázaro negatively frames the idea of 'fixing' a language by equating this to its paralysis and death, and finally attributes agency for giving language its splendour to 'los grandes escritores'. In effect, Lázaro appears to reject the RAE's historic motto as a description of its contemporary role, and focuses attention instead on the concept of unity which has become dominant in the Academy's public discourse and which he associates with the necessity of having '**un** punto de referencia' for all Spanish-speakers. To achieve this, the Academy looks out for or 'guards' the language so that change does not jeopardise the pursuit of linguistic unity. The verb 'velar' is used to designate this particular role of the Academy in its own statutes (Real Academia Española, 1995:7) and also frequently in the press, where the agent can be the Academy itself, its director, or representatives of organisations that support the RAE in its mission with financial and other resources:

La Real Academia Española (RAE) ha vivido una gran revolución tecnológica en los últimos doce años, que ha venido a facilitar el trabajo que los académicos desarrollan para **velar** por la mayor de nuestras riquezas culturales: el idioma.

(ABC 16-11-2004a)

Ahora [Víctor García de la Concha] es director de la Academia y **vela** por la lengua de 400 millones de hispanohablantes.

(El País 18-10-2001d)

Amparo Moraleda calificó como un placer ayudar a la RAE a **velar** por la unidad de la lengua.

(El País 24-10-2001)

As discussed in Chapter 5, maintaining the unity of language across the Spanish-speaking world is now the primary task that the RAE sets itself. In relation to its role in achieving this, Víctor García de la Concha explained that:

‘La Academia está para dar unidad al idioma, que puede ser uno y distinto. Una misma partitura, como la lengua española, se puede tocar de distintas maneras en México, en Soria o en Andalucía. El diccionario es el código del que todos participamos, y por eso la Academia tiene que trabajar para que sea reconocido como tal código.’

(El País 30-03-1997a)

In this statement, García de la Concha confirms the Academy’s general motivation to secure the unity of Spanish. He then affirms the primary position of the DRAE using the definite article which sets this publication up as ‘*el diccionario*’ offering ‘*el código del que todos participamos*’ before asserting the role of the Academy in ensuring that this unified code is recognised as the one shared by Spanish-speakers. Once again we see that, even if Spanish is recognised to have multiple distinctive varieties and expressions, these are

brought together by the RAE and ASALE in their authoritative publications for the benefit of Spanish-speakers worldwide.

The RAE's primacy in defining and promoting linguistic unity is reinforced by two metaphors used in *ABC* which referred to the RAE's Madrid head office as 'la sala de maquinas del idioma' and 'el centro espiritual donde se gesta esa unidad' (*ABC* 16-11-2004a). The industrial connotations of the first metaphor place responsibility for working and creating the language firmly with the RAE and demonstrate one aspect of the public perception of the RAE's work and importance. The second metaphor echoes Herderian discourse which views language as the spirit of a national community: the Academy as the 'centro espiritual' is seen to be the hub of Spanish where linguistic unity indexes belonging to an overarching community. For Herder, this community was realised by the nation-state, whereas in the case of Spanish, the community of speakers transcends national borders and encompasses countries in which, while an idealised homogenous language does represent a common factor of identity, there is also 'a complex set of disparate loyalties' (Bugel 2006:22) that do not figure in the discursive construction of linguistic homogeneity and unity. These loyalties are subsumed within the 'comunidad hispanohablante'.

Beside the array of non-linguistic loyalties present within the Spanish-speaking world, there are linguistic distinctives – evolving features of language which come to represent territorially-marked items and usages (*chilenismos, venezolanismos, etc*) – which give rise to linguistic loyalties. RAE member and famed writer Francisco Ayala remarked on the Academy's role in managing the evolution of Spanish:

Calibrarla, medirla y registrarla es precisamente la tarea de que se ocupan nuestras Academias.

(*El País* 18-11-2004d)

The sense here is that all the Academies participate in the task of 'gatekeeping' Spanish, ensuring that any changes, neologisms, borrowings and so on are weighed up, measured, registered and come to form part of the pillars of

Spanish in the Academies' Orthography, Dictionary and Grammar.

Consequently, language change is not so much subject to mere evolution as to a degree of *engineering* in pursuit of the homogenisation of the 'lengua común'.

Press discourse reveals a concentration on the *descriptive* aspect of the Academies' work. Angel Martín Municio of the RAE stated plainly that in order for the DRAE to be kept up-to-date, 'no tiene sino que recoger el lenguaje usado por la gente' (ABC 11-04-1997). Insinuated here is a somewhat passive role for the RAE in that it is seen only to collect the language already in use and commit it to paper in the form of dictionaries and other guides. López Morales corroborates this view when he comments on the debate around the singular and plural of *talibán*, leading the journalist of the article to frame his comments with the statement that:

[...] la Academia **tiene una función notarial de ver qué es lo que está pasando y qué es lo que dicen los usuarios**, López Morales está seguro de que en un futuro el Diccionario de la Real Academia recogerá talibán como singular y 'talibanes' como plural.

(ABC 12-10-2001b)

Once again, agency for language change and innovation is placed with 'los usuarios' who in this instance are positioned as separate from the Academy itself, whose responsibility— as the metaphorical linguistic *notario* — is to register what is actually happening amongst Spanish-speakers on the street. Víctor García de la Concha's assessment is that the work of the Academy and its resulting DRAE is to be a mirror of spoken Spanish:

Luis Herrero se quejó de la rápida aceptación por parte de la Academia de la palabra guay. El director de la RAE explicó que es un término que utiliza la gente y que **el Diccionario debe ser un espejo de la lengua que se habla, no una selección de los términos que prefieren los académicos.**

(El País 19-10-2001e)

As well as stating positively the role of the RAE, García de la Concha also specifies negatively what its role *must not* be, and that is to select terms to appear in the Dictionary according to the preferences of its members. This apparently assumes that Academicians are able to make disinterested choices about what should be included in the Spanish lexicon according to objective guiding principles or criteria, and that subjective ideologies of language play no part and are not brought to the table when deciding which aspects of ‘la lengua que se habla’ to include in the dictionary’s content. However, when dealing with the RAE and ASALE’s proposed new Grammar, García de la Concha talks of how it will serve to ‘recomendar determinados usos cuando se considere que forman parte de la lengua culta general estándar’ (*El País* 18-10-2001c).

Referring to a *lengua culta general estándar* – based on the Academies’ deliberations and publications – surely negates the possibility of their role being merely to mirror and capture the language that is spoken (always vaguely referenced by the passive ‘se habla’). In an article for the *Fundéu* magazine – another language guarding organisation over which he presides – García de la Concha reiterates the relationship between the Spanish language, its speakers and the Academies:

Porque la norma —es bien sabido— no la hacen los académicos sino los hablantes. **La Academia y la Asociación de Academias cumplen una función notarial o registral:** abren sus ojos y sus oídos para ver y oír lo que el pueblo hispanohablante, en un nivel medio de cultura, considera correcto o incorrecto, culto, coloquial o vulgar. Y lo fijan en el cuerpo, cambiante como organismo vivo que es, del sistema de la Lengua (*sic*) española.

(García de la Concha 2008:1)

We see here the intertextual reference to the metaphor of *notario*, before García de la Concha modifies the idea of registering Spanish-speakers’ *usage* to registering what those speakers consider to be *correct*, incorrect, and so on. It is first and foremost the speakers themselves – according to García de la Concha –

who decide what is correct. This appears to absolve the Academies of their traditional responsibility for fixing the norms of the language, and places responsibility for the creation of norms with Spanish speakers. What the Academies appear to fix are these 'speaker-generated norms', and by the Academies fixing them, they are seen to enter into the accepted system that is the Spanish language.

To make recommendations, to standardise, and to homogenise the status of language usages to *lengua culta* all involve far more than mere reflection of what is seen and heard: they signify the evaluation, selection, adaptation and recommendation of particular aspects of the 'image' of language, and the consequent rejection and stigmatisation of elements which become non-standard, non-general and unrefined.

In fulfilling this role, the RAE not only merely describes how the Spanish language *is* used but does in fact describe how it *should* be used, and it is clear that language prescription reflects personal, class, social and political interests. RAE member, José Manuel Blecua, demonstrates in the following interview extract how the criteria for language management are deeply rooted in historical and socio-political contexts:

'El diccionario de la RAE refleja una lengua consolidada', asegura Blecua quien pone un ejemplo muy gráfico a los lectores: 'durante la transición a los coches se les llamaban lecheras porque eran blancos. Si estas palabras se hubieran aceptado habría que haberlas cambiado, **el diccionario debe esperar a que se consoliden**'. Pero el lenguaje no entiende ni de modas ni legislaciones. Los debates generados sobre el sexismo del lenguaje o la aceptación de la palabra matrimonio para parejas del mismo sexo sólo caben en la legislación, **el diccionario se limita a 'dar cuenta de los significados válidos'**.

(*El País* 23-03-2007)

Having noted the example of the term 'lechera' and how its use was historically specific, Blecua uses this as a strategy to argue that inclusion of words in the

DRAE is not simply a matter of reflecting current usage, but is subject to the judgement of the Academicians as to whether these have been sufficiently consolidated. Moreover, the inclusion in or exclusion from the DRAE demonstrates the validity (and consequently the inferred invalidity) of terms.

It is important, then, to recognise that in spite of their claims to the contrary, both the 'normative metalinguistic practices' (Cameron 1995:237) of producing language guides, dictionaries, etc and also the 'explicit metalinguistic discourse' (Woolard 1998:9-11) of the Academies reveal a *prescriptive* rather than merely descriptive role in language matters. As I noted in Chapter 3, so-called descriptive publications – through being presented for public consumption – are essentially still prescriptive. They do more than describe language; they discursively construct and create the belief that there is (and ought to be) a common and ideal code (here, the *lengua culta general estándar*) to which members of the Spanish-speaking 'community' should have universal access. Given this recognition that the Academies do not merely register what is spoken but what is both spoken *and valid*, we can see the powerful position of the Academies in pronouncing what they consider to be acceptable terms for use in the prestigious *lengua culta* which has come to form the basic framework of the panhispanic standard and 'total Spanish' (see Chapter 7). Furthermore, in defining and deciding on terminology before agreeing or opposing its entry into the Dictionary, Grammar and Orthography guides, it is crucial to acknowledge the Academies' authority to attribute meaning (i.e. to establish *valid* meaning) to terms. In so doing, they enact a function articulated by Francisco Ayala at the 4<sup>th</sup> CILE in Argentina:

En suma, ponerle nombre a las cosas es transformar su condición, darles una consistencia nueva, o sea, en definitiva, inventarlas, crearlas.

(*El País* 18-11-2004d)

If the ultimate effect of nomenclature (through standardisation) is to potentially transform, invent and create language and meaning, then this is certainly a form of language control. This is not a problem *per se* because standardisation –

as I discussed in Chapter 2 – is not necessarily wrong, and linguistic disorder is not to anyone's advantage. However, there are interests, ideas and conditions of production and dissemination in the ideology and process of standardisation which must be recognised and not simply ignored or naturalised.

In pursuit of their claim to maintain linguistic unity by watching over the changes that Spanish is experiencing, the Academies reflect the everyday language usage of Spanish-speakers but also control language change through defining what constitutes the prestigious *lengua culta general estándar*. Arguably the most visible way that Academics fulfil this role is through consistent public commentary in the press, which involves their making proactive, as well as reactive, comments on a wide variety of language-related issues. For example, when the Nobel Literature prize winner Gabriel García Márquez called for the Spanish spelling system to be significantly reformed and simplified, there was a flurry of activity in which members of the Spanish Academy gave their overwhelming negative and dismissive responses to García Márquez's suggestions. Academics systematically discredited García Márquez himself as knowing little about linguistics and being typical of those who do not submit to any kind of norms; his comments were also discredited as exaggerated, nonsense, a joke and even magical realism (*ABC* 09-04-1997).<sup>70</sup> In providing such concentrated public commentary, the RAE reinforced its commitment to the Orthographic status quo for which it was responsible, demonstrated how jealously it guards its position of author and guardian of the Orthography and general standardisation of Spanish, and reinforced its role as the body with responsibility for producing and defending the rules of Spanish spelling. It also re-established very quickly who has the right to make these suggestions, who provides legitimate and authoritative commentary on them, and who the rightful arbiter is in defining the shape of the Spanish language.<sup>71</sup> Through their regular interventions in Spain's press, the Academics also offer opinions (written and framed in an authoritative manner) on the responsibilities of the education system, the press itself and the status of Spanish in the world (I will discuss the latter in Chapter 7). Recent debates surrounding language in education have, for example, included the RAE's

pronouncements on the meticulous application of spelling standards for university entrance exams,<sup>72</sup> the lamentable withdrawal of Latin from the Spanish curriculum,<sup>73</sup> and the failure to deal with the 'dreadful' state of Spanish language education.<sup>74</sup> Other professions such as journalists are often reminded of their responsibility to use 'correct' Spanish and that the RAE pays particular attention to media writings.<sup>75</sup> These writings are both descriptive and prescriptive commentaries in that they outline the situation in question (as the RAE sees it) and the particular position of language guardians regarding the situation, and then through the prevalent use of imperative modal verbs (*deben, debería, hay que*, etc) say what *should* be the case for Spanish-speakers.

The idea that the RAE is primarily a *servant* of the Spanish-speaking world is one which occurs and is emphasised frequently, contributing to the justification of its interventions in the press. In different articles, the object of the Academy's service is represented as the unity of the language, the language more generally, the public and the Spanish nation. Víctor García de la Concha, in his opening address to the 2<sup>nd</sup> CILE, thanks the President of Mexico (as patron of the previous conference) for recognising the language as a common identity factor for Spanish-speakers around the world and also for recognising the work of the Academies in serving this unity<sup>76</sup>. Appealing to such irreproachable values as unity and the supposed 'patria común' of Spanish, García de la Concha ensures the reader will associate the Academies with the pursuit of these laudable principles. Four years later, when Víctor García de la Concha gave an acceptance speech on the award of the *Premio de Valores Humanos* to the RAE, he recalled the founding mission of the Academy:

Cuando, va ya para trescientos años, S. M. el Rey Felipe V firmó la “Cédula de aprobación y protección real a favor de la Academia”, subrayaba de manera repetida que ésta se constituía con el objetivo de **“servir al bien público y a la honra de la Nación, sirviendo a la lengua castellana”**. [...] la Real Academia Española nació promovida por un grupo de ilustrados novatores, renovadores, que pensaban en el pueblo y querían hacerlo todo para el pueblo y con el pueblo.

(García de la Concha, ABC 15-11-2005)

In the first part of this extract, the RAE Director refers to the Academy’s mandate to serve ‘el bien público’ which is then collocated with ‘la honra de la Nación’; these are then placed in relation to the gerund ‘sirviendo’ indicating that serving the common good and the honour of the nation is achieved *by serving* the language. This sets the RAE’s mission as subservient to the ‘higher’ cause of national honour, although García de la Concha’s immediate retextualisation of the mission in the second part focuses more on the desire of the founding Academicians to serve the people. The repetition of ‘el pueblo’ three times adds further emphasis here and is somewhat reminiscent of Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg address (‘government of the people, by the people, for the people’, (Lincoln 1863)). García de la Concha concludes his speech by saying that:

[...] Al agradecer de todo corazón el Premio, la Real Academia Española quiere decir que lo acepta, más que como un reconocimiento, como un estímulo para cumplir mejor cada día su objetivo fundacional: “servir al bien público y a la honra de la Nación, sirviendo a la lengua castellana”, al español.

(ABC 15-11-2005)

By using a metonym, García de la Concha obscures his own agency in accepting the prize for the Academy and more importantly committing the institution once again to the pursuit of its founding mission. One of the effects here is that

he reiterates the link between the Academy and '*la Nación*' which – if this refers to Spain – appears misaligned with the more international and panhispanic discourse of recent years. However, just prior to this last extract, García de la Concha refers to a motion passed amongst the members of ASALE which sought to congratulate the King of Spain on 30 years of his reign during which he had – they argued – become '*artífice y referente continuo de la concordia no solo entre los españoles sino entre todos los pueblos de habla hispana*' (ABC 15-11-2005). At the end of the above extract, García de la Concha also re-textualises the reference to '*la lengua castellana*' by synonymising it with '*al español*', taking into account those Spanish-speaking nation-states that name the language *español* rather than *castellano*.

Given these contextual considerations, it is possible that in building a vision of the Academy's service to the people (Spanish-speakers) and in making reference to the King of the Spanish nation as also the architect of panhispanic concord, '*la Nación*' could well be synonymous with the discursively constructed '*comunidad de hispanohablantes*' discussed in the previous chapter. This would then set the role of the RAE as truly international and panhispanic in its authority and scope. On the other hand, even if '*la Nación*' is not being rescaled to denote the Spanish-speaking '*community*', there still remains a very clear link in the eyes of the RAE between its activities and those of the Spanish state, as evidenced by García de la Concha's claim that, '*Mis viajes son verdaderos viajes de Estado*'. (ABC 17-10-2001e). In the desire to be seen as '*serving*' the Spanish language, the RAE's discourse actually constructs a rather more powerful role for the organisation than that of a servant. It promotes its role as guardian of the unity of Spanish across the Spanish-speaking world, with the King of Spain seen to exercise the role of guarantor. The RAE's director, while acting as a figurehead for both the Spanish Academy and also the Association of Academies, suggests that the overseas travel he embarks on can be interpreted as serving the Spanish state, which brings into question the interests and ultimate goals that are met by the RAE's international activities. Does the RAE act in service of the language for the benefit of Spanish-speakers – to include all multilingual citizens of states where Spanish is

official? Or could there exist a conflict of interests through explicitly linking the activities of the RAE with the service of one particular nation-state, contradicting as this does the otherwise panhispanic direction in which the institution's recent developments have been heading?

### 6.2.2 *The King of Spain*

As I noted in the chapter introduction, this thesis is necessarily limited to a focus on the RAE and consequently to a less comprehensive analysis of some of the other language guardians of Spanish. I will, however, draw from some of the evidence from my press data which shows how the role and strength of certain other guardians is closely linked to their collaborative practices and relationship with the RAE. Furthermore in Chapter 7 I will discuss in more detail the particular role that these guardians play in the development and implementation of the *Política lingüística panhispanica*.

The first and perhaps most visible of the other language guardians is the King of Spain, who is frequently given public space to act as a 'voice' for all manner of public causes. Language is manifestly one of the topics about which he regularly speaks, and the resulting discourse is a frequent feature of the Spanish press and in particular of the two representative publications on which this study concentrates, *El País* and *ABC*. In Chapter 5, I showed how the King's speeches about the unity of Spanish and its 'community' of speakers amongst Spanish-speakers render him a kind of 'spokesperson' for the Spanish-speaking world. Such a designation is bolstered by the following extract from a speech by Víctor García de la Concha showing the eminent regard in which the RAE and ASALE hold the King:

[...] Su Majestad ha sido y es el inspirador y generoso impulsor de la política lingüística panhispanica de la Academia y de las Academias. Me atreví a añadir entonces que nuestro Rey no ejercía solo el alto patronazgo constitucional de nuestra Academia sino también el de la Asociación. Al día siguiente, en una reunión de trabajo celebrada en nuestra Casa de Felipe IV, el representante de Colombia pidió la palabra para presentar una moción que todos aprobaron con entusiasmo: la de

‘felicitar a Su Majestad en el trigésimo aniversario de su reinado por ser - son palabras textuales - artífice y referente continuo de la concordia no solo entre los españoles sino entre todos los pueblos de habla hispana’.

(ABC 15-11-2005)

The role of King Juan Carlos is portrayed not simply as head of the Spanish state and therefore guarantor of national political unity, but also as the architect and reference of unity between all Spanish-speakers.<sup>77</sup> Other than noting the presupposition of unity and community on which this ‘role’ for the King rests, it is interesting to note that agency for the Panhispanic Language Policy is assigned to the King. That the King is responsible for the birth of the panhispanic ideal – let alone this particular linguistic policy – is highly doubtful; this attribution obfuscates both the historical roots of this ideology in the attempts to maintain spiritual and political bonds of ‘hispanidad’ between Spain and the post-independence Latin American states of the 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman 2002a), and also the agency of the Academies and associated commercial enterprises in the design, promotion and execution of the policy (see Chapter 7, also Paffey and Mar-Molinero 2009).

Of course, as the head of a constitutional monarchy, the King’s public speeches are written for him by government ministries (e.g. the polemical ‘lengua de encuentro’ speech, *El País* 25-04-2001) and similar agencies such as the Academies. Consequently, in the case of the King’s support for the PLP as expressed in various speeches, these will have been written by the RAE/ASALE and reflect these organisations’ ideologies and practices. In describing the King as the driving force of the PLP, García de la Concha seems to be exploiting the political impartiality, popularity and symbolic authority of the King to legitimate the Academies’ policies. The constraints of this study do not allow me to investigate the press of other Spanish-speaking countries; however, ascertaining whether nature of their discourse is supportive and/or dissenting on the supposedly panhispanic role of the King would certainly be a fruitful and necessary study.

### 6.2.3 *The Instituto Cervantes*

The *Instituto Cervantes* (IC), in its duty to spread the Spanish language, also has the King of Spain as its honorary president as well as the incumbent head of the Spanish government as its Executive President, and therefore receives both the economic support and the symbolic prestige of the Spanish state and establishment. This is important when considering how, in my data corpus, the Cervantes and the RAE are cited recurrently as language authorities in the same articles on, for example, the launch and conclusion of the CILEs,<sup>78</sup> in special supplements on language matters,<sup>79</sup> and – as might be reasonably expected – on the launch of joint projects and publications.<sup>80</sup> In addition to its role in the spread of Spanish, the IC contributes towards the standardisation of the language. Two examples of how the IC does this are: first, its selection and promotion of the central peninsular variety of Spanish as a ‘pure’ model for its online *Aula virtual* and international courses; and second, its joint efforts with the RAE to provide standard answers to linguistic doubts in the DPD. In relation to this second point, the former Director of the IC (and now Spanish Minister of Culture) César Antonio Molina explained that:

[...] César Antonio Molina: Luego están las tareas del Instituto Cervantes, **que ha colaborado muy estrechamente en la elaboración del Diccionario**, y para el que resulta también un instrumento imprescindible. [...] Lo que ahora toca, en el caso del Cervantes, es **unificar las directrices, establecer pautas comunes en la enseñanza de la lengua, establecer esas normas que deben garantizar que su transmisión no se cargue de ruidos que la desvirtúen**. Un diccionario que resuelve las dudas es esencial en esa tarea.

(*El País* 19-11-2004c)

It is clear then, that not only does the *Cervantes* promote the standardisation of the language itself, but also the curricula and guidelines by which it is taught around the world (Chapter 7 includes a discussion of the IC’s common curriculum and accreditation system). What is equally clear is that Molina sees

the benefit of its co-operation with the RAE and ASALE that 'con este Diccionario se podrá enseñar siempre **el mismo español en cualquier rincón**' (ABC 19-11-2004). Its goals then are the same as those of the RAE in terms of the consolidation of a 'lengua común' represented by a particular 'pure' variety, free from 'ruidos que la desvirtúen'.

#### 6.2.4 *The Spanish media*

The media is largely recognised by Academicians as being a particularly powerful tool for the transmission of norms, ideas and standards (a point recognised throughout this study and which forms the basis of the data selection). The Academician Blecua spoke in an interview of 'una norma abstracta muy flexible, que es la norma culta, la lengua estándar, la que se puede entender en todos lados' (El País 19-10-2001f). When pressed as to who he believed marked/determined this norm, he stated his belief that:

Creo que es la de los escritores prestigiosos, los textos científicos y, **sobre todo, los medios**. Los modelos más imitables, sobre todo la radio y la televisión. Por eso tienen una responsabilidad enorme, mayor que la de los profesores. Una de ellas es no llenar de muletillas el habla de la gente.

(El País 19-10-2001f)

What this shows is that not only is there a clear recognition of the power of the media in contemporary society to influence language use (in both positive and potentially negative ways as indicated by Blecua), but that this influence is exercised over spoken language through audiovisual media as well as written language through the print media. As such, the Academy and its members make recommendations about the role and consequently the *responsibility* of media outlets to use correct, standardised language so as not to corrupt public speech.

Pascual, another prominent Academician, also makes reference to increased mobility, communications and media and the reliance of these on a standard language:

*III Congreso de la Lengua Española: 'Hoy la prensa marca la norma'*

[...] hay aviones, Internet y, sobre todo, canales internacionales de televisión que tratan de ser oídos por muchas personas y usan un idioma neutro común.

P. ¿No es un peligro dejar la norma en sus manos?

R. No hay más remedio. [...] Hoy se imita lo que sale en televisión.

*(El País 13-11-2004)*

There are a number of apparent presuppositions on the part of the interviewer when s/he questions the 'danger' of 'leaving the norm in their hands': that 'the' norm does indeed exist, that it belongs 'in the hands' of particular groups, and that perhaps these are not the ideal holders of the norm and in fact represent a 'danger'. Pascual seems almost 'resigned' to the fact that nothing can be done to avoid this. This perhaps explains to some extent why the RAE in particular engages in a considerable amount of criticism of and recommendations (solicited or otherwise) to other language guardians, in that if there are other non-Academy domains through which language practices are affected, the Academy seeks to include those guardians within its sphere of influence and hegemony. In this way, even if other guardians do not heed the Academy's advice, the RAE continues to exercise a hegemonic public function and to manufacture consent for its vision of a *lengua común*, presided over by multiple agencies but employing the same standardising criteria and expectations.

### **6.3 THE DISCURSIVE LEGITIMISATION OF ROLE AND AUTHORITY**

In the section that follows, I will consider the strategies that are used by the RAE as well as commentators and journalists to legitimise the Academy's particular role and authority in the press. Of particular focus will be the way in which these discursive strategies are employed in order to manufacture consent amongst readers and the wider Spanish-speaking public for the acceptance, reinforcement and expansion of the RAE's role and authority. I will draw out and pay attention to the various topoi on which the RAE's arguments are based,

as well as the ideological vocabulary and inclusive grammar used in the construction of these argumentative strategies.

### 6.3.1 *History*

As I have already shown from a number of examples, institutional discourse of the RAE tends to draw on the argument that, as an historical institution, its legitimacy lies in nearly three hundred years of its work to standardise, defend and elaborate the Spanish language.

In an article highlighting the achievements of film dubbing studios in producing a neutral Spanish ‘from nowhere’, Juan Luis Cebrián, founding editor of *El País* and one of the younger Academicians, appeals to the historical achievements of the academies:

[...] la unidad del idioma fue conseguida el siglo pasado ‘por la Real Academia Española y las Academias hispanoamericanas que se fueron creando en medio de las guerras de independencia de los pueblos del continente americano contra España. Es admirable ver cómo instituciones de la sociedad civil en medio de una confrontación bélica de esas características garantizaron la estabilidad del idioma, que constituye el principal patrimonio cultural que tenemos’.

(ABC 10-04-1997a)

The Academies’ power to secure an enduring standard common language in the face of war frames Cebrián’s claim. Also present is the sense that the Academies’ vital creative work continues whatever the political events of the time, hinting that language guardians are detached from political inconsistencies. Continuity and effectiveness over time and a seemingly apolitical agenda are desirable characteristics the Academies claim for themselves which contribute to an image of authenticity. Yet both its conservative attitude towards language change and its political acquiescence to the Franco regime during the 20<sup>th</sup> century mean that this representation of the RAE is contestable. Nevertheless, historical-based arguments appear in other parts of the data corpus, including statements which are not direct quotations of

the Academicians yet which represent the way in which journalists regard the Academy's history as one of the key indicators of its authority.<sup>81</sup>

Víctor García de la Concha, in one of his many speeches promoting the collaborative work of the RAE and ASALE, talks about the equality and fraternity between them, before singling out the RAE:

*'Trabajamos en pie de igualdad'*

Acabo de decir 'en pie de igualdad'. En el Congreso celebrado en 1998 en Puebla de los Ángeles -una vez más, de nuevo, México- se modificaron los Estatutos de la Asociación, [...] para reconocer un hecho: que todas y cada una de las Academias que la integramos somos iguales en hermandad y que **la Española cumple sólo el objetivo papel del 'primus inter pares' por razón de antigüedad (...).**

*(El País 16-10-2001e)*

This represents an admission that the RAE does indeed fulfil a different role to the other Academies. The RAE's director attributes this to the fact that it is the oldest academy, but there are manifestations of its primacy which are not so convincingly explained – or justified – by the institution's age. These include the prolonged Eurocentric dictionary which left peninsular Spanish items unmarked yet signalled words with Latin American roots and/or meanings, the fact that the Spanish academy leads the ASALE in many policy decisions, and also the (arguably related) fact that the director of the Spanish academy is also the president of the ASALE.

On the one hand, a topos of history positively frames discussions of the Academy and is a strategy arguing for its continued legitimacy and authority; on the other hand, the modernisation of the Academy's practices and its adoption of technology for managing the Spanish lexicon means it can now also claim to be at the cutting edge of language management and be changing in accordance with modern times.<sup>82</sup> With its history of standardisation and now its technologically advanced present, it is not surprising that the RAE is widely perceived as 'guardián natural de la lengua' (*ABC 16-11-2005a*).

### 6.3.2 Authority

Another legitimising strategy is to refer explicitly to the authority that the RAE and its members (particularly directors) already have. When Lázaro Carreter was Director, his fellow Academician and *ABC* editor Luís María Anson wrote of him as ‘la máxima autoridad en el idioma español, uno de nuestros más altos intelectuales y un hombre que tiene una vastísima influencia en las nuevas generaciones’ (*ABC* 02-04-1997), emphasising not only his being *the* highest authority but also linking this with his intellect and influence. I have already discussed above how Víctor García de la Concha claims to represent Spain and carry national authority when travelling on ‘state visits’, a claim which he would surely not make on the basis of his individual identity, but in relation to his leadership of the Academy and this institution’s leadership of international language matters.

Journalists tend to frame members of the RAE as experts by the referential strategy of always referring positively to their status as *académicos*,<sup>83</sup> for example:

El prestigioso lingüista y miembro de la Real Academia Española  
Francisco Rodríguez Adrados

(*ABC* 24-04-1997b)

El académico y escritor Luis Goytisolo

(*El País* 09-04-1997a)

While this might be interpreted as simply a ‘common sense’ description of their work (as we might refer to ‘the teacher, Mr. Smith’ or ‘the Minister for Transport’), what also happens is that this reference places them in a position to speak on the matters which follow. Furthermore, even where these same men (which, for the most part, they are) have other designations (the linguist, the novelist, the writer), *académico* is always collocated with it, as if indicating a sort of ‘badge of honour’.

Elsewhere, two articles point to the authority which is presumed to come from the joint work the RAE and the ASALE engage in. In one, the RAE’s

Ignacio Bosque gave a statement about the collaborative projects of the Academies, and in particular reference to the first Grammar to be released since the RAE's 1931 version, remarked that:

Somos muy conscientes de nuestra responsabilidad y sabemos que hemos de hacer todo lo posible para que la obra esté a la altura de lo que se espera de nosotros. (*El País* 13-11-2004d)

The inference here is that the new Grammar builds on the authority and 'altura' previously enjoyed by the RAE's 1931 Grammar, and that with the authority of the Academies comes responsibility to do what is expected of them – something Bosque seems confident they will do. In another article, the RAE director repeats the word 'all' three times, emphasising the consensus of all Spanish language authorities and the 'manera colegiada' in which decisions are taken in the production of the Academy's authoritative dictionary:

'Con la base del banco, la publicación, en 1997, de la nueva planta del Diccionario, por la que se rige la nueva construcción y la potenciación del trabajo de todas las academias hispanas, hemos podido preparar esta edición', contó el director. Todas las decisiones lingüísticas se han adoptado de manera colegiada. En correspondencia lógica con el trabajo realizado y con lo que representa, todas las academias de lengua española figuran en la contraportada del nuevo Diccionario.

(*El País* 12-10-2001)

Expressing the unanimity of the Academies as a foregrounded topic further adds to the representation of a totally united front making authoritative pronouncements on a united language for a united community. The nature of diversity – although acknowledged – is not commented upon in this article nor in the majority of others, which has the effect of closing down the possibility of debate around differences in language, standards and viewpoints. The asymmetrical social relations manifested in both these social practices and their

related discursive content and strategies are reflections of the Academy's language ideologies. As Fairclough (2001) argues, assumptions about the relative authority of different interlocutors and their roles/rights within discourse are well established and ritualised in institutional discourse, and it is clear from the Academy's discourse that it views and reinforces its authority as superior.

### 6.3.3 Agency

While the public understanding of the role of the RAE is established and reinforced (apart from its actual publications) through appealing to its historical function and to the authoritative position it claims in language matters, another discursive strategy found in the press deals with the issue of the Academy's relationship with and responsibilities to 'ordinary' language users.

In terms of explicit acknowledgement of who has power in matters of language standardisation, the vision of the RAE is clear – responsibility for the formation of language lies with Spanish speakers as the innovators of linguistic usages and norms. According to the Academy, Spanish-speakers themselves agree on language usages and the RAE simply notes the most common usages and considers these to be the most correct.<sup>84</sup> What is more, it is the Spanish-speaking society at large which is in favour of the linguistic unity of Spanish and desires this as a goal.<sup>85</sup> In presenting the processes in this way, the Academy is seen to be responding to the desire of a large but anonymous public, and presents the standardisation process in terms of a common commercial transaction: a client requests a service and the service-provider makes the service/product available for public consumption as per the initial request. However, the presupposition is that the current 'product' is not sufficient and that it needs work from an expert institution other than the everyday users in order to make it sufficient. This in turn seems to suggest that everyday users are less qualified to make the best use of language without guidance. This presentation of the duty of the RAE as a response to popular demand as well as a necessary intervention is seen most clearly here in a speech launching the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*:

‘Es nuestra obligación. Lo único que hemos hecho es estar atentos a lo que oímos en la calle, hacerlo nuestro y devolvérselo a los hablantes en forma de norma. La gente nos ha dado la tela y nosotros hemos confeccionado un traje.’

(*El País* 10-11-2005b) <sup>86</sup>

Underlying this metaphor of the ‘linguistic tailor’ is the Academy’s belief that it takes the raw material of the Spanish language and produces something more useful and aesthetically pleasing than just ‘the word on the street’ it claims to represent. This again raises the issue of whether it is purely the language itself or the wider socio-political context of ‘the street’ which is the target of verbal and even non-verbal hygiene. Such a language ideology could remain veiled behind the notion of the all-inclusive yet anonymous ‘public’ (Gal and Woolard 2001), but critical analysis here reveals ideology brokers and identifies the discursive construction (or obfuscation) of their perceived role.

The discussion of agency is developed further by a topos of numbers, in which the high volume and frequency of requests and queries that the Academy receives is taken to be a justification for its standardising practices, with no discussion of whether those asking for the norms have any role in the debate surrounding those same norms. Common statements include:

‘La Academia recibe **cientos de propuestas** similares cada día, propuestas de espontáneos individuales y colectivos’

(*ABC* 09-04-1997)

‘esta **avalancha de peticiones** nos ha llevado a promover el Diccionario Panhispánico de Dudas’

(*ABC* 18-10-2001a)

En la misma línea, las academias manifiestan el propósito de que el Diccionario panhispánico de dudas [...] constituya ‘el marco para

brindar a la comunidad hispanohablante una orientación unificada en los problemas lingüísticos que **de continuo** se presentan’.

(*El País* 20-10-2001a)

[...] que todas las Academias hayamos podido consensuar una respuesta a los hispanohablantes que **de continuo** nos piden normas y nos piden indicaciones.

(García de la Concha 2005a)

Common to all these examples is a *problem-solution* structure in which the doubts, queries and requests of Spanish-speakers constitute a problem to which the RAE responds with answers which standardise the usage and solve the perceived problem. What this structure allows the Academy to do is legitimise its work, firstly by the claim that it is asked by the public to do what it does in terms of standardisation and offering language advice, and secondly by the inference that without its work, the problems of linguistic doubt and unclear usage would remain.

When the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* was launched in November 2005, *El País* published an interview with Víctor García de la Concha who referred to the collaboration of the Academies as ‘un camino sin retorno’, and went on to say that:

...Es verdad que hay buenos libros de estilo en los medios de comunicación, pero los hispanohablantes quieren oír la voz de las Academias.

(*El País* 10-11-2005a)

A critical analysis of agency here suggests firstly that the RAE’s role as the authoritative ‘voice’ is being reinforced, with its output representing the final say on matters of language. Furthermore, by framing the media as a *source*, there is the suggestion of a passive role for the style guides published therein, whereas the more active nuance of being a *voice* locates the RAE above these

other publications, which are placed lower down in the hierarchy of linguistic authorities. García de la Concha's apparent claim to speak alongside and on behalf of 'Spanish-speakers' about their alleged desires are grand terms to use indeed.

#### 6.4 SUMMARY

What has emerged in the course of this chapter is a clear sense of the way in which the role of the Academy – particularly as *primus inter pares* alongside the other Academies – is discussed and ideologically transmitted in the Spanish press. Having sought to leave behind its original motto of 'limpia, fija y da esplendor', the RAE has in recent years concentrated its practices (and its public discourse) much more on unifying the language and unifying the inter-Academic practices which will ensure the standardisation of the *lengua común*. Equally, the RAE has sought to change the public perception of its formerly conservative practices by representing its work as primarily descriptive rather than prescriptive, with the task of reflecting the language that Spanish-speakers use; nevertheless the prescriptive element of the Academy's work remains and it acts alongside the ASALE as a 'gatekeeper' for the variations and changes that would supposedly break the linguistic (and potentially political, diplomatic, commercial, etc) unity if these were allowed to go unchecked. This chapter has also discussed how the IC and the Spanish-language media are promoted in their roles as co-workers with the RAE and ASALE in the task of defending and guaranteeing the continued unity and increasing strength of Spanish. The role of Spain's King is particularly remarkable in the way that the Academy and the Cervantes (and therefore the Spanish government) capitalise on his very public position and international popularity in order not only to highlight their own associations (and legitimacy) with him, but also to cement discourses and institutional ideologies of panhispanic unity, with Juan Carlos fulfilling a role which can easily be seen as 'King of Spanish-speakers'.

Through press discourse, the RAE's contemporary role is premised on its historical function in service of the state and its citizens, the position of the ultimate authority in Spanish language management that it fulfils, and

discussions of public demand for the Academy's services. It becomes apparent then that the ideology of standardisation has changed little, although as we shall see in the next chapter, the scope of a standard Spanish has certainly developed from a focus on national-based varieties to that of a global common variety framed by the emergence of a panhispanic norm. This is further reflected in the many and varied political and commercial links which depend upon the continued standardisation of Spanish. These links figure significantly in my discussion of the status of Spanish in the world, and it is to this discussion that I now turn in the next and final analytical chapter.



## THE SPANISH LANGUAGE IN THE WORLD

### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

In this final chapter of data analysis, I move on from the language debates concerning Spanish as a unified language, and also those debates establishing the role of the guardians of that unity, in order to now consider how the Spanish language is constructed as a commodity and promoted in a global linguistic ‘market’.

The first research question to be answered in my discussion here concerns the identification and explanation of the discursive strategies employed by the RAE to frame discussions of Spanish in the world. I examine the overarching themes of these debates as well as the particular grammatical and lexical items which mark the RAE’s discourse. The second research question that this chapter deals with considers the notion of Spanish as a pluricentric language with a number of prestigious (and other) norms. I ask how the RAE publicly debates these norms and that of *el español común*, before reviewing the policy response to various challenges to standardisation which has materialised in the form of the *Política lingüística panhispánica*. In the final section, I consider the competing discourses regarding ownership of the language, asking to whom Spanish ‘belongs’. This discussion involves a consideration of the various potential scales of ‘belonging’ – local, national and global – and the discursive and metaphorical references made to these in the press.

## 7.2 THE FRAMING OF DEBATES ABOUT SPANISH IN THE WORLD

### 7.2.1 *A language in expansion*

In contrast with the debates considered in Chapter 5 on the threats to – and subsequent defence of – Spanish, there is a strand of discourse in my data which – similar to the discourse on the ‘health’ of Spanish – emphasises the very real growth being experienced in terms of the number of speakers, not to mention the linguistic influence exercised by the ‘community’ of Spanish-speakers. This discourse has been naturalised by the frequent use of the phrase ‘lengua en expansión’ or similar variants<sup>87</sup>. In one such example (a closing speech from the Rosario *CILE*), César Antonio Molina of the IC classified Spanish as not only unified (‘**un idioma**’) but also growing (‘**en expansión** en el mundo’). He then argued that the next step for ‘los países iberoamericanos’ was to ‘Conseguir que el siglo XXI sea el siglo del español’<sup>88</sup>, and based this on four topoi: numbers (of speakers), advantage (homogenous, unified), diversity (seemingly in contradiction to unity, but this was discussed in 5.3), and history (language of culture since 18<sup>th</sup> century). The characteristics granted to Spanish here all follow Molina’s key suggestion, which is that the only one possible next step for Spanish-speaking countries (by which he means the Academies and governments) is to reinforce linguistic spread. In another example, RAE Academician Francisco Rodríguez Adrados expresses the boom of Spanish as a ‘buen momento’ for the language, and refers to the “**crecimiento asombroso**” de esta lengua, no sólo en cuanto a su número de hablantes, sino también por lo que se refiere a su despliegue en la literatura’ (*ABC* 24-04-1997b). In addition to the topos of numbers, the literary cultural function of Spanish features as an index of its international success.

Phillipson’s concept of ‘linguistic imperialism’ (1992) can be used to frame the discourse and practices of Spanish language spread as part of an ‘imperial’ project of linguistic, political and ideological spread across and beyond the Spanish-speaking world. Indeed, journalists have broached such suspicions with Academicians and have received responses such as the following:

¿Serán necesarios muchos más congresos? [...] ‘Sí, porque hay que tener conciencia del valor de la lengua’, nos dijo el vicedirector de la Española, Gregorio Salvador. ¿Y no corremos el riesgo de creer lo que dijo Nebrija, que la lengua y el imperio es lo mismo y que caen juntos? ‘¡Pero eso lo dijo con respecto al Imperio Romano, y fue de otro tiempo!’.

(*El País* 29-03-2007a)

The interviewer suggests that Nebrija’s statement might apply to the contemporary spread of Spanish (and, by suggestion, a new Spanish empire). Salvador, the RAE’s deputy director known for his promotion of Spanish and deprecation of minority languages (*El País* 19-11-2004a, 07-09-2004, 20-11-2004b), disagrees and explains the ‘true’ context of Nebrija’s remarks. He disassociates the Nebrijan hypothesis from contemporary Spanish expansion by consigning and limiting it to history, and to its reference to the Roman Empire. Because in contemporary liberal societies, the notion and associations of empire are widely rejected (and *El País* is, importantly, a robustly liberal, centrist publication as I noted in Chapter 3) Salvador avoids the collocation of language with empire to prevent any such connection being made. He seeks instead to ensure that language spread continues to be discursively framed by positive topoi of unity, community and advantage (as established elsewhere in the press).

Besides the growing number of speakers, the spread of Spanish is also contextualised by debates on the economic value of the language (as we saw in section 5.2.5). The expansion of Spanish is seen to take place economically through its dominance in new and important markets, as well as its consolidation in technological domains, as seen in the headline: ‘*La proyección económica del español depende de la conquista de las nuevas tecnologías*’ (*El País* 19-10-2001d).

The authority of the Academies (discussed in 6.3) and their practices such as the *CILEs* means that their conclusions are presented as convincing and definitive to the Spanish-speaking public. It follows that the content and tone

of language debates is established by the salient message coming from the *Congresos*:

*El Congreso de Cartagena de Indias concluye con el reconocimiento de la expansión del español.* El IV Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española, que ha concluido este jueves en Cartagena de Indias (Colombia), ha puesto de manifiesto que el español se ha consolidado como lengua de comunicación universal y de la unidad iberoamericana. “Estamos con una lengua extraordinariamente unida y trabada, lo que constituye una enorme fortaleza para contribuir a su expansión”, expresó el director de la Real Academia Española (RAE), Víctor García de la Concha, en el acto de clausura.

(*El País* 30-03-2007a)

The Conference conclusion ‘seals’ the event and takes forward a clear and official message from it that the consolidation of Spanish in the world is a perfected process (‘se ha consolidado’) and hence an objective reality. Not only is the language presented as the basis of ‘universal communication’ but also ‘la unidad iberoamericana’. As such, language spread and supranational unity are discursively constructed as going hand in hand, and any moves away from this and towards greater emphasis on the national would be negatively framed as anti-unitary. Language as a basis for unity becomes a common-sense concept, more so than the economic unity based on transnational companies which also form numerous links between Spain and America, and which are still seen as interest-laden.

Debates around the expansion of Spanish in the world are also framed by comparisons with other ‘global’ languages such as English, Chinese, French, etc. In particular, the push for the expansion of Spanish is partly seen as a response to the perceived threat to its status of English:

P. ¿Cómo proteger el español frente al poderío del inglés? R. Lo primero que tenemos que hacer es una expansión de la lengua española.

(*El País* 14-11-04b)

In this interview, the director of the Argentinean Academy of Letters frames the expansion of Spanish as an action, and the main priority of language authorities in response to the power of global English.<sup>89</sup>

La voluntad del congreso, o de quienes lo han organizado, es lograr una integración para articular estos dos mundos de la búsqueda de perfiles propios, de peculiaridades, de rasgos regionales y, por otro lado, esta necesaria expansión de la lengua, con elementos generales, elementos internacionales para que pueda competir en un mercado, inclusive el lingüístico, con otras lenguas como el inglés.

(*El País* 14-11-2004b)

Present in this last extract is the presupposition that Spanish language spread is 'necessary', and the juxtaposition of value for regional linguistic diversity with the importance of overarching, unifying features of Spanish which enable it to 'competir en un mercado [...] con otras lenguas como el inglés'. Employing the modern capitalist economic discourse of the market with its invisible forces obscures final agency for the success (or otherwise) of a language on an international level. Language guardians' regulation of Spanish is justified on the basis that the panhispanic aspects of language must be emphasised to ensure international acceptance of Spanish. This in turn legitimises the policies and practices of guardians in pursuit of this goal, most notably the *Política lingüística panhispánica*.

The need for a broad coalition of language guardians to regulate and further spread Spanish as a consequence of (and contributing factor to) its status in the world is further underlined by the King of Spain. In his speech at a 2005 ceremony in which the Vocento media group (owners of ABC) awarded its annual *Premio a los Valores Humanos* to the RAE, Juan Carlos advocated that:

El cultivo y la expansión de nuestra lengua en el mundo —objetivo al que también concurren como protagonistas los medios de comunicación— deben seguir centrando nuestros esfuerzos comunes e ilusiones colectivas.

(ABC 16-11-2005b)

The King employs a mode of obligation ('deben') to indicate the responsibility upon language guardians to combine efforts and hopes towards the growth and spread of Spanish. The inclusive possessive pronoun in 'nuestros esfuerzos comunes' positions the King – and arguably by inference those institutions he represents and patronises – alongside those language authorities already engaged in spreading Spanish. Again, this works to naturalise discourse towards a broader inclusion of commercial and other enterprises in language standardisation and the implementation of planning and policy.

The IC's director talks similarly of the obligations of his own institution in collaboration with the Academies when he remarks that 'Creo que el español es la lengua del siglo XXI, y todos debemos esforzarnos para asegurar su definitiva consolidación y proyección' (*El País* 17-11-04). While the authority and responsibility for this lies primarily with the institutions in question (and their partner organisations), there is arguably an obligation for all Spanish speakers (intimated by the inclusive imperative 'debemos esforzarnos') to be active in pursuing this goal. The naturalised discourse in which projecting Spanish internationally is taken as a 'given' aim means that little justification of it is needed. On the other hand, language guardians' discourse – as I have shown – is couched in legitimising strategies including arguments of the financial benefit, advantage, and utility of standardised international Spanish.

Thus far I have noted that language guardians' discourse on Spanish in the world rests on an emphasis of the spread that it is 'naturally' experiencing, as well as the role of guardians in actively expanding its presence and influence. The arguments present a consequent need for continued and further standardisation so that the essential unity of Spanish is not 'broken' by linguistic change (Real Academia Española 1995:7). Equally, there is evidence

of discourse emphasising the need for ‘maximal variation in function’ – Haugen’s *elaboration* (1972) – and also *acceptance* of Spanish into hitherto unconquered domains. These spheres are named frequently as scientific publishing, information technology, the internet and international diplomatic forums including the UN and EU<sup>90</sup>. Academicians such as Mario Vargas Llosa have argued publicly that their labours must be translated into concrete policies in order to achieve greater acceptance and importance of Spanish not only in cultural terms but also politically and economically (*El País* 16-10-2001a)<sup>91</sup>. These ‘deficit’ domains are also seen as those in which Spanish ought to be better represented on the basis of the number of Spanish-speakers:

El Rey afirmó que Cien años de soledad ‘es en sí mismo un ejemplo vivo de la unidad del español en su diversidad’; una **lengua en expansión** pero que para consolidarse requiere una mayor presencia en la ciencia y en organismos internacionales, ‘donde no se la reconoce como merece por el contingente de sus hablantes’, según Víctor García de la Concha, presidente de la Real Academia Española y del comité científico del congreso.

(*El País* 27-03-2007a)

García de la Concha’s argument sets the tone for the ongoing legitimisation of language planning efforts which seek to expand the presence and influence of Spanish even further. Given that English currently dominates the ‘deficit’ domains of Spanish, one of the goals of the panhispanic language policy is the consolidation of a globally standardised and unified Spanish language as a ‘match’ for hegemonic English and the Anglo-Saxon cultures – linguistically, scientifically, technologically and diplomatically.

### 7.2.2 *A language of the future*

In the previous section, I cited the IC director’s belief that ‘el español es la lengua del siglo XXI, y todos debemos esforzarnos para asegurar su definitiva consolidación y proyección’ (*El País* 17-11-2004). This belief in the contemporary significance of Spanish is shared by other press protagonists:

‘En el siglo XXI -indicó- habrá tres lenguas, tres idiomas que la persona culta necesitará conocer: el inglés, el español y la informática’.

(Cebrián, *ABC* 10-04-1997a)

El siguiente paso de los países iberoamericanos sólo puede ser uno:

‘Conseguir que el siglo XXI sea el siglo del español’.

(Molina, *El País* 22-11-2004)

*La lengua española, la industria del siglo XXI: [...]* ‘es la mejor industria del siglo XXI, nuestra principal materia prima’.

(Molina, *El País* 02-03-2007)

El siglo XXI habla español y lo hará cada vez más.

(*ABC* 16-11-2004a)

The common thread of these extracts is the idea that the 21<sup>st</sup> century represents a new ‘golden age’ for Spanish as a global language, to such an extent that it can be called **the** language of the century and **the** century of Spanish. In the last example, the journalist makes the 21<sup>st</sup> century the *agent* (metonymically representing people who follow contemporary trends) that performs the *process* of speaking Spanish – the language of progress, modernity and international expansion. Such linguistic practices will, in this view, continue to grow and be increasingly successful throughout this century.

Underlying the various effects of these texts appears to be an ideology that views Spanish as of unprecedented and escalating importance in the modern world, and which espouses an increasingly prominent profile for the language (and by inference, its speakers) and its related culture in the future. The strengthening and spread of both language and culture are understood to require a multiagency approach in which traditional institutions work towards these goals alongside governments and commercial entities, hence the economic expansion and unity of Spanish multinationals is justified. Furthermore, if the 21<sup>st</sup> century is indeed to see further growth of Spanish, then it becomes

desirable and necessarily for 'us all' to support linguistic and non-linguistic globalisation in the coming years.

A prominent element of discourse regarding the internationalisation of Spanish is the role of Spanish-speakers in the Americas in shaping and directing the language:

'El castellano del siglo XXI será lo que los latinoamericanos quieran que sea', afirmó Cebrián. También dijo que España podía aportar mucho, pero que era el empuje y el crecimiento de los hablantes latinoamericanos los que marcarían las trazas de la lengua en el futuro. Destacó el trabajo de las academias a la hora de consensuar la norma, indicó que la eficacia del Instituto Cervantes pasa por su internacionalización, reclamó un intenso diálogo con Brasil y explicó que había que estar muy atentos con la situación del *spanGLISH*.

(*El País* 20-11-2004g)

On the one hand Cebrián sees the future development of Spanish as very definitely ('será') dependent on its Latin American speakers. On the other hand, the standard and consensual norms which constitute global Spanish still appear to rest with the Academies as its historical guardians, and with Spain's RAE in particular as the 'leader and hub of the direction and initiatives of Spanish language policy' (Mar-Molinero 2008:31).

The director general of Telefónica, speaking at the Rosario *CILE*, argued that '[E]l futuro del español dependerá del peso social y, sobre todo, cultural de la población hispanohablante. Es imprescindible su propia fuerza expansiva' (*El País* 20-11-2004g). Embedded in interconnected social, economic and linguistic policies which involve Spain's multinational companies, government and the RAE, this vision of Latin America's importance and need for more socio-cultural 'weight' forms part of a legitimisation and justification for what Del Valle and Villa (2006) call the 'economic recolonisation' of the continent by Spanish corporations. In the context of language guardianship, transnational businesses frequently sponsor the *CILEs* and other language events and

publications. Consequently, commercial involvement in the process of language spread is becoming a natural occurrence and even 'common sense'. The argument is partly justified by signalling the significant contribution these companies make to increased literacy through their investment in areas where this is seen to be lacking, and also partly justified by the argument (illustrated above) that they also increase the cultural and social weight of Hispanic countries so as to achieve 'the century of Spanish'. Having seen how the ideology to increase the 'weight' of Spanish through discourses of unity and panhispanism is a response to the threat of hegemonic English, the desired boost to the political-economic-cultural power of the Spanish-speaking 'community' represents a goal for governments and organisations wishing to offset Anglo-Saxon hegemony in these non-linguistic domains. In terms of numbers of speakers, this alliance of linguistic and non-linguistic goals could not be achieved by Spain alone (with only 10% of the world's Spanish-speakers). However, where linguistic conditions favour the spread of economic power from Spain throughout Latin America, the resulting links form a supposed 'community' (Del Valle (2006) calls this *hispanofonía*) which has far more 'weight' to compete with markets, domains and territories hitherto dominated by English.

A final feature to consider here is the way that the future of Spanish is commonly linked to its past<sup>92</sup>, and particularly to significant locations. A topos of history is used to argue that Spanish— now international and growing — should still be associated with its historical fatherland, Spain. One such debate concerned the Academies' support for a proposed Spanish language museum (a project never completed) in Alcalá de Henares, birthplace of Miguel de Cervantes. López Morales proposed that this museum would make Alcalá the 'Capital Museística del Castellano' (ABC 21-10-2001b), a predicational strategy attributing a (hypothetical) unique trait to the city. Further positive features are attributed by García de la Concha:

[...] Alcalá es una ciudad a la que le sobran títulos históricos y literarios para tener relieve en las actividades relacionadas con la lengua, pero por ello le urge emprender una acción así en beneficio del español.

(ABC 21-10-2001b)

Continuing to build on this attribution of prestige to Alcalá, its mayor is then quoted:

El alcalde, Manuel Peinado, justificó el proyecto en que «Alcalá está en el pasado de la lengua castellana y debe estar también en su futuro».

(ABC 21-10-2001b)

Cervantes' origins in Alcalá, the Cervantes prize for Spanish literature, and the renown and reach of these throughout the Spanish-speaking world are firmly underlined and linked to the person (Cervantes) and place (Alcalá) in question. In addition, the 'principal' attribute of the museum is presented as 'la influencia ejercida por la ciudad "sobre la forma y el uso del español"' (ABC 21-10-2001b). The influence of language guardians over Spanish is obfuscated by portraying the development of Spanish as an agentless process of history. As I show in section 7.4.1, associating language processes with cities is a common discursive strategy. Alcalá (i.e. particular Alcalá-based individuals) had an important role in the past development of Spanish, and Spain's language guardians seek to legitimise a continuing high profile in the success and management of Spanish, not to mention the associated industries of culture and language learning which take place in this significant city of Spain.

## 7.3 PLURICENTRIC SPANISH AND THE RAE

### 7.3.1 Norms of pluricentric Spanish

In Chapter 4 (4.2.3), I sketched how the expansion of Spanish to the Americas later developed a number of national and regional linguistic norms. This led to the later categorisation of Spanish as a 'pluricentric' language, meaning that a

number of prestigious norms now exist alongside the traditional Peninsular standard (see Thompson 1992). In their recent panhispanic works (the DPD and *Nueva Gramática*) the RAE and ASALE have classified varieties according to seven distinct centres of Spanish norms outside of Spain: USA, Mexico and Central America, the Caribbean islands, continental Caribbean, the Andean zone, River Plate and Chile (*El País* 19-11-2004c).

In public statements, members of the RAE and ASALE indicate the value placed on the recognised varieties of Spanish. At the launch of the DPD, García de la Concha stated that:

[...] hemos presentado el Diccionario panhispánico de dudas, una obra consensuada paso a paso, en pie de igualdad, **desde la conciencia de que la norma del español es policéntrica** y que es deber de las Academias abrir los oídos a la pluralidad de las voces y la inteligencia y el corazón al propósito de robustecimiento de la unidad del idioma.

(García de la Concha, *ABC* 15-11-2005)

The RAE's deputy director, too, acknowledges that pluricentric norms exist and have value:

[...] las normas de uso del español varían de unos lugares a otros. Depende de donde hable unas cosas se dicen de una manera u otra, y las dudas seguirán existiendo. Este diccionario ayudará a despejarlas.

(Salvador, *El País* 10-11-2005c)

As can be seen, however, there is still evidence of the presupposition that, whatever multiple norms exist, there is a need to work with the global unity of the language in mind, and that this trumps the value of any one particular norm that is 'peripheral' to common, unified Spanish. It appears that the Academy's acknowledgement of the value of linguistic diversity has limits: that a pluricentric norm exists does not mean that speakers of that norm have

autonomy to stretch that norm beyond what the RAE would consider to be the 'essential unity' it exists to guard.

The RAE is still careful, however, to distinguish between the concept of an international standard Spanish which all speakers (of that 'standard', presumably) are able to understand and use, and the idea that such a standard originates in Spain (I shall concentrate on this point in more detail in 7.4.2). An interviewer in *El País* put it to Blecua that Spaniards had become less Spain-centric regarding language, to which Blecua replied:

Huyamos de eso, por favor. Aquí se ha reconocido la legitimidad de todas las variantes que existen: el porteño vale igual que el madrileño. Y se ha aceptado que hay una norma abstracta muy flexible, que es la norma culta, la lengua estándar, la que se puede entender en todos lados.

(*El País* 19-10-2001f)

Of the *Nueva Gramática*, the Peruvian Academy's Vice-President remarked that 'se desvincula del tradicional "centralismo peninsular"' (ABC 29-11-2005). Academicians recognise then that in the past, standardisation has prescriptively upheld Peninsular Spanish as the most prestigious norm. This is no longer the case, and it seems that having progressed from a monocentric ideology of prestigious standard Spanish, the RAE now accepts pluricentrism as the rule.

### 7.3.2 *El español común*

What is interesting, though, is the way that in recent discussions of the *Política lingüística panhispánica* (PLP), along with debates about the defence of the unity of Spanish, the Academies appear to discursively construct and elevate *el español común* which is shaped by the *norma panhispánica*. It is arguably being placed above all acknowledged norms of pluricentric Spanish – even Peninsular Spanish as I shall explain – as a variety which, while encompassing many aspects of these differing norms, is identifiable as a variety in itself because it surpasses the regional ties indexed in the pluricentric norms.

The second of the Academies' truly panhispanic publications is the *Nueva Gramática*, launched at the fourth CILE in Cartagena in 2007. In an interview

prior to its launch, the RAE's Ignacio Bosque – spokesperson for the project – demonstrated how *el español común* is envisaged:

*Neutro*. [...] Y la eterna controversia, claro, del español neutro.

**‘Escribimos el español común y luego las variantes**, que pueden corresponder al caribe insular, al español de Río de la Plata o al español de Asturias o de Murcia’, asegura el ponente. ‘Esta gramática es un retrato del idioma: muestra lo que compartimos y lo que nos diferencia’.

(*El País* 25-03-07b)

The referential strategy of naming *el español común* first and *then* (‘y luego’) referring to the varieties of pluricentric Spanish suggests that the former is classified as the core variety of Spanish and the latter are classified as varieties precisely because they are not considered to be part of the common standard. The journalist’s choice to use the subtitle ‘Neutro’ reinforces what is already implicit in Bosque’s comments: that the *español común* he refers to is neutral and is not linked to any particular territory or region, unlike the variations which he associates with named Spanish-speaking regions<sup>93</sup>. The norm is not presented as that of Madrid, nor as that which is shaped by the RAE in particular; it is a disembedded, *neutral* norm, not particular to any nation-state nor to any of the individual Academies. Once again, then, Woolard’s concept of ‘anonymity’ (2007) explains the language ideology apparent in the Academy’s discourse. *El español común* is framed as an identifiable core variety which is common to all Spanish-speakers and which therefore serves to unite this community, yet is distinct from the regional norms which might also influence educated speakers. The construction of this category of Spanish as a vehicle of wider and better global communication, and its association with unimpeachable foundational values of globalisation such as unity, harmony, wider communication, and international understanding, assure its standing as a prestigious standard of language. Furthermore, the Academies’ role as guardians of *español común* – led by the RAE – is underpinned and seen as essential for the safeguarding of the global norm.

Similar in some ways to the idea of *español común* is *español total* or ‘total Spanish’; both allude to a type of Spanish with no territorial roots, or a ‘Spanish from nowhere’ (Woolard 2007). Where they differ is that ‘total Spanish’ reflects the RAE’s confident desire to map the entirety of the Spanish language (Del Valle 2007a), that is *español común* **plus** all standardised regional norms.

Representative voices of the Academies emphasise the pursuit of ‘total Spanish’ through repetition and naturalisation of this phrase:

‘Una **visión completa** del español.’

(*El País* 10-11-2005a)

‘tiene como gran novedad el afrontar la gramática no sólo del español peninsular, de España, sino del **español total**.’

(*ABC* 29-11-2005)

*El IV Congreso de la Lengua analizará la diversidad del español* ‘Es una novedad. Por primera vez tendremos una gramática del **español total**, no sólo del español peninsular.’

(*El País* 29-03-2006)

‘una gramática del español total, no sólo de España’.

(*ABC* 19-09-2006)

‘será la primera gramática del **español total**.’

(*El País* 01-03-2007)

‘[La Nueva Gramática] Es descriptiva y normativa. Aborda el **español total** y está elaborada en un plano de igualdad en todo el mundo” indicó García de la Concha.’

(*ABC* 02-03-2007b)

In RAE discourse, this ‘total Spanish’ is seen to be supported by panhispanic norms and publications which are legitimised through a claim of egalitarian values in their production (i.e. ‘not only from Spain’; ‘developed on the basis of equality throughout the world’). Moreover, the all-encompassing vision of a globally unified Spanish, the panhispanic projects which promote and advance it and the standardising publications which define its form appear as accessible and applicable to all speakers:

*DPD ‘para ofrecer una respuesta unitaria a cualquier castellanohablante’.*  
(*El País* 22-11-2001)

‘una respuesta unitaria consensuada por todas las Academias de la Lengua Española’.

(Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española 2004:9)

*Las Academias de la Lengua española despejan hoy las dudas de todos los hablantes del mundo.*

(*ABC* 13-10-2004)

*La lengua española, industria del siglo XXI ‘...desde hace diez años, hemos estado trabajando en una gramática normativa y descriptiva común, por primera vez, a todos los países.’*

(*El País* 02-03-2007)

Indeed, the *Nueva Gramática* is described frequently using the metaphor of a ‘map of the whole language’, emphasising that there is a definite shape and territory of Spanish, which can – and indeed should – be mapped and navigated using the Academies’ normative, panhispanic publications.

### **7.3.3 Panhispanic Language Policy (PLP)**

The framework within which the RAE has begun to supersede pluricentric norms with the pursuit of ‘total Spanish’<sup>94</sup> is the PLP. Launched in 2004 in close co-operation with the ASALE, this policy is a factor in realising a sense of

panhispanic community by promoting a shared common linguistic code across the Spanish-speaking world. The PLP finds expression in standardising publications, media discourse, collaborative projects and conferences such as the series of *CILEs*. The publications – dictionaries, grammars and orthography guides – serve the entire Spanish-speaking world with a definition of the Spanish language, i.e. what it looks like and what shape it takes. Consequently these publications represent one stage in ‘the struggle to control language by defining its nature’ (Cameron 1995).

En una tarea de intercambio permanente, las veintidós Academias de la Lengua Española articulan un consenso que fija la norma común para todos los hispanohablantes en cuestiones de léxico, de gramática o de ortografía, armonizando la unidad del idioma con la fecunda diversidad en que se realiza.

(La política lingüística panhispanica, [www.rae.es](http://www.rae.es))

The PLP appears to respond (and contribute) to a ‘rescaling’ of relations between the RAE and Spanish-speakers in which the global scale may be ‘an ultimate horizon for action’ (Fairclough 2006:34) for nation-states and multinational organisations. This rescaling is taking place for the RAE, and its domain of activity – according to its statutes and publications – is no longer limited to nation-states, nor its activities to those of ‘cleansing, fixing and giving splendour’ to a nation-state based variety of Spanish. Instead, and perhaps above all, the focus of the PLP goes beyond this (with the collaboration of the Spanish American academies)<sup>95</sup> in pursuit of global linguistic unity through a standardised ‘norma común para todos los hispanohablantes’.

Besides the Academies, Spain’s IC also serves the PLP through contributing a commodified Spanish (see Mar-Molinero 2006a, b) to the global linguistic market via its online and class-based courses. The IC’s teaching materials favour central peninsular Spanish because of its supposed purity and freedom from the effects of language contact and borrowings (Mar-Molinero 2006a:85), yet presents a disembodied, neutral, ‘panhispanic’ variety of Spanish

in line with the PLP. In addition, the IC's *Plan curricular* and the *Sistema Internacional de Certificación* homogenise the content of courses taught beyond its many centres, and thus are tools in the PLP enabling considerable control over *what Spanish is* and *how it is taught*. The correspondence between the goals of the PLP and the activities of the IC are made explicit in this recent excerpt from the *Revista del Instituto Cervantes*:

La importancia que se ha dado en el Congreso de Colombia a la idea de preservar la unidad en la diversidad del español es coherente con la línea de acción del Instituto Cervantes en su política de colaboración, en distintos órdenes, con las instituciones y las autoridades educativas de los países hispanoamericanos. ... Esta línea de colaboración panhispánica en el ámbito del español permite situar iniciativas de particular interés para los profesionales del ámbito del español como lengua extranjera de los diferentes países del ámbito hispánico.

(Instituto Cervantes 2007:41)

In the same way that the Spanish Academy seeks to collaborate with and simultaneously lead the cohort of Hispanic Academies, the IC seeks to reinforce the panhispanic unity of Spanish through collaborating with and guiding language teaching institutions in the Americas and offering its curricula and accreditations in support of such objectives.

Summarising this discussion of pluricentric Spanish, the reaction of the RAE – initially at least – appears to have been to accept and acknowledge the value of these norms and their differing centres of prestige. Nonetheless, the rise of discourse highlighting the commonality of a panhispanic code of Spanish – *el español común* – as well as the resulting language policy driven by the Academies and supported by Spain's government, businesses and IC, have shifted emphasis away from particular regional norms (subsumed within general classifications of *diversidad*) onto more general panhispanic linguistic unity and the all-encompassing 'total Spanish'. As Spanish-speaking areas increase around the world through high birth-rates, migration and language

learning, the RAE's leadership in the PLP ensures that Spain benefits (in terms of prestige as well as economically) from the expansion of Spanish as a first, second and foreign language.

## 7.4 TO WHOM DOES SPANISH 'BELONG'?

In the tradition of linguistic nationalism, language has consistently been linked to a particular territory, even if - as in the case of Spanish (and English, French, Portuguese and so on) - it has spread through colonisation and imperialism (Mar-Molinero 2006a, b, Phillipson 1992). Throughout the Americas, Caribbean, Philippines, and arguably much of the Iberian Peninsula, Spanish is present in those territories by means of conquest and migration. With the sense of a colonial 'centre' or homeland came also the idea of a 'linguistic homeland' and 'capital', from which the language had evolved, to whom it belonged and where its 'purest' form was spoken. The way that this concept of a linguistic capital has been used in metalinguistic discourse has, as might be expected, changed consistent with the social and political circumstances of the empire's centre and periphery. In the following discussion, I seek to understand the concept of 'ownership' of Spanish, and how the RAE sees this and debates it in the press.

### 7.4.1 *Spain as a diminished linguistic power?*

The discourse of the RAE and its Academicians shows their awareness that Spain ranks low in terms of its population share of the Spanish-speaking world (approximately 10% of all native speakers)<sup>96</sup>. This recognition leads to the view that:

El gran acierto de los últimos años de los directores de la Academia ha sido, en su opinión, darse cuenta de que **«ya no es un solo pueblo el que crea el idioma, sino que son 22 pueblos iberoamericanos los que están, de una manera permanente, creándolo»**.

(ABC 02-04-1997)

The RAE's Luís María Anson, former editor of *ABC* and still a regular writer, recognises that whereas previously one group generated and regulated Spanish, that is no longer the case ('ya no es...') and now 22 distinct 'groups' of Spanish-speaking people use and create the language.

An *El País* editorial from the same period also uses the adverb 'ya' to signify a break from the previous situation:

El español es un bien común que **ya no pertenece siquiera a España.**

(*El País* 07-04-1997b)

The inferred conclusion is that the ability and authority to create, define and benefit from the Spanish language is no longer limited to Spain. However, García de la Concha believes this is not a status quo that the 'former' linguistic power of Spain can easily accept:

Se fue de casa hace tiempo y aun así a los españoles nos cuesta hacernos a la idea de que una hija tan querida como la lengua española **ya no volverá a depender del hogar paterno.** Es más, su vida depende de otros allende el mar. Así lo volvió a recordar ayer en Valladolid el director de la Real Academia Española, Víctor García de la Concha.

(*ABC* 16-10-2001a)

Employing a metaphor of family appeals to the emotional understanding of readers who have experienced or can imagine such a 'difficult' departure. The Spanish people, García de la Concha believes, cannot get used to the idea that they are no longer the 'hogar paterno' of the language. Then again, his use of metaphor paints the picture that the 'personified' Spanish language made the decision to 'leave', which somewhat obscures the facts surrounding the initial spread of Spanish, that of the American colonisation.

José Manuel Blecua (RAE Secretary), made the following statement prior to the 4<sup>th</sup> *CILE* and the launch of the panhispanic *Nueva Gramática*:

En este caso la palabra en castellano o español, a gusto del consumidor, no tiene dueño. 'Pensar que los españoles somos dueños de la lengua es una visión provinciana, injusta y no es verdad', así lo asegura José Manuel Blecua, Secretario de la Real Academia Española (RAE), en una entrevista mantenida con los lectores de ELPais.com.

(*El País* 23-03-2007)

The view that Spain 'owns' the language is represented by Blecua as 'provincial, unjust and untrue'. Consequently Blecua delegitimises those who hold this view by positioning it in opposition to the presumably 'global', 'fair', and 'true' vision being constructed through moves towards panhispanic vision and policy.

Other examples from the press further serve to naturalise and embed in public discourse this sense of a definite change in Spain's relationship with the Spanish language:

**'desde el siglo XVI, el español dejó de ser el idioma sólo de España para convertirse en el idioma de casi todo un continente, y de España'.**

(*ABC* 10-04-1997b)

América fue definitiva para que **el español rompiera su moldura inicial.**

(*El País* 17-10-2001a)

*España deja de ser el principal referente en el uso del lenguaje [...]* 'Es una gramática [...] en la que **por vez primera España no es eje vertebrador'.**

(*El País* 24-03-2007c)

El gran péndulo del español abarca con su movimiento campos **cada vez más anchos que la Península en que nació.**

(*El País* 10-11-2005b)

El nuevo diccionario, además, elimina **el absurdo sentimiento de propiedad que los españoles teníamos sobre la lengua.**

(ABC 12-11-2005)

**Ya se acabó el tiempo en que los españoles de la península dictaban lo que era correcto.**

(El País 12-11-2005)

Un solo español, sí, pero abierto, flexible, integrador, que **entiende la lengua no como un privilegio de España**, sino que abraza la múltiple realidad iberoamericana, como ha sido siempre el objetivo del director de la Real Academia Española, Víctor García de la Concha.

(El País 15-11-2005)

In one particular example, Blecua was asked to identify who produces the linguistic norm to which he had just referred. He stated that 'Ahora hay que investigar eso, hay que saber quién hace la norma culta' (El País 19-10-2001f)<sup>97</sup>. He then suggested that 'los escritores prestigiosos, los textos científicos y, sobre todo, los medios' are all influential in creating and propagating the standard. These are supposedly disembedded professional groups with no particular links to specific Spanish-speaking countries. However, these professions are far more common in wealthier, more developed Spanish-speaking countries where scientific research funding and powerful international media organisations are commonly based.

So while the predominance of Spain as a model or leader of the standard language is frequently played down, and previous views of its primacy consigned to history, the alternative 'role-models' suggested by Blecua demonstrate how Spain continues to hold considerable functional (even if not numerical) influence because of the predominance of these standardising bodies within its territory and in countries of a similar social and economic strength.

#### 7.4.2 *The shifting 'capitals' of Spanish*

The concept of a symbolic 'capital' of the Spanish language – while firmly rejected as being Madrid – has not entirely disappeared from language debates. On the contrary, there is a clear context in which a number of cities are given this important status and this is when a city hosts the *Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española*. The following headlines show how the designation of 'capital' is repeated diachronically:

*La ciudad mexicana de Zacatecas será la 'capital' del español durante cinco días*  
(*El País* 07-04-1997c)

*Valladolid se convierte en la capital del español*  
(*ABC* 16-10-2001b)

*Rosario se erige hoy en capital del español*  
(*ABC* 17-11-2004b)

*Cartagena de Indias, capital del español*  
(*ABC* 26-03-2007b)

An indicator of how this phrase has become naturalised is how in the first example, 'capital' appears in inverted commas, signalling the metaphorical nature of the concept. In subsequent examples, there are no inverted commas, implying that the concept is not unusual, and has moved into the common-ground of belief. Interestingly, in *El País* the writer uses inverted commas whereas the *ABC* writer does not, which might also suggest a difference in attitude to the concept of a 'worldwide capital of the language' between the liberal *El País* and the conservative *ABC*, and the commitment of each to such a term.

By employing the metaphor of 'capital' to the host city of the CILE, a metaphorical importance is constructed for that particular city for the short duration (3-4 days) of the triennial conference. This suggests that in the

symbolic geographical 'seat of power' sit the central authorities over the Spanish language, consisting of the Academies, the IC, and the governmental leaders of the nation-states involved, not to mention the other 'language mavens' (Pinker 1995:372) of the Spanish-speaking world invited to participate. It appears that whenever and wherever they are gathered in one place, there is sufficient concentration of prestige, power and decision-making to merit the title of 'capital', a reference to the nation-state framework in which a historically significant centre (arguably always a city) holds the majority of executive, legislative, judicial and commercial power. The presupposition here is that a similar framework can work for a linguistic community and its authorities<sup>98</sup>. On one hand, the idea of a 'capital' being wherever the language authorities are gathered suggests that language belongs not to a particular territory but to its guardians and speakers; this in turn reflects the ideology of 'Spanish from nowhere' and strengthens belief in one common narrative of 'the' Spanish language with common characteristics, challenges and opportunities<sup>99</sup>. On the other hand, the discourse surrounding each *CILE* site focuses on celebrating the linguistic development and merits of the Spanish language which 'belong' in that place, which reflects more of a pluricentric ideology in which linguistic and sociolinguistic developments are happening constantly and concurrently across the Spanish-speaking world.

### 7.4.3 *Spanish in the Americas*

In the previous sections, I have highlighted the tensions arising from discursive strategies which ostensibly move a monocentric 'capital' of Spanish away from Madrid/Spain and towards either a roving 'capital' representing a pluricentric set of norms, or a disembedded symbolic 'capital' which rests solely on assemblies of powerful linguistic (and other) authorities. Common to both of these strategies are references to the status of Spanish in the Americas as where the language is seen to be flourishing.

In one *ABC* editorial, the Spanish language is referred to as 'una lengua americana', a referential strategy allowing the reader to believe that Spanish now belongs to the American continent/people. This also reinforces the idea – established in the texts below and in other examples<sup>100</sup> – that where the

numerical bias of language-speakers lies, to some extent there too can be found the 'ownership' of the language:

Un espacio cultural común que se traducirá en un territorio mediático, económico, científico, educativo y tecnológico. He ahí uno de los aciertos de los organizadores. Para ello, este Congreso ha dejado claro que deben crearse programas de cooperación entre las naciones iberoamericanas - con la inclusión de Estados Unidos y Brasil- para desarrollar esa inmensa riqueza, no sólo cultural, que **el idioma español -que es ya una lengua americana-** significa.

(ABC 20-10-2001a)

P. Primer trabajo de consenso América-España. Un hito.

R. Piense usted que de cada 10 personas que hablan español, **9 viven en América**. Y el esplendor de la literatura hecha por latinoamericanos en el siglo XX ayudó a que desde aquí se vislumbrara de veras la realidad de la lengua.

(Salvador, *El País* 10-11-2005c)

The development and spread of Spanish in America is a topic publicly highlighted by Academicians for its importance to the future of the language:

[...] si el español tiene hoy tanta importancia, **es en gran medida gracias a América**, donde están la mayoría de los hispanohablantes.

(Rojo, ABC 06-10-2001)

'El castellano del siglo XXI será lo que los latinoamericanos quieran que sea", afirmó Cebrián. También dijo que España podía aportar mucho, pero que era **el empuje y el crecimiento de los hablantes latinoamericanos** los que marcarían las trazas de la lengua en el futuro.

(Cebrián, *El País* 20-11-2004g)

So the concentration of Spanish-speakers in the Americas is fully recognised by the RAE and the Spanish press. As I noted earlier, however, the majority of Spanish-speaking America represents economic opportunities for Spanish language authorities – as well as the commercial entities with which it collaborates – due to Spain’s superior economic power (CIA 2004). The exception is the USA, and the growth of the Spanish-speaking community there could, in time, represent a threat to Spain’s hegemony over the language tourism industry. It is therefore feasible that part of the RAE’s thinking in its leadership of the PLP is to ‘keep the enemy within’, i.e. incorporate the US Spanish language authorities into the Spain-led policy and ensure that the IC (with five centres in the USA and plans for more) establishes leadership of Spanish as a foreign language education.<sup>101</sup>

#### 7.4.4 ‘*La lengua de todos*’

As the Spanish government and business elites – in co-operation with the Academies and IC – have come to recognise the enormous potential of Spanish as a lucrative and important commercial commodity, its convergence into a presentable ‘item’ for sale through definitive publications and language courses has taken place. This commodity – and commodification more generally – suggests that the producers and marketers of global Spanish exercise some degree of ownership, akin to a copyright or patent. In spite of this, competing discourses coming even from within the Academies seek to obscure this concept of ownership and deflect suggestions that language ownership is either a motivation or goal of their activities. We have already discussed (in 5.3) how the unified Spanish language (*español común*) is constructed as a ‘space’ in which speakers encounter one another and participate in a ‘patrimonio de todos’<sup>102</sup>. Participation and ownership in this, then, is extended by RAE discourse to include as wide an ‘ownership’ as possible, emphasising that language belongs to speakers, not to academies, or organisations:

Toda lengua es violada y penetrada. Los que la hacen no son las instituciones, **sino los hablantes.**

(Cebrián, *El País* 20-11-2004g)

**el español «es la lengua de todos, españoles y americanos, ni nuestra más que vuestra ni al revés».**

(ABC 08-04-1997a)

El rey Juan Carlos, que cerró el acto, resalto la importancia del español como 'patrimonio común de más de cuatrocientos millones de personas', y como "herramienta insustituible para potenciar la comunidad hispanohablante en el concierto de las naciones". [...] En este futuro, el español 'tiene ante si una historia larga con paginas prestigiosas aun por escribir. Es un idioma que **se enriquece con las aportaciones, voces y giros que le aportan los hombres y mujeres que pueblan este inmenso universo lingüístico**'.

(El País 17-10-2001f )

We can deduce from this that the RAE and ASALE see the Spanish language as belonging to its speakers, and thus represents the common ownership of language as the 'patrimonio de todos'. Language is considered to be general, disembedded from any territory, and global in scope, unity and variety (see 6.2.1). As a result, in its attempts to assign agency ('blame'?) for the innovation and direction of language to lay speakers, the RAE obfuscates its own influence and power over decisions on the acceptability of norms. What should be clear from the analysis thus far is that the ideology in which language authorities become anonymous, and in which when they *do* act it is merely to record the norms of the speakers themselves,<sup>103</sup> does not alter the fact that public discourse on norms is shaped primarily by those institutions claiming language authority. When the Academy standardises (or rejects) a linguistic usage in its publications or press discourse, it does more than simply note or record the language of the ordinary person on the street: it actually engages in a contestation over the ultimate authority for language norms and consequently to whom language belongs. García de la Concha demonstrates something of the RAE's conflicting discourse when he says that: 'Lo único que hemos hecho

es estar atentos a lo que oímos en la calle, **hacerlo nuestro** y devolvérselo a los hablantes en forma de norma.' (*El País* 10-11-2005b). In setting particular norms – however necessary these might be for the communicative, transactional functions of a global Spanish – the Academy (and the Academies following its lead) stamps a particular mark on language standards according to the language ideologies it simultaneously attempts to negate. It is somewhat misleading then to obscure agency for standardisation by suggesting that both the language of 'la calle' and that of the 'lengua culta' belong to speakers, when it is in fact a product of standardisation by a very particular and arguably biased group of (predominantly male) highly educated, privileged individuals.

## 7.5 SUMMARY

Summing up this chapter then, it has become clear that the RAE's press discourse on Spanish in the world utilises strategies that promote key themes and topoi. These focus primarily on the number of Spanish-speakers worldwide, the action and process of the growth and spread of Spanish, the communicative and economic advantages of linguistic unity, the historical rootedness of Spanish, and its future golden age in hitherto unconsolidated domains such as diplomacy, technology and science. Furthermore, ideological vocabulary, presuppositions, categorisations and truth claims embedded in vocabulary constitute a lexical strategy for the construction of the RAE's view of Spanish in the world. Among the effects of these strategies is firstly the manufacture of public consent to the RAE's (and associated language guardians') renewed leadership of the 'new' standardisation of Spanish which now affects language on a rescaled international level. Secondly, RAE discourse manufactures consent to the public linguistic and social practices of 'natural' and 'necessary' standardisation which mask the hidden agenda of ensuring that Spain benefits from the expansion of Spanish into the domains mentioned above.

The RAE seeks to recognise and control the shape and perception of pluricentric Spanish by controlling the definition of its various norms. Having evolved from a monocentric norm from Spain, through the amalgamation of all

Peninsular and American varieties into dichotomised ‘Spanish’ versus ‘American’ norms, the RAE has since classified seven regional norms on which standardising research and publications such as the DPD and *Nueva Gramática* are based. It now seems, however, that RAE discourse has come full circle to once again promoting a single, prestigious overarching norm, whose prestige comes not from any (explicit) territorial link but from its unified status across the Spanish-speaking world and hence its ‘anonymity’. It remains the duty of the RAE and the ASALE to guard *el español común* and to guarantee its essential unity. Unified Spanish is framed as an alternative to the hegemony of global English, with this alternative premised on a hegemonic standardised global Spanish established in reaction to the threat of linguistic borrowings from – or shift to – English and the potential fragmentation of Spanish.

Finally, this chapter has discussed the concept of the ‘ownership’ of Spanish, showing how this no longer lies with Spain (according to the RAE and others). Language debates indicate that Spain has long since ceased to be the ‘hogar paternal’ of Spanish, and now no territorial group is seen to own the language. Instead, those who have most influence over the shape and direction of the language are those in science, literature and the media, representing a shift from a formerly nation-state based philosophy of language ownership to one in which the international architects, craftsmen and users of Spanish are those to whom Spanish ‘belongs’. I noted that there is a concentration of these professional and cultural authorities in the economically superior Spanish-speaking nation-states, raising serious questions – if not doubts – about the authenticity of discourse promoting ‘democracy’ in linguistic authority. In other sections of the data, cities in which the CILEs take place are metaphorically transformed into ‘capitals’ of the language, each representing the incumbent seat of linguistic power as resting in these conferences and their participants. Most commonly, however, ownership of Spanish is deflected from identifiable institutional or national agents onto the common linguistic ‘patrimonio de todos’ in which all users and speakers of Spanish are attributed a share in the ownership and (re-)production of the language. This notion of shared heritage reinforces the ideology of a panhispanic ‘Spanish from

nowhere' which nevertheless continues to be debated, constructed and standardised by the language authorities guided by the RAE.



## CONCLUSIONS

### 8.1 THE IDEOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF 'STANDARD' SPANISH

The aim of this thesis has been to address the two overarching concerns which have guided the research: first, an examination of the ideological and political factors which impact upon and inform both public debates about language standardisation and the debates and practices of standardising institutions and agencies themselves; and second, an analysis of the nature of the ideological debates and discursive contestations surrounding so-called 'standard' Spanish.

The first question led me to construct my theoretical framework which drew on work from the field of language ideologies. My synthesis in Chapter 1 brought together key ideas from Woolard (1998) and Blommaert (1999c) in particular. Throughout the thesis I have used the term 'ideology' in line with Woolard (1998) who defines it as a way of ordering our reflections and interests in response to lived experience. This definition also sees ideology as relating particularly to social position and the struggle to manage power relations between different groups, be they tribes, nations, speech communities, political movements or other defined groups. From Blommaert (1999c), I emphasised the important point that ideology is not limited to the motivations of dominant groups (such as the RAE and other language authorities) but can be subaltern too. While the focus and scope of this thesis subsequently allowed only for a consideration of the 'top-down' ideological discourse of linguistic authorities, it was necessary to frame the study by noting the dialectical relationship between ideologies of both dominant and dominated groups.

In relation to language in particular, my working definition stated that a language ideology offers representations of the historical, contemporary and perceived future role of a language variety in its socio-political context, as well as its utility, value and quality. Ideologies about Spanish, then, have historically emerged from its golden age of literature and its spread throughout Spain's former colonies, not to mention its role in discourses of nationalism and unity from the times of *los reyes católicos* through to the Franco dictatorship. Moreover, I highlighted Kroskrity's observation that language users' ideologies are 'indexically tied to features of their sociocultural experience' (2000a:21), and it must therefore be recognised that factors of ethnicity, national belonging, cultural practices, educational achievement and religious practice affect the construal of language varieties. All of these factors were later identified as aspects of language ideological discourse by the agents of hegemonic visions of the Spanish language.

According to Woolard (1998), language ideologies can be located in linguistic practices, in metapragmatic discourse and in implicit metapragmatics. All three sites relate to the domains in which institutions such as the RAE establish and ritualise their ideologies and definitions of language through the texts and metatexts that constitute language ideological debates (Blommaert 1999b). A related point that Blommaert makes is that as well as the historical context of language ideologies, it is essential to identify the 'ideological brokers' who hold authority to establish and occupy discursive space for ideological debates (1999b:7-9) and the specific instruments by which they achieve this (1999a:426). All too often both the particular agents and their means of establishing linguistic and ideological hegemony are veiled behind discourses of authority and anonymity in public spheres (Woolard 2007), and for this reason I established the need to identify those who control and influence language practices and debates in the Spanish context. I found that an identifiable network of institutions exists in Spain, including not only the RAE and IC, but also media outlets on television, radio and increasingly the internet. These institutions and their outputs serve to provoke reflection on individual linguistic practices and usages, inferring or even explicitly stating the need to

classify these according to the 'correct/incorrect' dichotomy. Importantly, the RAE and IC are both strongly connected to the Spanish Government and hence to its range of state policies on language, including Constitutional articles and the public education system. While these state-level language planning efforts are extensive, newspapers (and increasingly, internet versions of them) remain crucial for the widespread propagation of language and other ideologies across broad geographical areas and social classes. It follows that the continued presence and influence of the RAE in the public discursive space of the press is vital for the perpetuation of its authority and standardisation discourse.

The framework of language ideologies outlined in Chapter 1 was then applied in Chapter 2 to help us understand the ideological basis of a 'standard' language and the process of standardisation. Drawing particularly on scholarship by Joseph (1987), Cameron (1995), Lippi-Green (1997) and Milroy and Milroy (1999), I underlined how a written form of the spoken language of educated and powerful social elites has come to be a model for standard languages across many societies. Above all, the ideology of standardisation represents a process in which constant intervention through language planning has ensured the continued unity and cohesion of the Spanish language, and subsequently of the political and 'fraternal' community which is seen as a consequence of the common language. Haugen's (1972) taxonomy of standardisation suggests that the written model of a standard language traditionally displays minimal variation in form and maximal variation in function across the territory in which it is used. To this end, the standardisation of Spanish has taken place through: elevating an elite variety throughout the community of speakers, which was historically Castilian and is nowadays *el español común* (selection); securing conventions on the orthography, lexis and grammar of the selected variety through the publications of the RAE and ASALE (codification); extending the domains in which the language is used, as in debates about Spanish in technology, diplomacy and so on (elaboration); and enlarging the number of speakers as is the purpose of the education systems of Spanish-speaking countries as well as the global mission of Spain's IC (acceptance).

Although Haugen's approach was written with the national context in mind, his taxonomy is still pertinent to an explanation of standardisation processes in the contemporary transnational context of the Spanish-speaking 'community'. Within this language community of more than 400 million speakers, standardisation practices and public debates involve 'verbal hygienists' (Cameron 1995) including 'lay' Spanish-speakers but are led primarily by key public figures from the RAE, IC, *Fundéu* and the mass media. These, then, are the institutions that control and influence 'standard' Spanish. The historical and prestigious role of Spain's Academy in particular has afforded it a privileged position in the national press debates about Spanish but also in international standardisation practices. The series of high-profile CILE events as well as leadership of the now panhispanic publications that codify *el español común* are manifestations of the RAE's hegemonic position and practices, and are evidence of the continuation of its standardising practices across a rescaled, international panhispanic community of speakers.

## **8.2 THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF 'STANDARD' SPANISH**

Having established the institutional and ideological framework within which public debates of standard language authorities take place, I set out in my later chapters to ascertain the ideological and political content of these debates, and the particular ideologies which shape the discourses and practices of the principal Spanish language authorities. In order to do this – and to answer my second overarching research question, 'What is the nature of the ideological debates and discursive contestations surrounding "standard Spanish"?' – I applied some of the guidelines of key Critical Discourse Analysts to an interrogation of press articles from *El País* and *ABC* featuring language ideological debates. By drawing primarily from the works of Fairclough (2001), van Dijk (2001b) and Wodak et al (1999), my analytical approach enabled me to draw on both the explicit content and implicit features of the textual data in order to reveal how hegemonic ideologies are embedded in and dispersed through texts and discourses. My analysis considered the overall framing of the debates as well as the way that the texts encoded language ideologies and the

'hidden agendas' (Cameron 2001) of the RAE and associated language authorities.

Cameron's argument that language guardians engage in the 'struggle to control language by defining its nature' (1995:8) underpinned the first part of my data analysis in which I considered how Spanish language was defined and described in press debates. I found that the description of Spanish as one, common, unified language is naturalised by the RAE through its frequent designation of the language using terms of unity and cohesion. These characteristics are foregrounded in RAE discourse through their position as the topic (and often the title or sub-title) of many articles. The definition of Spanish as necessarily common to all speakers of its community has its roots in linguistic nationalism; I pointed out, however, that in the contemporary context, the scope of this unity goes beyond Spain to include nation-states where Spanish has official status, and even some where it does not (US, Brazil). As such, this panhispanic definition of Spanish is transnational in its scope, and draws on legitimising values of democracy, globalisation and transnational identity.

In addition to controlling the perception of the language itself, RAE discourse was found to embrace and promote a particular definition of the speakers of Spanish, categorising them as one 'community'. This community is staked out and reinforced by political and diplomatic unions (*Comunidad Iberoamericana de Naciones*) as well as linguistic and cultural events (*Congresos Internacionales de la Lengua Española*), but the common discursive theme is that its many members all share *la lengua común* as a language of encounter, harmony and democracy (as they are believed to have done throughout the history of Spanish and its spread). This vision of social relationships between speakers of *el español común* is embedded in press debates through choices of inclusive grammar and lexis, creating a sense of belonging to an 'in-group' or 'imagined community' (Anderson 1983). Furthermore, we saw that in discourse where *el español común* is referred to as ordered, unified and common across the language community, the linguistic diversity of the Spanish-speaking world – occasionally recognised elsewhere – is backgrounded in order to maintain 'unity' as the foregrounded topic. Notwithstanding some recognition

of linguistic diversity within Spanish-speaking territories, the bulk of RAE discourse on *el español común* infers that minimal variation in form (Haugen 1972) is highly valued within this particular supranational code for purposes of linguistic unity and widespread communication. This common variety of Spanish is consequently disembedded from particular territorial contexts, seen as ‘panhispanic’, and comes to represent a ‘Spanish from nowhere’ that transcends national linguistic varieties and loyalties. At work here is an ideology of *anonymity* (Woolard 2007) in which the agency of Spain-based institutions, policies and practices is obscured in pursuit of an agentless, naturally-occurring, ‘total Spanish’ guided by panhispanic norms.

On this point, I identified something of a contradiction in institutional ideologies (as Blommaert 1999b suggests is common) in that on the one hand, the RAE promotes and naturalises the idea of a disembedded global norm as if this were somehow *not* linked to or ‘owned’ by particular authorities, yet on the other hand this norm is indeed determined by real, identifiable, nationally-embedded language guardians of Spain. The RAE reacts to the various norms of pluricentric Spanish by elevating a supposedly ‘anonymous’ variety of Spanish over and above the various pluricentric varieties. This overarching panhispanic norm gains prestige from its unified status across the Spanish-speaking world and is predicated in the press on values of unity and the linguistic, social and economic advantages of a common standard language. While according to the RAE’s view, *el español común* has no identifiable national ‘owners’ (only influential professional groups from science, literature and the media), I observed that the RAE’s discourse legitimates its own role and authority in standardisation by presenting itself as the guarantor of the essential unity of Spanish. Indeed, the RAE discursively constructs and promotes its role in language matters through a focus on not only its historical function and service to Spanish-speakers, but also its contemporary role of *primus inter pares* with the other Spanish Language Academies.

At the same time as elevating *el español común*, the Academies have also categorised the diversity of Spanish varieties into a schema of what they believe to be the seven particular norms in the Spanish-speaking world. These centres

of prestige (USA, Mexico and Central America, the Caribbean islands, continental Caribbean, the Andean zone, River Plate, and Chile) form the basis of the corpus planning that the Academies engage in when producing the DPD and *Nueva Gramática*, yet these publications – and discussion of them in the press – are couched in terms of unity and panhispanism rather than diversity and pluricentrism. We see, then, how the unified practices of the Academies via the PLP and the categorisation of pluricentric Spanish norms actually contribute more towards the power of the Academies to control the development of *el español común* through panhispanic norms than it does towards the full recognition of Spanish pluricentrism and the valorisation of this.

We have seen in the discussion of the data that RAE discourse does not only focus on the concept of unity as a characteristic of the language, but also it is presented as a determining factor in the contemporary role and authority of the Academy. Even though the RAE's motto 'limpia, fija y da esplendor' still appears on its heraldic logo, it claims to no longer pursue this goal, seeking instead to guard the essential unity of Spanish throughout the world. In recent years, the RAE has concentrated its practices and public discourse on the maintenance and protection of unified Spanish, as well as the involvement of the other Academies in this standardisation of *el español común*. Although a combination of explicit declarations and metaphorical representations in press discourse suggest that the Academies' work on panhispanic norms is primarily *descriptive*, there remains little doubt that the RAE's mandate (to ensure that linguistic diversity should not fracture the essential unity of Spanish) means that this institution functions *prescriptively* too.

However, there is more at stake than simply the RAE's perceived threat of linguistic fragmentation: the unificatory role of Spanish in the political, diplomatic and commercial union of *la comunidad hispanohablante* represents an implicit motive or 'hidden agenda' for which the RAE strives to manufacture public consent. Neo-liberal framings of the RAE's discourse emerge from the data, in which there is evidence of capitalist economic ideologies relating to markets, including a 'linguistic market'. In this context, there are supposedly

invisible and inevitable market forces which are framed as legitimising factors for the commodification and continued spread of the Spanish language through industries of language teaching and 'language tourism', particularly when framed as an alternative to the hegemony of global English. Enabling and fomenting the ideological spread of Spanish as a 'commodity' is presented as a desirable – if not the *only* – option, and topoi of the economic value of Spanish, its profitability, and its representation as an industry are presented as justifications for the work of the RAE and IC, as well as further inter-Academic collaboration.

Ideological debates regarding Spanish in the world focus in particular on themes such as the global number of speakers, the growth and influence of Spanish, the communicative and economic advantage of linguistic unity and a necessary and upcoming 'golden age' in which Spanish will conquer hitherto unconsolidated domains such as the internet, scientific scholarship, technological advances and international diplomacy (Haugen's maximal variety of function, 1972). This extension of Spanish is once again premised on the need to counter the 'threat' of global English, and relies on a hegemonic standardised global Spanish being established in reaction to the threat of linguistic borrowings from – or shift to – English and the potential fragmentation of Spanish. In the light of this, my argument has been that the effects of the RAE's strategies of reference, categorisation, argumentation and framing of Spanish have been twofold. Firstly, they manufacture public consent to the consolidation of the RAE's authority and its renewed leadership of Spanish standardisation in a rescaled panhispanic context – a context which now affects the language on a potentially global scale. Secondly, they manufacture consent to the public linguistic and social practices of 'natural' and 'necessary' standardisation (involving linguistic, cultural and commercial institutions) which mask the hidden agenda of ensuring that Spain's Academy, IC, government and transnational corporations benefit from the continued expansion of Spanish.

### 8.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

In reaching the conclusions above, it has been necessary to consider a number of important questions which have previously been recognised by scholars as gaps in the field of language ideological studies. In line with Cameron's discussion of 'verbal hygiene' (1995), one question I have not asked in this study is 'should we prescribe?'. I have instead sought to 'pose searching questions about who prescribes for whom, what they prescribe, how and for what purposes.' (Cameron 1995:11). In recognising that the RAE sees its role as a leader amongst the associated Academies in language debates regarding the Spanish language as a whole, I have identified 'who prescribes' and 'for whom'. The former is not necessarily new knowledge: in Spain (and beyond), the Academy's prescriptive role has been known throughout its long history. However, the network of other language authorities with whom the RAE collaborates – as well as the influential commercial bodies that fund much of this work – constitutes an identification of 'ideological brokers' in the Spanish context. The latter point regarding those 'for whom' the RAE prescribes confirms that the RAE does not see its sphere of influence as limited to Spain: instead, the entire Hispanic world is the 'market' within which its discourses, publications and events circulate. In terms of 'what they prescribe', my focus has not been on the linguistic minutiae laid down in the pages of the *DRAE*, *DPD*, *Ortografía* or *Nueva Gramática*, but has been more on the overarching arguments, conceptions and definitions of Spanish that are prescribed through its ideological discourse. This takes place through the specific instrument of the newspaper press, and while my investigation was necessarily limited to two publications within very specific time periods, I suggest that further study of other newspapers – and importantly newspapers from other Spanish-speaking countries – will demonstrate media discourse as a highly significant site and vehicle of prescriptive linguistic practices. The purposes of these prescriptions have emerged clearly through a combination of explicit statements from the data and through the contextualisation of these statements – the RAE and associated language authorities prescribe in order to preserve the linguistic unity of Spanish throughout the territories where it is spoken, and to perpetuate

the notion of a harmonious language community. The result is a vehicle by means of which Spain's economic, political and cultural interests can be assured in an international context.

Not only was this study necessary within a general framework of language ideological scholarship, but within the Hispanic context in particular. Consequently, I relate this thesis to Del Valle and Gabriel Stheeman's observation that:

To date, in the Hispanic intellectual context, there has been a remarkable absence of in-depth critical studies of the ideological/political foundations and implications of linguistic standardization

(2002a:xiii)

This study is offered to the scholarly community – and interested others from within the Spanish-speaking world – as one particular contribution to redressing this absence. In doing so, I have presented evidence of how an everyday reading of press articles related to language can show language authorities and their practices at work, reinforcing asymmetrical social relations in terms of who has authority to make decisions on behalf of all Spanish-speakers. The aim of the thesis has also been to raise awareness of how the press is an important and widely accessed discursive space in which language ideologies are staked out, and hence can be revealed using tools of critical discourse analysis.

In sum, the purpose of this study has not been to negate the existence of standard Spanish or standard languages as 'myths', but to problematise their construction, development and maintenance. Equally, my aim has not been that readers should discard standard languages/language standards or call for their demise, but to understand new facets of their construction and establishment, and, in doing so, to be able to challenge them through identifying and challenging those social, political and economic agents responsible for their creation.

#### 8.4 LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

On reflection, the first limitation of this study that I would identify is its bias toward textual data, and in particular the volume of articles I dealt with.

Although a large text corpus was entirely necessary in terms of being able to draw out recurring patterns of discourse and points of naturalisation into 'common-sense' ideologies, it also meant that there were aspects of individual texts which simply could not be analysed in depth due to constraints of space. Furthermore, there were other features of press articles such as their design, layout and positioning on the printed/internet page that would have made for an interesting multimodal analysis (Kress and Leeuwen 1996, 2001), to include a consideration of the use of imagery in the presentation of RAE discourse.

A second limitation is that while this thesis has shed light on aspects of top-down, hegemonic discourse of language authorities, contesting ideologies embedded in subaltern discourses have not been considered here. While I do not believe this represents a weakness of the study – given its legitimate focus on dominant discourses – it is however a limitation which means that no conclusions can be drawn regarding the reception and processing of RAE ideologies in readers of *El País* and *ABC*.

Finally, I return to the point made in Chapter 1 concerning ideologies within the research process. I acknowledge that although I have sought to apply high standards of academic rigour to my investigation, this does not result in a necessarily 'objective' study as the choices I have made on the research topic, data collection, methodology and analytical framework all reflect priorities which I believe to be important. At the same time, the conclusions I have drawn are based on the critical analysis carried out in the investigation, but this does not equate to 'neutral' research, a concept which Fairclough refers to as an illusion (Fairclough 2001). My work must therefore be taken as a product of my context, priorities, and the imperfect process of carrying out the research, and consequently I lay my thesis open to the possibility of the same analysis as I have made of the RAE discourse. The thesis represents one approach to RAE discourse which should be considered parallel

to other approaches – the few that already exist and the many potential future analyses which will build on existing work.

## 8.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Of the numerous ideas for future research which have occurred to me throughout the course of this study, there are several I shall briefly mention here. The first proposal addresses a particular limitation of the study concerning contesting discourses and constructions of Spanish. It would be a fruitful and necessary study to take an approach from the ‘bottom up’ in order to consider how the RAE’s discourse is received by readers of the newspapers I have analysed. This could take the form of a medium-large scale attitudinal study which would seek to determine the extent to which the objectives of the RAE as outlined in my conclusions above are being received by those language users that it seeks to influence. This study could be conducted not only in Spain but could also provide fruitful and interesting findings in other Spanish-speaking countries too.

Another study to follow on from the present thesis might take a more detailed consideration of the discourse of the other 21 Spanish Language Academies. It would be interesting to consider how similar data from leading newspapers in each of the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America compares with that of Spain. For example, is the Spanish language defined and constructed in similar or different ways? What about the authority and role of the individual national Academies and their relationship with Madrid? What more might this tell us about the authenticity of the claim that the Academies work ‘en pie de igualdad’? (*El País* 16-10-2001e).

One final research proposal would take as its basis Haugen’s claim that in nation-building there is always an urge for a nation-state to have its *own* language (Haugen 1972:104). Building on the historical groundwork laid by Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman (2002a) on language in post-independence Latin American states, it could be interesting to investigate contemporary discourse and relationships between the RAE and the Academies in any Latin American states which have sought to enhance the distinctiveness of their

'national' varieties of Spanish as part of nation-building projects. How in particular does the emerging panhispanic language policy respond to the detail of linguistic diversity, particularly when this is used indexically to strengthen national language varieties? The underlying assumption of this and all other possible language ideological studies to follow on from this thesis is that, as Woolard observes, 'ideologies of language are not about language alone' (1998:3) and for this reason they would be fruitful and fascinating questions for further study.



# NOTES

---

## Chapter 1

- <sup>1</sup> It is assumed that the readers of this thesis will have a sufficient grasp of Spanish so as to not require translations of the data and other citations, which have consequently been left in their original language.
- <sup>2</sup> This discussion does not include other non-verbal forms of communication such as gesture, posture, facial expression, which – although essential paralinguistic features that contribute to the intention and interpretation of communication – do not form part of a systematic and structured perception of ‘language’.
- <sup>3</sup> One notable contribution to this gap in scholarship, and particularly relevant to this study, is Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman (2002a).

## Chapter 2

- <sup>4</sup> I am aware of the potentially problematic use of the various terms which can be used to refer to American countries where Spanish is an official and/or national language. Of the various terms available, including South America, Latin America, Spanish America, Spanish-speaking America, Hispanic America, Hispano-America, and so on, I tend to favour Latin America but may also use these other terms interchangeably, something I do for convenience but not out of ignorance to the often complex debates around the definition of this area. When using Iberia/Ibero-America, I do so in order to include the Portuguese and other languages of those territories.
- <sup>5</sup> I use the acronym SLI for the sake of brevity, not because I view standard language ideology as in any way a single, monolithic ideology. I recognise that on the whole there is convergence in the goals of standardisation; nonetheless its definition as an ideology – as noted in Chapter 1 – means that it may contain elements of contradiction, ambiguity and inconsistency.
- <sup>6</sup> I return to a fuller discussion of theoretical perspectives on ‘discourse’ when explaining my methodology in Chapter 3.
- <sup>7</sup> Throughout this thesis I use the term ‘academician’ to translate *académico* and to refer to the full members of the RAE. I do this primarily to highlight the distinction between the understanding of an ‘academic’ in English – usually linked to universities – and that of the Spanish ‘académico’ which is much more linked to the series of *Academias Reales*.
- <sup>8</sup> To watch over the French language and to fulfil acts of patronage.
- <sup>9</sup> The Academy has, in the past, worked to fix the language, in order to make it a common heritage for all French people and all those who use our language. Today, the Academy acts to maintain the qualities and monitor the developments of French. It defines its proper use.

---

<sup>10</sup> It does this by drawing up its dictionary, which fixes the use of language, but also by its recommendations and by its participation in various terminology committees.

### Chapter 3

None

### Chapter 4

<sup>11</sup> Much of this section is based on Penny (2002) and Mar-Molinero (2000a).

<sup>12</sup> The three principal minority languages in Spain – Catalan/Valencian, Basque and Galician – not to mention a number of lesser used language varieties including Asturian, Aragonese and Andalusian enjoy an increasingly comprehensive literature on their history, development and contemporary sociolinguistic situation. As such there seems little sense in reproducing here a small part of what is a vast discussion. Instead I would direct the reader to general works considering the multilingual situation in Spain (Castillo Lluch and Kabatek 2006, Díez et al. 1977, Lodares 2000, Siguán 1992, Turell 2001), as well as language-specific studies on Catalan/Valencian (Boix Fuster 2004, Colectivo Valldaura. 1992, Nicolás and Ferrando 1998), Galician (Beswick 2007, Del Valle 2000, Monteagudo 1999), Basque (MacClancy 1996, Mateo 2005, Tejerina 1992), Asturian (Kramer 2002, Schmidt-Riese 2002), Aragonese (Martínez Ferrer 1995) and Andalusian (Alvar et al. 1991, Payán Sotomayor 1993).

<sup>13</sup> The other Academies in chronological order of establishment are Colombia (1871), Ecuador (1874), Mexico (1875), El Salvador (1876), Venezuela (1883), Chile (1885), Peru (1887), Guatemala (1887), Costa Rica (1923), Philippines (1924), Panama (1926), Cuba (1926), Paraguay (1927), Bolivia (1927), Dominican Republic (1927), Nicaragua (1928), Argentina (1931), Uruguay (1943), Honduras (1948), Puerto Rico (1955) and the US (1973). (from ASALE 2008).

<sup>14</sup> This is no longer a condition that the Gramática enjoys; following the Civil War of 1936-39, the *Ley de Instrucción Pública* which accorded the RAE Grammar its privileged use was never reinstated. See Zamora Vicente (1999:381-2).

<sup>15</sup> ‘Consistirán los caudales de la Academia: (1º.) En la asignación ordinaria que se le concede en los presupuestos del Estado, y en las extraordinarias con que el Gobierno y donadores o fundadores particulares quieran favorecer las actividades de la Corporación’ (Artículo XXXVIII, Estatutos, *Estatutos y Reglamento de la Real Academia Española*, 1995:23).

<sup>16</sup> For example in 2007, this amount was 3.8 million euros (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia 2007).

<sup>17</sup> For example in 1999, Aznar’s government awarded 500 million pesetas to the RAE for the development of its technological infrastructure (*El Mundo* 16.04.1999).

<sup>18</sup> ‘La Academia rendirá cuentas al Gobierno, en la forma establecida, de las cantidades que percibiére del Estado’ (Artículo XLI, Estatutos, *Estatutos y Reglamento*, 1995:24).

- 
- <sup>19</sup> ‘La revisión de los presentes Estatutos habrá de ajustarse al procedimiento siguiente: ... Para ser sometido a la aprobación del Gobierno de la Nación, el Artículo o conjunto de Artículos cuya inclusión, modificación o supresión se haya propuesto, tendrá que contar con la mayoría absoluta de los votos emitidos por la mitad más uno de los Académicos con derecho a voto...’ (Artículo XLV, Estatutos, *Estatutos y Reglamento*, 1995:25).
- <sup>20</sup> ‘Los presentes Estatutos entrarán en vigor en el momento de su publicación en el *Boletín Oficial del Estado*’ (Artículo XLVI, Estatutos, *Estatutos y Reglamento*, 1995:25).
- <sup>21</sup> ‘Para cumplir con lo prevenido en el Artículo VII de los Estatutos, que trata de Certámenes públicos, so observarán las reglas siguientes: 1ª) ...; 2ª) Aprobado por la Academia el plan presentado por la Comisión, redactará la Secretaria, con arreglo a él, una convocatoria que se publicará en el *Boletín Oficial del Estado*’ (Artículo 7º, Reglamento, *Estatutos y Reglamento*, 1995:32).
- <sup>22</sup> ‘Cuando ocurra alguna vacante de Académico de Número, la Academia, en Junta Ordinaria y a propuesta de la Junta de Gobierno, declarará dicha vacante de acuerdo con lo que señala el Artículo X de los Estatutos, y lo comunicará al Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia para que se publique en el *Boletín Oficial del Estado*’ (Artículo 18, Reglamento, *Estatutos y Reglamento*, 1995:39).
- <sup>23</sup> Albuquerque, New York, Chicago and Seattle (Instituto Cervantes 2008a).
- <sup>24</sup> For example, ‘Supervivientes’ and ‘Confianza ciega’, (Antena 3); ‘Esta cocina es un infierno’, ‘Gran Hermano’ and ‘La casa de tu vida’ (Telecinco); ‘Operación triunfo’ (TVE).
- <sup>25</sup> See also De Miguel (2002, 2005) and Millán (2005).

## Chapter 5

- <sup>26</sup> The ‘revelation’ of the unity of Spanish is part of a process that has ‘become clear to us’, in the context of the production of the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* on which Salvador is commenting. As such, the ‘us’ (the Academicians who have produced the DPD) becomes the object/recipient of the action, and could infer that while the *truth* regarding the superlative unity of Spanish may not be clear to all, it is quite clear to the experts. These same experts are those who have ‘cleared up’ linguistic doubts, even if some ‘might’ remain. The use of the subjunctive here (‘las que queden’) as opposed to the indicative is a grammatical choice which diminishes the extancy of any remaining doubts, rendering them possibilities rather than certainties.
- <sup>27</sup> Blecua’s use of the definite article implies consensus and authority, and the indicative mood indicates a truth claim and suggests there is no need for a more measured or modalised response. The article from which this extract comes took as its title part of his phrase: ‘El español, al final, es uno’ (the Spanish language, in the end, is but one language), representing the choice of the journalist/editor to foreground this particular point of Blecua’s interview,

- 
- and establishing an 'expert view' on the Spanish language at a time when press coverage of language matters was increased due to the International Congress in Valladolid.
- <sup>28</sup> Juaristi subrayó la ventaja que supone 'el prestigio cultural y la homogeneidad de la lengua castellana, que es comprensible por todos sus hablantes, lo que la convierte en vehículo de comunicación internacional eficaz' (ABC 14-10-2001).
- <sup>29</sup> *Superación de Babel*, Julián Marías, de la Real Academia Española. Por fortuna, nuestra lengua es enormemente sólida; su fonética es excepcionalmente clara; se entiende en toda la inmensa extensión de su dominio: nunca es necesario deletrear las palabras como ocurre en otras lenguas. El deterioro del español es casi siempre deliberado y culpable. (ABC 18-10-2001b)
- <sup>30</sup> Pero, como el propio Cela ha dicho, 'es bueno que sepamos defender esa maravilla de nuestra **lengua común**' (ABC 08-04-1997b). *Aviso de la defensa de nuestra lengua común: el español*, Camilo José Cela: [...] pruebo a dar mi aviso de la defensa de nuestra **lengua común**, el español [...] Aristóteles piensa que la escritura es la representación del habla y el habla lo es de la mente, y para mí tengo que el alma tiembla en la voz que se pronuncia y se serena cuando la palabra se pone al servicio de las ideas nobles y duraderas: la defensa de nuestra **lengua común**, pongamos por caso [...] los hombres cultos del siglo XXI tendrán que estar alertas para evitar que el español deje de ser la **lengua común** de todos nosotros, lo que sería un despropósito histórico e incluso político [...] Nuestra **lengua común**, el español, ha venido siendo ignorada... [...] los recuerdo a los americanos que habláis el español que ésta es la **lengua común** de todos (El País 08-04-1997b). Rodríguez Adrados recordó que el español, además de ser el idioma oficial del Estado, como establece la Constitución, 'es la **lengua común** de todos los españoles, aquella en la que todos nos entendemos, aunque algunos tengan otra propia', en referencia a los habitantes de regiones como Cataluña, Galicia o el País Vasco (ABC 24-04-1997b). Su Majestad el Rey y Su Alteza Real la Infanta Doña Elena presidieron ayer, en el Palacio de la Quinta, la Reunión anual del Patronato del Instituto Cervantes, institución que cumple diez años de exitosa vida, pidiendo, ante estos tiempos críticos, que mostremos lo que une: el patrimonio de nuestra **lengua común** (ABC 11-10-2001). La **lengua común** fortalece, como ayer afirmó el Rey, la posición en el mundo de todos los países donde se habla. Incrementar la presencia de nuestra **lengua común** en los foros internacionales, e impulsar unas relaciones transatlánticas que han de considerar a todas las Américas, requiere esfuerzo y constancia (El País 17-10-2001a). 'Nos ha reunido la vocación y el amor al español', ha concluido De la Concha con un mensaje de panhispanismo que el director del Instituto Cervantes, Jon Juaristi, ha subrayado al apelar a la unidad de todos 'para afrontar juntos riesgos y esperanzas, porque como pueblo no tenemos otro destino que nuestra **lengua común**' (El País 19-10-2001b). (King Juan Carlos speech) Como afirmara Octavio Paz, al recibir el Premio Príncipe de Asturias de Comunicación y Humanidades en 1993, 'la cultura hispana reúne a pueblos distintos en una **lengua común** y un conjunto de valores y costumbres' (ABC 16-11-2005b). *Lengua común*: [...] Por encima de la pluralidad

- 
- territorial se alza la lengua como elemento común de un país que hace de la diversidad virtud (ABC 16-11-2005c). Esta Gramática no es para especialistas, sino para la gente normal, 'es la gramática del español común', dice Bosque, y se aborda para que los hablantes se reconozcan de una **lengua común**, cuya sintaxis es firme pero que se habla de modo distinto según en qué áreas (El País 12-11-2005). El ex vicepresidente de Nicaragua, Sergio Ramírez, resaltó al respecto que 'quien no inventa tecnología tampoco inventa los términos de la tecnología'. El también escritor destacó que, gracias al apego de los latinoamericanos a la **lengua común**, el español se expande hacia Estados Unidos de la mano de los inmigrantes. (ABC 28-03-2007a).
- <sup>31</sup> P. ¿El español no corre riesgo de dispersión? R. No. A finales del XIX se pensó que se iba a romper. Pero entonces no había una literatura americana. Unamuno citaba sólo a veinte escritores hispanoamericanos. Hoy conocemos cientos, y hay aviones, Internet y, sobre todo, canales internacionales de televisión que tratan de ser oídos por muchas personas y usan un **idioma neutro común** (El País 13-11-2004).
- <sup>32</sup> Su Majestad el Rey y Su Alteza Real la Infanta Doña Elena presidieron ayer, en el Palacio de la Quinta, la Reunión anual del Patronato del Instituto Cervantes, institución que cumple diez años de exitosa vida, pidiendo, ante estos tiempos críticos, que mostremos lo que une: el **patrimonio** de nuestra lengua común [...] El español es ya el **patrimonio** más valioso de los países y de los cientos de millones de personas que 'formamos una comunidad plural, abierta a todos y a la que precisamente une e identifica la lengua común', sostuvo El Rey (ABC 11-10-2001). Esta impresionante movilización de esfuerzos y amplísima participación da idea de la importancia del objeto del Congreso: el idioma español, **patrimonio** común de más de cuatrocientos millones de personas repartidas por el mundo (ABC 17-10-2001c). *El Rey resalta el valor de la lengua española como herramienta de cohesión: Don Juan Carlos exhorta a utilizar el idioma para potenciar la comunidad hispanohablante en el concierto de las naciones.* El rey Juan Carlos, que cerró el acto, resaltó la importancia del español como '**patrimonio común de más de cuatrocientos millones de personas**', y como 'herramienta insustituible para potenciar la **comunidad hispanohablante** en el concierto de las naciones'. '**Nuestro idioma**', afirmó, 'es el instrumento que permite y facilita la comunicación', lo que aproxima 'a **gentes y países**, aprovechando así las aportaciones de todos ellos en un proceso de enriquecimiento constante'. Pero además, destacó, 'el idioma español es cada vez más un elemento que fortalece nuestra posición en las relaciones con el resto del mundo' (El País 17-10-2001d). Fox se refirió también al papel que tiene México, 'el país en el que la lengua castellana cuenta con el mayor número de hablantes', en la difusión de este **patrimonio** común sobre todo en Brasil y Estados Unidos (ABC 17-10-2001f). 'No se puede olvidar que la comunidad hispanohablante', señaló también, 'añade al **patrimonio** de la lengua común la riqueza del plurilingüismo' (El País 18-11-2004e). En este foro han quedado acreditados la vitalidad y el interés por el **patrimonio** que tenemos en común cerca de 400 millones de ciudadanos del mundo (El País 21-11-2004b). Su aprobación (La nueva gramática de la RAE) es un hecho que

- 
- debemos celebrar por cuanto constituye un **patrimonio** común de la Humanidad, que se actualiza y preserva en provecho de toda la comunidad hispanohablante' (ABC 25-03-2007e). Como **patrimonio** común, recordó a Octavio Paz, quien contaba que 'los primeros libros que leí fueron escritos en español, sin pensar jamás en la nacionalidad del autor. (ABC 27-03-2007a).
- <sup>33</sup> Que en el marco de la visita de Estado haya V. E. reservado un espacio para venir a esta Casa expresa por sí solo la conciencia que V. E. tiene de **lo que la Lengua supone como patria común de los pueblos hispánicos**, y de lo que al servicio de su unidad hacen la Real Academia Española y las Academias hermanas que con ella integran la Asociación de Academias (El País 16-10-2001e). 'La decisión del Gobierno brasileño acerca de la obligatoriedad de la enseñanza del español en escuelas públicas y privadas es muy importante y **fortalece esa idea de que consideremos a Iberoamérica como patria común**, dentro de su diversidad', dijo Molina (El País 09-11-2005b). (editorial) Somos cerca de cuatrocientos millones de almas los que compartimos la **patria espiritual de la lengua común**; la sangre de nuestro espíritu, en el decir unamuniano (ABC 08-04-1997b).
- <sup>34</sup> (El País 09-11-2005b) as above.
- <sup>35</sup> Pastrana defiende la solidaridad del español. El presidente de Colombia, Andrés Pastrana, también asistió ayer a la inauguración del Congreso de la Lengua, donde **defendió** que el español es '**la lengua del tercer milenio** porque es la lengua de la solidaridad y la paz' (ABC 17-10-2001b).
- <sup>36</sup> III CONGRESO DE LA LENGUA ESPAÑOLA: '*El castellano no es superior, pero parece ponernos siempre en el camino de la amistad*' (El País 13-11-2004a).
- <sup>37</sup> Y hoy, cuando el mundo vive momentos de inquietud y preocupación, 'el español ha de ser más que nunca una propuesta de **amistad** y de **comprensión**, un instrumento de **concordia** y **de tolerancia**, y un cauce para la creación y el entendimiento entre las personas y las culturas'. El Rey glosó la extraordinaria expansión del español, hasta el punto de que se ha convertido en idioma de ámbito universal. [...] Don Juan Carlos concluyó que los pueblos iberoamericanos deben '**compartir cosas, resaltar lo que nos une, mostrar que estamos unidos**' ante '**estos tiempos críticos**' (ABC 11-10-2001).
- <sup>38</sup> *Servir al idioma es servir al bien común*: La lengua española constituye, en efecto, un factor de identidad de una comunidad de hombres y mujeres asentada en distintas latitudes del mundo. Es un factor de universalidad que rompe fronteras, que aglutina propósitos, que establece fortísimos lazos de fraternidad y solidaridad, y que crea un circuito inmaterial por el que discurren valores y aspiraciones compartidos (ABC 16-11-2005b).
- <sup>39</sup> La lengua común fortalece, como ayer afirmó el Rey, la posición en el mundo de todos los países donde se habla. Incrementar la presencia de nuestra lengua común en los foros internacionales, e impulsar unas relaciones transatlánticas que han de considerar a todas las Américas, requiere esfuerzo y constancia. Algo nuevo tiene el español a su favor, frente a

- 
- siglos y años no tan lejanos: por vez primera, y salvo contadas excepciones, la inmensa mayoría de los hispanohablantes viven en sistemas democráticos, lo que refuerza su alcance y autoridad moral (*El País* 17-10-2001a).
- <sup>40</sup> See *El País* 25-04-2001 'Las palabras del Rey', 29-04-2001 'Casi tres siglos de imposición' and 15-05-2001 'El discurso real y la responsabilidad política' for published examples of when Spanish has indeed been imposed.
- <sup>41</sup> In 1492, Antonio de Nebrija wrote in his introduction to *Gramática de la lengua castellana* that 'siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio'.
- <sup>42</sup> Humberto López Morales descubre los falsos mitos del español en América: [...] El filólogo publica una edición actualizada de *La aventura del español en América* (Espasa) en la que revisa los falsos mitos del español en América (*El País* 09-11-2005a).
- <sup>43</sup> Amparo Moraleda calificó como un placer ayudar a la RAE a velar por la unidad de la lengua en un momento en que el español es el sexto idioma de Internet (un 6% del total), tras el inglés (70%), japonés, alemán, chino y francés (*El País* 24-10-2001). La Real Academia Española (RAE) ha vivido una gran revolución tecnológica en los últimos doce años, que ha venido a facilitar el trabajo que los académicos desarrollan para velar por la mayor de nuestras riquezas culturales: el idioma (*ABC* 16-11-2004a). Hay que luchar contra los barbarismos, hay que establecer con precisión la norma y velar por su cumplimiento, pero la historia de la creación de las lenguas es la del mestizaje. Toda lengua es violada y penetrada. Los que la hacen no son las instituciones, sino los hablantes (*El País* 20-11-2004g).
- <sup>44</sup> La defensa de la unidad de la lengua española y la obligación de conservar, al mismo tiempo, su infinita variedad. Su arrolladora fuerza actual y su riqueza, pero también la necesidad de prestarle atención en un mundo cada vez más globalizado, capaz de arrasar la diversidad y la pluralidad de las culturas. Ésas fueron las líneas maestras de todas las intervenciones con las que se inauguró ayer el III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española en Rosario (*El País* 18-11-2004e).
- <sup>45</sup> Este nuevo diccionario aclara dudas y fija el modo correcto de usar nuevas palabras y extranjerismos que hemos ido acoplando a nuestro lenguaje cotidiano y que convenía adaptar y filtrar para evitar que nuestro idioma se convirtiera en un caos difícilmente entendible. En buena hora porque, dada la **invasión** de vocablos que estábamos sufriendo, andábamos con un lío lingüístico algo más que importante (*ABC* 17-11-2005). Other examples of the term 'invasion' related to English and technological fields occur in *El País* 13-04-1997, 20-10-2001a, 30-03-1997b, and 20-10-2001b.
- <sup>46</sup> An article in *El País* published at the time of the presentation of the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* provided a summary and discussion of a number of the terms included in the new dictionary which sought to provide Spanish alternatives to the English borrowings, e.g. blog – *bitácura*, e-mail – *correo electrónico*, attachment – *adjunto*, stock – *existencias/reservas* (*El País* 13-11-2005a). In the same article there is reported speech which also draws on – and hence

---

reinforces – this discourse of conflict and a related/consequential discourse of protection, i.e. ‘defender la riqueza de la lengua española... una lengua asediada por los términos que generan las nuevas tecnologías, que suelen surgir en el ámbito anglosajón... hay batallas ya perdidas’. (defend the richness of the Spanish language...a language besieged by new technological terms which often arise in the Anglo-Saxon world...some battles are already lost)’.

<sup>47</sup> Pedro Luis Barcia, presidente de la Argentina de Letras, tercia: ‘Los extranjerismos se pueden usar si se indican en bastardilla’. Y remata: ‘Prefiero decir bastardilla porque indica su origen bastardo’ (ABC 11-11-2005). Extranjerismos, topónimos, cuestiones gramaticales, semánticas... Casi todas tienen cabida dentro de lo que para el mexicano Gonzalo Celorio ‘es la norma culta entre lo correcto y lo ejemplar’, y con atención especial, remarcada por el argentino Barcia, a los neologismos, ‘muchos de ellos marcados en bastardilla para dejar clara su condición de bastardos en nuestra lengua’, aseguró este último (El País 11-11-2005a). Ya sabe, por ejemplo, que no está solo cuando llama beige a lo que los españoles decimos beis; con ponerlo en bastardilla – ‘no en cursiva: en bastardilla; son palabras bastardas’- le basta para que el lector sepa que es una palabra extranjera: es decir, bastarda (El País 11-11-2005c).

<sup>48</sup> Fiesta grande del idioma en la Real Academia Española. La Asociación de Academias que labora por la unidad del español celebraba su primer medio siglo de vida (ABC 16-10-2001c). Con sus más de 7.000 entradas, el ‘Diccionario panhispánico de dudas’, presentado hoy en Madrid, ofrece respuestas claras y argumentadas a las principales dudas de los hablantes y tiene ‘su valor supremo en la autoridad que le confiere el ser una obra de consenso al **servicio de la unidad del idioma**’ (ABC 10-11-2005a). ...ese patrimonio, como cualquier otro, precisa conservación y mimo, correcta administración e incrementos en lo que resulte posible. La Real Academia, sus equivalentes americanas y otras muchas y doctas instituciones próximas hacen un buen trabajo que, ni reconocido ni pagado, ayuda en mucho a la salud del idioma (ABC 18-10-2001c).

<sup>49</sup> *La buena salud del español*: [...] La lengua española goza de excelente salud y la actual coyuntura histórica le es extremadamente favorable. Y ello al menos por tres razones. La primera, puramente biológica: con más de **350 millones de hablantes en todo el mundo** en una comunidad que tiene aún relativamente altas tasas de **crecimiento demográfico** no parece que su futuro sea incierto. La segunda razón es más importante: vivimos en una **sociedad de la comunicación, de la información o del conocimiento**; no es tema que interese precisar ahora. Pero toda información o conocimiento, aunque circule en *bits*, acaba volcándose en alguna lengua natural, y por ello la explosión de la comunicación potencia las lenguas bien asentadas. Basta comparar la dinámica del español con la del francés para percibir cómo las tendencias nos son favorables. De modo que las llamadas industrias de la lengua son ciertamente parte importantísima de una economía (pos)moderna de los servicios. Finalmente, la propia eclosión de las comunicaciones parece **despejar una vieja incógnita, la**

---

**de la fragmentación de la lengua** española (*El País* 20-04-1997). El presidente colombiano concluyó su alocución con un brindis por la 'buena salud' de la lengua española, 'la lengua de la vida, de la esperanza, de la comunicación y sobre todo (...) de la paz' (*ABC* 17-10-2001b). *La creatividad de los hablantes marcará los futuros derroteros de la lengua: El debate sobre la internacionalización del español confirma su actual buena salud [...] Y la lengua española goza de una extraordinaria salud. Fue entonces cuando disparó un arsenal de argumentos para demostrar que el español no es una lengua amenazada* (*El País* 20-11-2004g). El programa del congreso, desbordante, propiciará la reflexión sobre la salud y los retos de un idioma en auge, tomando por eje al español como instrumento de integración iberoamericana y como lengua de comunicación universal, además de su función en la ciencia, la técnica, el periodismo, el comercio, la diplomacia [...] (*ABC* 26-03-2007b).

<sup>50</sup> In one article by a Professor of Sociology in Madrid (*El País* 20-04-1997, see note 26), these factors are presented in a clearly ordered list of 'admirable' points or persuasive facts about the Spanish language, typical of what Aristotle called epideictic rhetorical argumentation (Richardson 2007:157).

<sup>51</sup> El II Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española deberá marcar la nueva cartografía intelectual, educativa, económica y política de una lengua que hoy es ya, tras el inglés, el segundo idioma internacional (*ABC* 12-10-2001). La pujanza del español aún no encuentra su reflejo en Internet, donde el inglés gana por goleada. A pesar ser hablado por 400 millones de personas, lo que convierte al español en la cuarta lengua en número de hablantes y la segunda en implantación en todo el mundo, únicamente 26 millones de hispanohablantes utilizan Internet y los contenidos en nuestro idioma en la Red ocupan un quinto lugar con sólo un 2,4 por ciento, tal como se constató ayer en el II Congreso de la Lengua Española (*ABC* 18-10-2001h). Que la lengua española ocupe el segundo lugar entre las de Occidente da crédito no de una amenaza, sino de una oportunidad (*El País* 18-11-2004e). Y una autocrítica asumida por todos: la escasa presencia del segundo idioma occidental en la red y la urgente necesidad de resolverla (*El País* 21-11-2004c); La presencia del español en los organismos internacionales debe adecuarse a su reconocida cualidad de segunda lengua en la comunicación universal (*ABC* 26-03-2007c).

<sup>52</sup> Otro dato, cerca del 15% del PIB actual de nuestro país tiene que ver con el español (*El País* 27-10-2006); Otra riqueza de la lengua es puramente económica, como destacó el director del Instituto Cervantes, César Antonio Molina, que cifró en un 15% su aportación al Producto Interior Bruto (*El País* 27-03-2007a). A este aspecto se refirió el presidente José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero durante la inauguración del congreso, donde afirmó que la industria editorial es la tercera en exportación en Europa y la quinta en el mundo, además de señalar que en torno al 15 por ciento PIB nacional tiene que ver con el español (*ABC* 28-10-2006). Al menos el 5% de nuestro PIB lo generan empresas y actividades en las que el español como lengua es determinante. Hay quienes como el profesor Martín Municio, en un pionero y espléndido

- 
- trabajo, lo elevó hasta el 15% al sumar también la riqueza generada con alguna influencia del español (ABC 29-10-2006). Según cifras del Instituto Cervantes, el valor de nuestra lengua como plataforma cultural y herramienta utilizada en el mundo de los negocios representa un 15% del PIB, una cifra muy cercana al porcentaje que genera el sector turístico (ABC 31-12-2006).
- <sup>53</sup> Further research is needed to determine the extent to which press discourse in other Spanish-speaking countries addresses the perceived economic benefits of language acquisition related industries.
- <sup>54</sup> 'La Academia no es más que un notario de los usos idiomáticos y trata de recomendar aquellos en los que **la comunidad de hispanohablantes** ha estado más de acuerdo y que, por tanto, considera más correctos', afirma. [...] El idioma es, desde esta perspectiva, el vínculo, el gran basamento de la comunidad española (El País 30-04-1997a).
- <sup>55</sup> 'No se puede olvidar que la comunidad hispanohablante', señaló también, 'añade al patrimonio de la lengua común la riqueza del plurilingüismo' (El País 18-11-2004e). *El Rey: 'El español es un instrumento para la paz y la solidaridad'* Su aprobación es un hecho que debemos celebrar por cuanto constituye un patrimonio común de la Humanidad, que se actualiza y preserva en provecho de toda la comunidad hispanohablante' (ABC 25-03-2007e).
- <sup>56</sup> El IV Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española, que ha concluido este jueves en Cartagena de Indias (Colombia), ha puesto de manifiesto que el español se ha consolidado como lengua de comunicación universal y de **la unidad iberoamericana** (El País 30-03-2007a). Desbordamiento (7.500 participantes frente a los 2.500 previstos) como demostración de algo más profundo: **la comunidad iberoamericana y lo panhispánico**. Ésa es quizá la gran conclusión, según los organizadores, que puede extraerse del IV Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española (El País 31-03-2007a).
- <sup>57</sup> Pero valga la advertencia: el idioma español no sólo es el mayor activo intelectual de **una comunidad de cuatrocientos millones de hablantes**, sino que, además, constituye, o podría constituir, una inmensa riqueza, no sólo cultural, que ya lo es desde hace siglos, sino económica (ABC 12-10-2001).
- <sup>58</sup> *Discurso de Víctor García de la Concha* ...gracias a eso [nacimiento de las Academias americanas] se aseguró la unidad de una lengua que es **el** elemento vertebrador de la actual comunidad de naciones hispánicas (ABC 15-11-2005).
- <sup>59</sup> El español es ya el patrimonio más valioso de los países y de los cientos de millones de personas que 'formamos **una comunidad plural**, abierta a todos y a la que precisamente una e identifica la lengua común', sostuvo El Rey (ABC 11-10-2001).
- <sup>60</sup> *Discurso íntegro del Rey* En este sentido, desearía saludar en primer lugar a los Presidentes de México y Argentina, con los que me honra compartir la Presidencia de Honor de este Congreso. Mis saludos de bienvenida igualmente a los Presidentes de Colombia y Guinea Ecuatorial, así como al representante de la Presidenta de Filipinas. Su presencia hoy aquí,

---

expresión de la continuidad a la que antes me refería, es la mejor prueba de que **la comunidad de naciones que utiliza el español** como instrumento de comunicación avanza con determinación y dinamismo, a través de proyectos y realizaciones bien concretos, como resultado de una herencia histórica y cultural hondamente enraizada en nuestros pueblos. [...] Nuestro idioma es el medio en el que se desarrollan los contactos y las relaciones en el seno de esa vasta comunidad de personas. [...] De este proceso, el idioma español debería salir enriquecido y reforzado, del mismo modo que los ciudadanos que lo utilizan. Efectivamente, las posibilidades de proyección exterior de nuestra lengua, de su patrimonio y de su cultura se incrementan de una forma hasta hace poco impensable, mientras que la utilización intensiva [...] de las nuevas tecnologías hace posible una difusión sin precedentes de la educación y la formación. Este nuevo y prometedor horizonte permite contemplar con optimismo las perspectivas de nuestro futuro como comunidad de hispanohablantes (ABC 17-10-2001c).

<sup>61</sup> *Superación de Babel* Julián Marías, de la Real Academia Española. Creo que ahora puede comprenderse mejor que nunca la idea de '**Mundo Hispánico**'. Cuando se habla de 'Tercer Mundo' no se sabe lo que se dice: los diferentes pueblos que tienen un nivel de desarrollo económico y técnico arbitrariamente fijado no tienen nada que ver entre sí: no son un mundo. Un mundo significa un repertorio de creencias, vigencias, usos, costumbres, saberes, estilos, que tienen unidad y admiten una espléndida diversidad. El Mundo Hispánico es efectivamente eso: un mundo; en este sentido, entre las lenguas universales, pertenecería el primer puesto al español, aunque en otros sentidos hay que poner por delante el inglés (ABC 18-10-2001b).

<sup>62</sup> El Panhispánico se presenta como un elemento clave en la configuración de las relaciones entre los **hispanoparlantes**, que a partir de ahora **tendremos** un sistema de referencia al que acudir cuando surjan las lagunas/riquezas del uso cotidiano y distanciado del lenguaje. Este diccionario facilitará la comunicación, multiplicará las vías expresivas de quienes trabajamos con palabras y terminará, en fin, por incrementar el patrimonio cultural de **quienes somos habitantes de una misma realidad lingüística**, con independencia del lugar de expedición del pasaporte (ABC 12-11-2005).

<sup>63</sup> Here, Spanish is designated *the* primary factor in the community of Hispanic nations rather than *an* element, reiterating the primacy of language over other factors of unity.

<sup>64</sup> Pero, como el propio Cela ha dicho, 'es bueno que **sepamos** defender esa maravilla de **nuestra lengua común**' (ABC 08-04-1997b). Jon Juaristi, ha subrayado al apelar a la unidad de todos 'para afrontar juntos riesgos y esperanzas, porque **como pueblo no tenemos otro destino que nuestra lengua común**' (El País 19-10-2001b). Este nuevo diccionario aclara dudas y fija el modo correcto de usar nuevas palabras y extranjerismos que hemos ido acoplado a nuestro lenguaje cotidiano y que convenía adaptar y filtrar para **evitar que nuestro idioma se convirtiera en un caos** difícilmente entendible. En buena hora porque, dada **la invasión de**

- 
- vocablos que estábamos sufriendo, andábamos con un lío lingüístico** algo más que importante (ABC 17-11-2005). *Un cuerpo con 22 almas* ([The Spanish language is] ‘One body with 22 souls’) (*El País* 13-11-05b).
- <sup>65</sup> There are twenty-three members, but Puerto Rico is an associated free state of the USA. The other members of the CIN are Andorra, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Spain, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Uruguay, Venezuela.
- <sup>66</sup> Unidad y diversidad – (*El País* 21-11-2004c).
- <sup>67</sup> De hecho, la obra llega a las librerías con el aval de los medios informativos de mayor peso en la comunidad hispana, que se han comprometido ya a adoptarlo ‘como norma básica de referencia’, según ha dicho en nombre de ellos Alberto Casas, de la emisora colombiana Radio Caracol (*El País* 10-11-2005a).
- <sup>68</sup> Recorrer el Diccionario panhispánico de dudas sirve para descubrir con qué imprecisión se utilizan tantos términos heredados del inglés, e invita a defender la riqueza de la lengua española. **Pero sobre todo sirve para unificar criterios, de ahí su voluntad de ser normativo en España e Hispanoamérica, y limpiar** de incorrecciones una lengua asediada por los términos que generan las nuevas tecnologías, que suelen surgir en el ámbito anglosajón. Aun así, hay batallas ya perdidas (y vaya que suenan mal en algunos casos). Por ejemplo, *monitorear*, que viene del inglés *monitor* (‘dispositivo o pantalla de control’), y que ya se ha aceptado ‘con el sentido de vigilar o seguir mediante un monitor’ (*El País* 13-11-2005a).
- <sup>69</sup> Another example of commercial involvement in language standardisation is the ‘*Recomendaciones de uso de nuestro idioma*’ article which is a feature of Iberia’s in-flight magazine. Not only is Iberia seen as Spain’s national airline, and ‘its Madrid hub acts as the European gateway to Latin America’ (BBC News 2008), but it also considers itself ‘one of the most important vehicles for the dissemination of Spanish’ (Iberia 2008:58). Its role in promoting a particular vision of Spanish to a very international readership is therefore significant.

## Chapter 6

- <sup>70</sup> *I Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Lingüistas y académicos rechazan la ‘jubilación de la ortografía’*. Zamora: ‘Se puede ser un gran escritor y saber poco de lingüística’. Lapesa: ‘Los que hablan contra la ortografía suelen ser personas que no se han ocupado de sujetarse a ninguna norma’. Alarcos: [...] ‘Además, García Márquez exagera. La ortografía española es de las más sencillas y su aprendizaje aporta una sencilla imagen visual de las palabras’. [...] Por su parte, Luis Goytisolo calificó de ‘despropósito’ la propuesta del Nobel. [...] Nieva: ‘De broma’ [...] Salvador: ‘García Márquez convierte en realismo mágico lo que su prosa toca y viste como aceptable’ (ABC 09-04-1997).

- 
- <sup>71</sup> No comment from any of the American Academies was included in Spain's press at the time, only reference by Víctor García de la Concha to a Latin American – Andrés Bello – who did much towards assuring panhispanic language unity in his day, yet highlighted the need for existing moves towards more collegial and combined efforts in inter-Academic activity. Interestingly though, within two years a new and revised orthography had been published. Although there was little difference to the previous edition ('Apenas hay en ella novedad de doctrina' (RAE 1999:xiii)) and while RAE logo and authorship remained prominent, it was the first publication to be described as 'panhispanic', a claim which broadened the authorship, scope, and authority of collective publications of the RAE and ASALE.
- <sup>72</sup> *La Real Academia pide a los profesores que sean rigurosos con la ortografía en las pruebas de selectividad* La Real Academia Española (RAE) remitirá en los próximos días al consejero de Educación, Gustavo Villapalos, y a los rectores de las universidades madrileñas una declaración institucional sobre la 'ineludible' necesidad de aplicar las normas de corrección y propiedad idiomáticas a la calificación de los exámenes de cualquier asignatura. [...] La Academia matiza: 'La corrección ortográfica no es circunstancia que dependa del estado de ánimo del alumno, sino una muestra esencial de su verdadero nivel de formación, y así debe entenderse en todo sistema educativo' (*El País* 14-04-1997).
- <sup>73</sup> Seguidamente Camilo José Cela [...] Se lamentó del olvido del latín en la enseñanza, por su 'poder integrador en nuestra lengua' e hizo votos por que se ponga remedio. (*ABC* 08-04-1997a).
- <sup>74</sup> 'La educación idiomática de los españoles es pésima' Fernando Lázaro, Carreter, que dirige la Real Academia Española desde 1991, se propone en su último libro, *El dardo en la palabra* [...] 'combatir la ignorancia y la necedad idiomática'. [...] Los artículos recogidos en este tomo se publicaron en *Informaciones*, *ABC* y otros periódicos nacionales e internacionales. Fueron distribuidos por la agencia Efe. En comentarios hechos a este periódico, Lázaro Carreter afirma que la educación idiomática de los españoles es pésima. [...] P. Usted no se cansa de luchar contra el empobrecimiento del idioma. ¿Cuál es el problema de fondo? R. Detrás del empobrecimiento del idioma está el mal funcionamiento de las instituciones educativas. La cuestión misma de no tener en cuenta las faltas de ortografía en algunos exámenes revela hasta qué punto el idioma ha dejado de ser interesante, cuando es el mayor activo que tenemos en la vida cultural, individual y colectiva de los españoles. El fracaso de la enseñanza del idioma es verdaderamente notable por culpa de los pedagogos oficiales que fijan los planes de estudio. Están destruyendo la educación idiomática, que, todo hay que decirlo, es pésima. La lengua es todo. [...] El idioma es la piel del alma. (*El País* 30-03-1997b).
- <sup>75</sup> Fernando Lázaro Carreter también afirmó que los periodistas tienen hoy más influencia sobre el lenguaje que los escritores y poetas, por lo que 'tienen una responsabilidad especial que no tiene el resto de los mortales, a los que no nos oye nadie'. Según el director de la Real Academia Española, el lenguaje actualmente se oye y se ve en los medios de comunicación, de

---

ahí que se analice especialmente el uso que los periodistas hacen de éste, su instrumento de trabajo (ABC 13-04-1997a).

<sup>76</sup> *'Trabajamos en pie de igualdad'* (Víctor García de la Concha) [...] Que en el marco de la visita de Estado haya V. E. reservado un espacio para venir a esta Casa expresa por sí solo la conciencia que V. E. tiene de lo que la Lengua supone como patria común de los pueblos hispánicos, y de **lo que al servicio de su unidad hacen la Real Academia Española y las Academias hermanas** que con ella integran la Asociación de Academias (*El País* 16-10-2001e).

<sup>77</sup> Other aspects of the discourse of 'unity' include the following data in which the King (and other Spanish-speaking heads of state) represents a global Spanish language community in which communicative (and other?) differences are minimised (achicar): 'La presencia de Su Majestad el Rey de España y del presidente mexicano Ernesto Zedillo en la reunión de Zacatecas significa mucho más que un simple acto protocolario y refleja la creciente sensibilidad de los países de habla hispana hacia soluciones de convergencia que entiendan la lengua como recurso estratégico de agregación cultural, económica y de poder en un escenario definido por los vectores de la globalización. Una ocasión para achicar los espacios de la incomunicación y desarrollar, lejos de la retórica nostálgica poscolonial, el espacio de lo hispano en el amplio territorio de la lengua.' (*El País* 07-04-1997a).

<sup>78</sup> *El II Congreso de la Lengua de Valladolid potenciará el español como recurso económico.* MADRID. Antonio Astorga. Los directores del Cervantes y de la Real Academia Española, Jon Juaristi y Víctor García de la Concha, presentaron ayer el II Congreso de la Lengua (ABC 28-09-2001). El próximo Congreso Internacional de la Lengua se celebrará en 2007 y Cartagena de Indias será la ciudad anfitriona, como anunciaron ayer el director de la Real Academia Española, Víctor García de la Concha, y el del Instituto Cervantes, César Antonio Molina (ABC 20-11-2004a).

<sup>79</sup> *ABC entra en la sala de máquinas del idioma.* Por último, no olvidamos que el otro gran recurso del idioma en el mundo es el Instituto Cervantes, por lo que también dedicamos un espacio a explicar la dimensión de su trabajo, destacando que es la primera ventana por la que se asoman al español los nuevos hablantes (ABC 16-11-2004a).

<sup>80</sup> *La Real Academia, a 200 por hora.* Víctor García de la Concha, el director de la Española, explicó cómo surgió la idea de esta fenomenal herramienta de consulta, hace cinco años en el Congreso de Zacatecas. 'Fue asumido por las 22 academias, por el Instituto Cervantes y hemos contado con el patrocinio generoso de Telefónica. La palabra mecenazgo es en este caso muy adecuada. Estamos convencidos de que Santillana, que ya está trabajando en él, hará una edición tan cuidadosa y excelente como la que ha hecho del Quijote' (*El País* 19-11-2004a). *La Real Academia Española y el Instituto Cervantes crean un Observatorio del Neologismo para vigilar el idioma* (ABC 20-10-2001b).

<sup>81</sup> [...] la opinión de Lázaro Carreter **tiene el valor** de ser la de alguien tan **atento al pasado** - entre sus proyectos sigue una Historia de la lengua literaria- **como al frenético presente** del

---

español, o sea, **a su futuro** (*El País* 13-10-2001b). Media hora después de que Fox atravesara **la 'casa solar' del español**, abandonó el lugar en un imponente Rolls-Royce negro, dejando tras de sí una gran sintonía entre los académicos hispanos (*El País* 16-10-2001a).

- <sup>82</sup> *La Real Academia, a 200 por hora* (*El País* 19-11-2004a). *El valor económico y el futuro del español*. Hasta hace no demasiados años, la Real Academia Española ha padecido desequilibrios notorios. [...] Es de justicia reconocer la gran labor promovida por su anterior presidente, Lázaro Carreter, continuada, perfeccionada y llevada a efecto más tarde por Víctor García de la Concha, brillante conductor de la casa en los días que corren. Iniciativas tan laboriosas, brillantes, necesarias y recientes como el Diccionario del Estudiante y el Diccionario Panhispánico de Dudas, con siete mil doscientas entradas, constituyen testimonios del dinamismo y la capacidad de esta institución que hoy aquí premiamos. La Academia ha comprendido que era necesario valerse, para la codificación del idioma, de los medios que aportaba la tecnología moderna. Y ha dado principio a novedades de gran calado, de las que destaco dos a modo de ejemplo, además de las antes citadas: la creación del Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual, que permite recorrer las formas orales o escritas con vigencia en España e Hispanoamérica, y la del Corpus Diacrónico del Español, que pone a disposición del usuario los procedimientos informáticos de búsqueda, para rastrear el origen y las sucesivas vicisitudes en el tiempo de un término cualquiera (*ABC* 16-11-2005a).
- <sup>83</sup> El secretario general de la Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española y académico puertorriqueño, Humberto López Morales... (*ABC* 29-11-2005). Como ha señalado el escritor y académico Mario Vargas Llosa... (*El País* 17-10-2001a). El novelista y académico Antonio Muñoz Molina... (*ABC* 27-03-2007a).
- <sup>84</sup> "La Academia no es más que **un notario** de los usos idiomáticos y trata de **recomendar** aquellos en los que **la comunidad de hispanohablantes ha estado más de acuerdo** y que, por tanto, considera más correctos", afirma (*El País* 30-03-1997a).
- <sup>85</sup> La sociedad hispanohablante, cabalmente representada en Zacatecas, ha expresado el deseo de mantener su idioma común y defenderlo ante la invasión anglosajona, que llega principalmente por la vía informática (*El País* 13-04-1997).
- <sup>86</sup> A similar metaphor occurs in an interview with Pedro Luís Barcía, President of the *Academia Argentina de Letras*: 'Tomamos de la lengua del pueblo su naturalidad, la ordenamos y la devolvemos al pueblo, para que el pueblo tome conciencia del bagaje que tiene, de la riqueza que realmente tiene en su expresión, en su vocabulario, y que se sienta orgulloso de esto' (*El País* 14-11-2004b).

## Chapter 7

- <sup>87</sup> *ABC* 08-04-1997a; *ABC* 24-04-1997b; *ABC* 11-10-2001; *ABC* 17-10-2001a; *ABC* 20-10-2001c; *ABC* 16-11-2004b; *ABC* 16-11-2005a; *ABC* 16-11-2005b; *ABC* 16-11-2005d; *ABC* 16-11-2005e; *ABC* 26-

- 
- 03-2007b; *El País* 16-10-2001a; *El País* 16-10-2001d; *El País* 19-10-2001d; *El País* 19-10-2001e; *El País* 14-11-2004b; *El País* 22-11-2004; *El País* 09-11-2005a; *El País* 23-03-2007; *El País* 30-03-2007a.
- <sup>88</sup> El siguiente paso de los países iberoamericanos sólo puede ser uno: ‘Conseguir que el siglo XXI sea el siglo del español’, dijo César Antonio Molina, y recordó que son cuatro las patas que lo convierten ‘en **un idioma en expansión en el mundo** que en los últimos años ha alcanzado cotas sin precedentes: el crecimiento de hablantes (con más de 400 millones de hablantes, es la cuarta lengua más hablada del mundo e idioma oficial de 21 países), sus características (ser sumamente homogénea y unitaria, ‘sin apenas riesgos de fragmentación’), su fertilísima diversidad y el ser ‘una de las grandes lenguas de cultura desde al menos el siglo XIII’. (*El País* 22-11-2004).
- <sup>89</sup> A particularly interesting phrase referred to the process of ‘the internationalisation of Spanish’, which was the title of the final section of the 3rd *CILE* in Rosario, and was much-publicised and debated in both *El País* and *ABC* (*El País* 14-11-2004a; *El País* 17-11-2004; *ABC* 17-11-2004b; *El País* 20-11-2004a; *El País* 20-11-2004c; *ABC* 20-11-2004c; *El País* 21-11-2004b; *El País* 21-11-2004c).
- <sup>90</sup> *García de la Concha defiende una política lingüística panhispánica*. ‘El déficit que el español arrastra como lengua de la ciencia y de la técnica; su todavía escasa presencia en el campo de las comunicaciones informáticas, y su uso limitado en el mundo de las relaciones diplomáticas.’ (*El País* 08-02-2006); Y una autocrítica asumida por todos: la escasa presencia del segundo idioma occidental en la red y la urgente necesidad de resolverla. (*El País* 21-11-2004c).
- <sup>91</sup> ‘Esta gran congregación es un buen síntoma si a esto le siguen políticas de apoyo y promoción de la lengua, un gran patrimonio de los hispanohablantes, para que adquiriera una importancia no sólo cultural, sino también política y económica’, destacó el novelista. (*El País* 16-10-2001a).
- <sup>92</sup> For example, when the 3rd *CILE* opened in Rosario, *El País* foregrounded this historical topos with the headline *El idioma de Cervantes, frente a la globalización* (*El País* 14-11-2004a) which collocates the past glorious writer of the Spanish language with the present and future context of the globalised world.
- <sup>93</sup> El periodismo escrito, hasta hace un tiempo, tenía una versión regional, o más bien local, con aspiración a la gente que habitualmente lo lee. Cuando aparecen los diarios on line, la aspiración es trascender las fronteras. Entonces, en la lengua del on line se busca **una universalidad mayor del español, no con tantos rasgos regionales que atan el español a un ámbito**. (*El País* 14-11-2004b).
- <sup>94</sup> Entre los objetivos del congreso, además de precisar y potenciar la capacidad del español como incentivo económico en la actual sociedad de la información, también se encuentra el estudio de la unidad y variedad del español desde la perspectiva de las normas española e hispanoamericana «para llegar a una norma panhispánica». (*ABC* 16-10-2001a).

- 
- <sup>95</sup> [...] el último gran proyecto de Diccionario Panhispánico de Dudas que la RAE ha realizado codo con codo con el resto de Academias correspondientes. (*ABC* 16-11-2004a).
- <sup>96</sup> Hoy son algo más de 400 millones los hispanohablantes; de ellos sólo la décima parte corresponden a España. En términos demográficos es una lengua mucho más americana que española (*El País* 17-10-2001a); Nueve de cada diez hablantes están en América, en Estados Unidos hablan español más personas que en nuestro país [...] (*ABC* 16-11-2004a); Piense usted que de cada 10 personas que hablan español, 9 viven en América (*El País* 10-11-2005c); En España hablamos español el 10 por 100 de los hispanohablantes del mundo (México tiene más de cien millones) (*ABC* 23-03-2007);
- <sup>97</sup> **P.** Parece que somos menos hispanocentristas. **R.** Huyamos de eso, por favor. Aquí se ha reconocido la legitimidad de todas las variantes que existen: el porteño vale igual que el madrileño. Y se ha aceptado que hay una norma abstracta muy flexible, que es la norma culta, la lengua estándar, la que se puede entender en todos lados. **P.** ¿Y quién la determina? **R.** Ahora hay que investigar eso, hay que saber quién hace la norma culta. Creo que es la de los escritores prestigiosos, los textos científicos y, sobre todo, los medios. Los modelos más imitables, sobre todo la radio y la televisión. Por eso tienen una responsabilidad enorme, mayor que la de los profesores. Una de ellas es no llenar de muletillas el habla de la gente. (*El País* 19-10-2001f).
- <sup>98</sup> A similar construction of linguistically important geographical space takes place when key events other than the Congresses are held in particular cities, such as the meeting of the 22 Academies in Medellín, Colombia, prior to the Congress, and even the fictitious city of Macondo which features in the works of celebrated writer Gabriel García Marquez: (*El País* 23-03-2007) La expectación que ha traído el paso del tiempo y el trabajo de 10 años conjunto entre las 22 academias han situado a **Medellín como ciudad de la palabra**; (*ABC* 27-03-2007a) *Don Juan Carlos sitúa a Macondo como «un lugar de la lengua española».*
- <sup>99</sup> Indeed, the Academic Claudio Guillén argues that there is in fact no conceivable 'centre' of the Spanish language: 'Para Claudio Guillén (París, 1924) -hijo del poeta Jorge Guillén, que ha vivido casi la mitad de su vida en el exilio (desde 1939 hasta 1983)- ya no hay un centro lingüístico y aboga por aumentar el conocimiento mutuo entre España y Latinoamérica. (*El País* 13-11-2004a)'
- <sup>100</sup> Nueve de cada diez hablantes del español se encuentran al otro lado del Atlántico. **El español es ya una lengua americana**, de ahí su irreversible presencia emergente en Estados Unidos y su cada vez más fuerte demanda en Brasil. Lo que hoy da sentido al español en el mundo es su proyección atlántica, y donde España tiene una baza imponente de promoción es, precisamente, más allá de cualquier otra actividad económica, industrial o cultural, en el apoyo y mimo de la lengua como base y vertebración de su presencia internacional. (*ABC* 12-10-2001); Hoy son algo más de 400 millones los hispanohablantes; de ellos sólo la décima parte corresponden a España. En términos demográficos es una lengua mucho más americana

---

que española. Como ha señalado el escritor y académico Mario Vargas Llosa, América fue definitiva para que el español rompiera su moldura inicial. (*El País* 17-10-2001a); 'El español está alcanzando cotas verdaderamente importantes. En Estados Unidos hay ahora mismo 32 millones de hispanohablantes, y esto excluye a los hispanos que han perdido su idioma original. Dentro de 45 años es muy probable que haya cerca de 100 millones. En México, en la actualidad hay 101 millones, y en Brasil se espera que en los próximos años se llegue a 30 millones. (López Morales, *El País* 09-11-2005a); En América tenemos el mayor caudal de hispanohablantes, (Barcia - Pdte de la Academia Argentina, *El País* 14-11-2004b).

<sup>101</sup> Los esfuerzos realizados por las Academias de la Lengua o por el Instituto Cervantes para acompañar la difusión del idioma a la acelerada marcha de las nuevas tecnologías no son caprichosos, sino imprescindibles. No se puede perder de vista, por ejemplo, el inmediato escenario que va a dibujarse en Estados Unidos, donde pronto habrá más hispanohablantes que en la propia España, con todo lo que este hecho significa. (*ABC* 17-10-2001a).

<sup>102</sup> García de la Concha le respondió que lo que se persigue es la unidad del idioma y manifestaba a los medios que el español es «la patria de todos» y que se encamina a «un mayor fortalecimiento de su unidad» gracias al trabajo de todas las Academias de habla española. (*El País* 28-09-2001).

<sup>103</sup> Porque la norma —es bien sabido— no la hacen los académicos sino los hablantes. **La Academia y la Asociación de Academias cumplen una función notarial o registral:** abren sus ojos y sus oídos para ver y oír lo que el pueblo hispanohablante, en un nivel medio de cultura, considera correcto o incorrecto, culto, coloquial o vulgar. Y lo fijan en el cuerpo, cambiante como organismo vivo que es, del sistema de la Lengua española. (García de la Concha 2008:1).

# A

## FAIRCLOUGH'S CDA QUESTIONS (2001)

### (I) Description

#### **A. Vocabulary**

1. What experiential values do words have?
  - What classification schemes are drawn upon?
  - Are there words which are ideologically contested?
  - Is there *rewording* or *overwording*?
  - What ideologically significant meaning relations (*synonymy*, *hyponymy*, *antonymy*) are there between words?
2. What relational values do words have?
  - Are there euphemistic expressions?
  - Are there markedly formal or informal words?
3. What expressive values do words have?
4. What metaphors are used?

#### **B. Grammar**

5. What experiential value do grammatical features have?
  - What types of *process* and *participant* predominate?
  - Is agency unclear?
  - Are processes what they seem?
  - Are *nominalizations* used?
  - Are sentences active or passive?
  - Are sentences positive or negative?
6. What relational values do grammatical features have?
  - What *modes* (*declarative*, *grammatical question*, *imperative*) are used?
  - Are there important features of *relational modality*?
  - Are the pronouns *we* and *you* used, and if so, how?
7. What expressive values do grammatical features have?
  - Are there important features of *expressive modality*?
8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?
  - What logical connectors are used?
  - Are complex sentences characterized by *coordination* or *subordination*?
  - What means are used for referring outside and inside the text?

### **C. Textual structures**

9. What interactional conventions are used?

- Are there ways in which one participant controls the contributions of others?

10. What larger-scale structures does the text have?

#### (II) Interpretation

- Context: What interpretation(s) are participants giving to the situational and intertextual contexts?
- Discourse type: what discourse type(s) are being drawn upon (hence what rules, systems or principles of phonology, grammar, sentence cohesion, vocabulary, semantics and pragmatics; and what schemata, frames and scripts)?

#### (III) Explanation

- Social determinants: what power relations at situational, institutional and societal levels help shape this discourse?
- Ideologies: what elements of MR [member's resources] which are drawn upon have an ideological character?
- Effects: how is this discourse positioned in relation to struggles at the situational, institutional and societal levels? Are these struggles overt or covert? Is the discourse normative with respect to MR or creative? Does it contribute to sustaining existing power relations, or transforming them?

(based on Fairclough 2001: Chapters 5-6)

# B

## NVIVO DATA ANALYSIS CATEGORIES

The categories under the Genre, Grammar, Vocabulary and Textual Structure sections were informed by CDA approaches. All other categories arose from my own analysis of the data.

<b>TEXTUAL FEATURES (tree nodes)</b>		
<b>CATEGORY OF ARTICLE</b>		
Context	Language and economy	Role and authority of RAE
Corpus-deficit-borrowings	Other languages	Unity and community
History of spanish	Spanish in the world	
<b>EVENTS</b>		
1 CILE – Zacatecas	DPD	Ortografía
2 CILE – Valladolid	DRAE	Other Publications
3 CILE – Rosario	Libro de estilo	SICELE
4 CILE – Cartagenas	Nueva Gramática	
<b>GENRE</b>		
Feature article	News article	Short news article
Interview	Opinion	Speech text
<b>GRAMMAR</b>		
Active	G expressive	modes – obligation
Agency	G relational	Nominalisations
direct quotation	modes – conditional	Passive
G experiential	modes – indicative	reported speech
<b>TEXTUAL STRUCTURE</b>		
assumptions - presumed knowledge	Intertextual reference	Linking
Coordination - subordination	Intratextual reference	predictable elements of discourse type
<b>VOCABULARY</b>		
Anglicisms-borrowings	Legitimising strategy	Statistics
Delegitimising strategy	Metaphor	V experiential
Different discourse	Metonym	V expressive
Euphemism	Naturalisation—mystification	V relational
Hyperbole-exaggeration	Neologism	

TOPICS (free nodes)		
America	Future of spanish	Political importance of language
Americanismos	Globalisation	Political language
Backgrounding	Importance--prestige	Popular resistance
Brazil	Lang and cultural value	Science--technology
Capital of spanish language	Lang and media importance	Simulated equality
Care + - of language	Lang as economic asset	Social practices
Challenges	Lang as industry	Spain as minority of SSW
Collaboration	Lang as instrument	Spanglish
Common language	Language spread	Spanish in USA
Comparison	Liberalisation-RAE	Splendour
Control interaction	Literature--writers	Sport commentators
Defence	Location	Terms for RAE
Dialogue	Media language	'Total spanish'
Doubts of lang users	Modernisation-RAE	Unity—diversity
Education	Norms	Varieties
English	Panhispanic language policy	Women—feminism
Foregrounding	Perspective of history—present	

AGENTS (cases)		
ABC	Instituto Cervantes	Spain Government
ASALE	Latin American Governments	Spanish Royal Family
Business	Other Guardians	
El País	RAE	

# PRIMARY DATA REFERENCES

## ARTICLES FROM ABC

All articles were collected in electronic form from the 'Archivo' page (<http://abc.mynewsonline.com/?method=query>) of ABC online and were accessed during the period July – September 2007.

- (ABC 02-04-1997) Anon. *El director de ABC presentó 'El dardo en la palabra', del director de la Real Academia Española.*
- (ABC 08-04-1997a) Anon. *El Rey señala que el cuidado de la lengua debe ser una de las metas de los medios de comunicación.*
- (ABC 08-04-1997b) Anon. *Diálogo de la lengua.*
- (ABC 09-04-1997) Anon. *I Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Lingüistas y académicos rechazan la 'jubilación de la ortografía'.*
- (ABC 10-04-1997a) Anon. *I Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Eco de las propuestas de Anson y Cebrián para que Academias y periodistas colaboren.*
- (ABC 10-04-1997b) Anon. *I Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Zabludovsky: 'Las Academias deben abrirse a los que hacen esplendor de la lengua hablada'.*
- (ABC 11-04-1997) Anon. *I Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Martín Municio: 'En el campo de la tecnología el español no funciona bien'.*
- (ABC 13-04-1997a) Anon. *La Real Academia exige más rigor 'en la valoración ortográfica de los aspirantes a la Universidad'.*
- (ABC 24-04-1997b) Anon. *Rodríguez Adrados solicita más ayuda institucional para la defensa del español.*
- (ABC 28-09-2001) Antonio Astorga. *El II Congreso de la Lengua de Valladolid potenciará el español como recurso económico.*
- (ABC 06-10-2001) Rosa Valdelomar. *Guillermo Rojo: 'Hoy en día el monolingüismo no es defendible'.*
- (ABC 11-10-2001) Antonio Astorga. *Don Juan Carlos: 'El español, ahora más que nunca, ha de ser concordia y tolerancia'.*
- (ABC 12-10-2001) Anon. *La lengua, una inmensa riqueza.*
- (ABC 12-10-2001b) Antonio Astorga. *El Diccionario de la Real Academia admite talibán y fundamentalismo.*
- (ABC 14-10-2001) Anon. *Juaristi reclama a políticos y empresarios más atención al español.*
- (ABC 16-10-2001a) Anon. *Tras la norma panhispana.*
- (ABC 16-10-2001b) J. Álvarez. *Valladolid se convierte en la capital del español.*
- (ABC 16-10-2001c) Antonio Astorga. *Las veintidós Academias de la Lengua Española celebran sus bodas de oro.*
- (ABC 17-10-2001a) Anon. *Seña de identidad.*
- (ABC 17-10-2001b) Anon. *Pastrana defiende la solidaridad del español.*

- (ABC 17-10-2001c) Anon. *Discurso íntegro del Rey.*
- (ABC 17-10-2001d) Félix Iglesias. *El Rey subraya que el español debe ser más que nunca instrumento de cooperación entre los pueblos.*
- (ABC 17-10-2001e) Ignacio Ruiz Quintano. *Pange lingua.*
- (ABC 17-10-2001f) Félix Iglesias. *Fox: 'Defendamos la lengua sin cerrazón'.*
- (ABC 18-10-2001a) Félix Iglesias. *Las Academias preparan un Libro de Estilo del español.*
- (ABC 18-10-2001b) Julián Marías. *Superación de Babel.*
- (ABC 18-10-2001c) M. Martín Ferrand. *Mucho Congreso, poca eficacia.*
- (ABC 18-10-2001h) Félix Iglesias. *La pujanza del español aún no encuentra su reflejo en Internet, donde el inglés gana por goleada.*
- (ABC 20-10-2001a) Anon. *Abrir el idioma.*
- (ABC 20-10-2001b) Tulio Demicheli. *La Real Academia Española y el Instituto Cervantes crean un Observatorio del Neologismo para vigilar el idioma.*
- (ABC 20-10-2001c) Félix Iglesias. *Carlos Fuentes: 'El español es una lengua impura'.*
- (ABC 21-10-2001b) Elena Mohíno. *Las Academias del español apoyan la creación del Museo de la Lengua.*
- (ABC 13-10-2004) Jesús García Calero. *Las Academias de la Lengua Española despejan hoy las dudas de todos los hablantes del mundo.*
- (ABC 16-11-2004a) Jesús García Calero. *ABC entra en la sala de máquinas del idioma.*
- (ABC 16-11-2004b) EFE. *'Ya se ha acabado eso de que una Academia mande', afirma Carmen Calvo.*
- (ABC 17-11-2004b) Carmen de Carlos. *Rosario se erige hoy en capital del español.*
- (ABC 19-11-2004) Carmen de Carlos. *El panhispánico de dudas, un diccionario de combate contra extranjerismos.*
- (ABC 20-11-2004a) Carmen de Carlos. *El IV Congreso se celebrará en Cartagena de Indias en 2007.*
- (ABC 20-11-2004c) Carmen de Carlos. *Alfredo Bryce Echenique: 'La Academia se esfuerza por mantenerse al día, pero es imposible'.*
- (ABC 10-11-2005a) EFE Madrid. *Un Diccionario panhispánico de dudas.*
- (ABC 11-11-2005) Anon. *Presentado en la RAE el primer diccionario que 'baja a la calle': el Panhispánico de Dudas.*
- (ABC 12-11-2005) Víctor Charneco. *El Panhispánico.*
- (ABC 15-11-2005) Anon. *Discurso de Víctor García de la Concha.*
- (ABC 16-11-2005b) Anon. *Servir al idioma es servir al bien común.*
- (ABC 16-11-2005c) Opinión. *Lengua común.*
- (ABC 16-11-2005d) Anon. *Una lengua viva.*
- (ABC 16-11-2005e) A. Astorga/A. M.-Fornés *El Rey defiende la convivencia de las lenguas en España como riqueza del conjunto de la nación.*
- (ABC 17-11-2005) Lola Álvarez. *De cuerpos y almas.*
- (ABC 29-11-2005) Anon. *Aprobado más del 70 por ciento del contenido de la nueva 'Gramática' del español.*

- (ABC 19-09-2006) Patricia Carro. *La nueva Gramática de la Lengua incorporará un DVD con ejemplos de entonación.*
- (ABC 23-10-2006) A.C.M. *El potencial económico del español, a debate en Montevideo y San Millán de la Cogolla.*
- (ABC 19-12-2006) Anon. *La riqueza de la lengua.*
- (ABC 31-12-2006) Anon. *El 15% del PIB mundial habla español.*
- (ABC 02-03-2007b) Anon. *La primera gramática panhispánica.*
- (ABC 23-03-2007) A. Astorga. *Una Gramática no parda, sino 'normativa, descriptiva y reflexiva'.*
- (ABC 25-03-2007e) ABC/EFE. *El Rey: 'El español es un instrumento para la paz y la solidaridad'.*
- (ABC 26-03-2007b) Manuel M. Cascante. *Cartagena de Indias, capital del español.*
- (ABC 26-03-2007c) Anon. *Gramática de la lengua de todos.*
- (ABC 27-03-2007a) Manuel M. Cascante. *Don Juan Carlos sitúa a Macondo como 'un lugar de la lengua española'.*
- (ABC 28-03-2007a) Manuel M. Cascante. *Internet se perfila como el mayor desafío y un gran trampolín para el castellano.*

#### **ARTICLES FROM *EL PAÍS***

All articles were collected in electronic form from the 'Archivo' page (<http://www.elpais.com/archivo/buscador.html>) of *El País* online and were accessed during the period July – September 2007.

- (*El País* 30-03-1997a) Opinión. *Uno y distinto.*
- (*El País* 30-03-1997b) José F. Beaumont. *'La educación idiomática de los españoles es pésima'.*
- (*El País* 07-04-1997a) Bernardo Díaz Nosty. *La globalidad como descubrimiento cultural y lingüístico.*
- (*El País* 07-04-1997b) Opinión. *Español en congreso.*
- (*El País* 07-04-1997c) Maite Rico. *La ciudad mexicana de Zacatecas será la 'capital' del español durante cinco días.*
- (*El País* 09-04-1997a) Agencias. *La Academia, enfadada por no haber sido invitada.*
- (*El País* 13-04-1997) Opinión. *La lengua de todos.*
- (*El País* 14-04-1997) Paz Álvarez. *La Real Academia pide a los profesores que sean rigurosos con la ortografía en las pruebas de selectividad.*
- (*El País* 20-04-1997) Emilio Lamo de Espinosa. *La buena salud del español.*
- (*El País* 25-04-2001) Opinión. *Las palabras del Rey.*
- (*El País* 29-04-2001) Jordi Busquets. *Casi tres siglos de imposición: Decenas de leyes desmienten el discurso del Rey y revelan que sí se obligó a hablar en castellano.*
- (*El País* 15-05-2001) Carmen Chacón and Jesús Caldera. *El discurso real y la responsabilidad política.*
- (*El País* 28-09-2001) A.Castilla. *El Congreso de la Lengua potencia los recursos del español.*

- (El País 11-10-2001c) Jesús Ruiz Mantilla. *El Rey aboga por el español como 'cauce de concordia y tolerancia'*.
- (El País 12-10-2001) Amelia Castilla. *El nuevo Diccionario refleja la unidad del español.*
- (El País 13-10-2001b) Javier Rodríguez Marcos. *El español, una lengua diversa: 'Si se empobrece la lengua se empobrece el pensamiento'*.
- (El País 16-10-2001a) M. José Díaz de Tuesta/Jesús Ruiz Mantilla. *Vicente Fox recibe el homenaje de las 22 academias.*
- (El País 16-10-2001d) Anon. *El congreso de Valladolid medirá desde hoy el potencial económico del español en el mundo.*
- (El País 16-10-2001e) Víctor García de la Concha. *'Trabajamos en pie de igualdad'*.
- (El País 17-10-2001a) Opinión. *Globalizar en español.*
- (El País 17-10-2001f) Miguel Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *Latidos del universo lingüístico del español: el Rey exhorta a utilizar el idioma para potenciar la comunidad hispanohablante en el concierto de las naciones.*
- (El País 18-10-2001c) José Andrés Rojo/Miguel Mora. *II Congreso de la Lengua Española: La Academia anuncia la publicación de un 'Libro de estilo'*.
- (El País 18-10-2001d) José Luis Ferris. *Don Víctor.*
- (El País 19-10-2001d) José Andrés Rojo/Miguel Mora. *II Congreso De La Lengua Española: La proyección económica del español depende de la conquista de las nuevas tecnologías.*
- (El País 19-10-2001b) EFE. *El II Congreso de la Lengua Española apuesta en su clausura por la promoción del idioma en Internet.*
- (El País 19-10-2001f) Miguel Mora. *II Congreso de la Lengua Española: 'El español, al final, es sólo uno'*.
- (El País 20-10-2001a) Anon. *II Congreso de la Lengua Española: Un observatorio para neologismos.*
- (El País 19-10-2001e) Anon. *II Congreso de la Lengua Española: Las batallas cotidianas del español actual.*
- (El País 24-10-2001) Miguel Mora. *La Real Academia Española presenta su nuevo portal de Internet con acceso directo al Diccionario.*
- (El País 22-11-2001) Ginés Donaire. *Los expertos de la lengua española destacan el auge de los diccionarios de especialidad en los últimos años.*
- (El País 07-09-2004) EFE. *Gregorio Salvador alerta sobre los daños que causa el bilingüismo.*
- (El País 13-11-2004) Javier Rodríguez Marcos. (Babelia) *III Congreso de la Lengua Española: 'Hoy la prensa marca la norma'*.
- (El País 13-11-2004a) Winston Manrique Sabogal. *III Congreso de la Lengua Española: 'El castellano no es superior, pero parece ponernos siempre en el camino de la amistad'*.
- (El País 13-11-2004d) Cruz Blanco. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: 'Falta conciencia de la importancia del idioma'*.
- (El País 14-11-2004a) José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: El idioma de Cervantes, frente a la globalización.*

- (El País 14-11-2004b) Francesc Relea. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: 'No creo que en ningún país se pueda hablar un español puro'*.
- (El País 16-11-2004) Miguel Ángel Aguilar. *¿Quién manda en las lenguas?*
- (El País 17-11-2004) Rosa Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española : Rosario confirma la conciencia viva del idioma.*
- (El País 18-11-2004d) Francisco Ayala. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Palabras, palabras, palabras.*
- (El País 18-11-2004e) Rosa Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: La variedad del español se destapa en Rosario.*
- (El País 19-11-2004a) Rosa Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: La Real Academia, a 200 por hora.*
- (El País 19-11-2004c) Rosa Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Los engranajes ocultos de una enciclopedia.*
- (El País 20-11-2004a) Agencias. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española : El Congreso de Rosario concluye con un emocionado homenaje a Sábado.*
- (El País 20-11-2004b) Rosa Mora. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: El siglo XXI, contra el monolingüismo.*
- (El País 20-11-2004c) Rosa Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Próxima parada, Cartagena de Indias.*
- (El País 20-11-2004g) Rosa Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: La creatividad de los hablantes marcará los futuros derroteros de la lengua.*
- (El País 21-11-2004b) Opinión. *Lengua viva.*
- (El País 21-11-2004c) Rosa Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: Una sesión de conclusiones sin demasiadas conclusiones.*
- (El País 22-11-2004) Rosa Mora/José Andrés Rojo. *III Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: El idioma, en el camino.*
- (El País 04-03-2005) Anon. *Zapatero respalda en la Academia el 'Diccionario histórico del español'.*
- (El País 15-09-2005) Ignacio Francia. *Las Academias de la Lengua fijan las bases de la política lingüística panhispánica.*
- (El País 09-11-2005a) Andrea Aguilar. *Humberto López Morales descubre los falsos mitos del español en América.*
- (El País 09-11-2005b) EFE. *El Instituto Cervantes abrirá ocho nuevos centros en Brasil.*
- (El País 10-11-2005a) Anon. *Las 22 academias de la Lengua presentan el 'Diccionario panhispánico de dudas'.*
- (El País 10-11-2005b) Jesús Ruiz Mantilla. *El gran acuerdo para la unidad del idioma.*
- (El País 10-11-2005c) Juan Cruz. *'Tenemos la lengua más cohesionada del mundo'.*
- (El País 11-11-2005a) Jesús Ruiz Mantilla. *Un acuerdo histórico sobre la lengua: El camino para resolver los retos del español.*
- (El País 11-11-2005c) Juan Cruz. *Un acuerdo histórico sobre la lengua: 'Mándeme al plomero, que se descompuso la tina'.*
- (El País 12-11-2005) Juan Cruz. *Para enseñar la lengua.*

- (El País 13-11-2005a) José Andrés Rojo/Jesús Ruiz Mantilla. *Un acuerdo histórico sobre la lengua: 'Recomendado: un castin en Bangladés'*.
- (El País 13-11-2005b) Juan José Millás. *Un acuerdo histórico sobre la lengua: Un cuerpo con 22 almas*.
- (El País 15-11-2005) Opinión. *No lo dude más*.
- (El País 29-03-2006) Pilar Lozano. *El IV Congreso de la Lengua analizará la diversidad del español*.
- (El País 08-02-2006) Anon. *García de la Concha defiende una política lingüística panhispánica*.
- (El País 05-11-2006) Miguel Ángel Noceda. *Una potencia de 440 millones de hablantes*.
- (El País 01-03-2007) EFE. *El IV Congreso de la Lengua homenajeará a García Márquez*.
- (El País 02-03-2007) Elisa Silió. *La lengua española, la industria del siglo XXI*.
- (El País 23-03-2007) David Corral. *José Manuel Blecua: 'La propiedad del lenguaje es provinciana'*.
- (El País 24-03-2007c) EFE. *La RAE y las otras 21 Academias de la Lengua aprueban en Medellín la 'Nueva gramática de la lengua española': España deja de ser el principal referente en el uso del lenguaje*.
- (El País 25-03-2007b) Juan Cruz/Carles Geli. *XIII Congreso de Academias de la Lengua Española: A vueltas con las palabras*.
- (El País 27-03-2007a) C. Geli/P. Lozano. *IV Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: La devoción por las letras invade Cartagena*.
- (El País 29-03-2007a) Juan Cruz. *IV Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: La multinacional panhispánica*.
- (El País 30-03-2007a) EFE. *El Congreso de Cartagena de Indias concluye con el reconocimiento de la expansión del español*.
- (El País 30-03-2007c) Juan Cruz. *IV Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española: La energía americana y la apatía española*.
- (El País 31-03-2007a) Carles Geli. *Desbordamiento: El IV Congreso de la Lengua hace balance en su última jornada*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABC & Vigara Tauste, A. M. (2001) *Libro de estilo de ABC*, Barcelona: Ariel.
- ABC., Ansón, L. M. & Lázaro Carreter, F. (1995) *Libro de estilo de ABC*, Barcelona: Ariel.
- Académie Française (2005) *Le rôle de l'Académie Française*. Available at: <http://www.academie-francaise.fr/role/index.html> [accessed 27.07.2005].
- AIMC (2006) *Estudio general de medios: Resumen general de resultados, abril 2005 a marzo de 2006*. Madrid: Asociación para la Investigación de los Medios de Comunicación (AIMC).
- AIMC (2007) *Estudio general de medios: Resumen general de resultados, abril 2006 a marzo de 2007*. Madrid: Asociación para la Investigación de los Medios de Comunicación (AIMC).
- Alvar, M. (1982) *Atlas lingüístico y etnográfico de Aragón Navarra y Rioja (ALENAR)*, Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico de la Excma Diputación Provincial.
- Alvar, M. (1999) *Atlas lingüístico de Castilla y León*, Valladolid: Consejería de Educación y Cultura.
- Alvar, M., Llorente, A. & Salvador, G. (1991) *Atlas lingüístico y etnográfico de Andalucía*, Madrid: Arco/Libro.
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London: Verso.
- ASALE (2008) La Asociación. Available at: <http://asale.org/ASALE/ConAALEBD?IDDOC=1&menu=1> [accessed 29.09.2008].
- Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2004) *La nueva política lingüística panhispánica*, Madrid: Real Academia Española.
- BBC News (2008) BA and Iberia hold merger talks. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/7532129.stm> [accessed 29.07.2008].
- Bengoechea Bartolomé, M., Lledó, E. & Vargas Martínez, A. (1998) *Lo Femenino y lo Masculino en el Diccionario de la Lengua de la Real Academia Española*, Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales.
- Bermel, N. (2007) *Linguistic authority, language ideology, and metaphor : the Czech orthography wars*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bertolotti, V. (2007) La expansión del español en América del Sur: el Instituto Cervantes y las universidades latinoamericanas. *Hispanic Issues On Line [online]* 1, 2, 191-197.
- Beswick, J. (2007) *Regional nationalism in Spain: language use and ethnic identity in Galicia*, Clevedon, UK/ Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Bex, T. (1996) *Variety in written English: texts in society: societies in text*, London: Routledge.

- Blommaert, J. (1999a) The debate is closed. In Blommaert, J. (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 425-438.
- Blommaert, J. (1999b) The debate is open. In Blommaert, J. (ed.) *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1-38.
- Blommaert, J. (ed.) (1999c) *Language ideological debates*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. & Verschueren, J. (1998) The Role of Language in European Nationalist Ideologies. In Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. & Kroskrity, P. V. (eds) *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 189-210.
- Boletín Oficial del Estado (1978) Constitución Española. Available at: [http://www.boe.es/datos\\_iberlex/normativa/TL/ConstitucionCASTELLANO.pdf](http://www.boe.es/datos_iberlex/normativa/TL/ConstitucionCASTELLANO.pdf) [accessed 23.09.2008].
- Bravo, J. M. (2006) Film Translation Research in Spain. In Meyer, I. & Bowker, L. (eds) *Lexicography, terminology, and translation: text-based studies in honour of Ingrid Meyer*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 227-237.
- Briggs, C. L. (1998) You're a liar! You're just like a woman! In Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. & Kroskrity, P. V. (eds) *Language ideologies: practice and theory*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 229-255.
- Bugel, T. (2006) A macro- and micro-sociolinguistic study of language attitudes and language contact: Mercosur and the teaching of Spanish in Brazil. . PhD thesis. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Butt, J. & Benjamin, C. (2000) *A new reference grammar of modern Spanish*, London: Arnold.
- Calero Fernández, M. Á. (1999) *Sexismo lingüístico : Análisis y propuestas ante la discriminación sexual en le lenguaje*, Madrid: Narcea.
- Cameron, D. (1995) *Verbal hygiene*, London: Routledge.
- Cameron, D. (2001) *Working with spoken discourse*, London: SAGE.
- Castillo Lluch, M. & Kabatek, J. (eds.) (2006) *Las lenguas de España: Política lingüística, sociología del lenguaje e ideología desde la Transición hasta la actualidad*, Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Castro, A. (1961) *La peculiaridad lingüística rioplatense y su sentido histórico*, Madrid: Taurus.
- Chilton, P. (1988) *Orwellian language and the media*, London: Pluto.
- Chilton, P. (2004) *Analysing political discourse : theory and practice*, London: Routledge.
- Chouliarakis, L. & Fairclough, N. (1999) *Discourse in late modernity : rethinking critical discourse analysis*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- CIA (2004) Rank Order: GDP per capita', *The CIA World Factbook* [online]. Available at: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2004rank.html> [accessed 05/09/2008].
- CMVocento (2007) ABC: un gran diario. Available at: <http://www.cmvocento.com/abc.htm> [accessed 09.10.2007].

- Cochrane, J. (2004) *Between you and I: a little book of bad English*, Cambridge: Icon.
- Cook, V. (2004) *Accommodating Broccoli in the Cemetery: or why can't anybody spell?*, London: Profile.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989) *Language planning and social change*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupland, N. (2003) Introduction: Sociolinguistics and Globalisation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 4, 465-472.
- Crowley, T. (2003) *Standard English and the politics of language*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crystal, D. (2006) *The fight for English: how language pundits ate, shot, and left*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Miguel, A. (2002) *El idioma español*, Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Consejo Social.
- De Miguel, A. (2005) *La lengua viva: polémicas apasionadas sobre el idioma español*, Madrid: La Esfera de los Libros.
- Del Valle, J. (2000) Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: Misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia. *Language and Communication*, 20, 2, 105-132.
- Del Valle, J. (2006) US Latinos, *la hispanofonía* and the language ideologies of high modernity. In Mar-Molinero, C. & Stewart, M. (eds) *Globalization and language in the Spanish-speaking world: Macro and micro perspectives*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 27-47.
- Del Valle, J. (2007a) Embracing diversity for the sake of unity: Linguistic hegemony and the pursuit of total Spanish. In Duchêne, A. & Heller, M. (eds) *Discourses of Endangerment: Interest and Ideologies in the Defence of Languages*. London/New York: Continuum, 242-67.
- Del Valle, J. (2007b) La lengua, patria común: La *hispanofonía* y el nacionalismo panhispánico. In Del Valle, J. (ed.) *La lengua, ¿patria común?* Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 31-56.
- Del Valle, J. & Gabriel-Stheeman, L. (eds.) (2002a) *The battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000 : language ideologies and Hispanic intellectuals*, London: Routledge.
- Del Valle, J. & Gabriel-Stheeman, L. (2002b) 'Codo con codo': Hispanic community and the language spectacle. In Del Valle, J. & Gabriel-Stheeman, L. (eds) *The Battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000: Language ideologies and hispanic intellectuals*. London/New York: Routledge, 193-211.
- Del Valle, J. & Gabriel-Stheeman, L. (2002c) Nationalism, *hispanismo*, and monoglossic culture. In Del Valle, J. & Gabriel-Stheeman, L. (eds) *The Battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000: Language ideologies and hispanic intellectuals*. London/New York: Routledge, 1-13.
- Del Valle, J. & Villa, L. (2006) Spanish in Brazil: Language Policy, Business and Cultural Propaganda. *Language Policy*, 5, 369-392.
- Díez, M., Morales, F. & Sabín, Á. (1977) *Las lenguas de España*, Madrid: Ministerio de Educación/Instituto Nacional de Ciencias de la Educación.

- DiGiacomo, S. M. (1999) Language ideological debates in an Olympic city: Barcelona 1992-1996. In Blommaert, J. (ed.) *Language ideological debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 105-142.
- Domínguez Calvo, S. (1993) *Limpiemos nuestro idioma*, Montevideo: Ediciones de la Plaza.
- Eagleton, T. (1991) *Ideology : an introduction*, London: Verso.
- Edwards, J. (1985) *Language, society and identity*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- El Mundo* (16.04.1999) Aznar apoya con 500 millones la informatización de la Academia. *El Mundo* Available at: <http://www.elmundo.es/1999/04/16/cultura/16N0112.html> [accessed 27.09.2008].
- El Mundo* (26.04.2007) 14 millones de alumnos convierten al español en el segundo idioma más estudiado. *El Mundo*. Available at: <http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2007/04/26/cultura/1177610767.html> [accessed 26.04.2007].
- El País (1998) *El País : Libro de estilo*, Madrid: Ediciones El País.
- El País (2002) *El País: Libro de estilo*, Madrid: El País.
- Fairclough, N. (1985) Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 739-63.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a) *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*, London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b) *Media discourse*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and power*, Harlow: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2005) Critical Discourse Analysis. *Marges Linguistiques*, 9, 76-94.
- Fairclough, N. (2006) *Language and globalization*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the press*, London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, R., Kress, G. & Trew, T. (1979) *Language and Control*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fries, D. (1989) *La Real Academia Española ante el uso de la lengua*, Alcobendas: Sociedad General Española de Librería.
- Fundéu (2006) ¿Quiénes somos? Available at: [http://www.fundeu.es/QuienesSomos.aspx?frmOpcion=QUIENES\\_SOMOS&frmFontSize=2](http://www.fundeu.es/QuienesSomos.aspx?frmOpcion=QUIENES_SOMOS&frmFontSize=2) [accessed 09.05.2006].
- Gal, S. & Woolard, K. (eds.) (2001) *Languages and Publics: the making of authority*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- García de la Concha, V. (2005a) 'Diccionario panhispánico de dudas' (Promotional video). *El País*. Available at: [http://www.elpais.com/videos/cultura/Presentacion/Diccionario/panhispnico/dudas/elvid/20051110elpepucul\\_1/Ves/](http://www.elpais.com/videos/cultura/Presentacion/Diccionario/panhispnico/dudas/elvid/20051110elpepucul_1/Ves/) [accessed 10-11-2005].
- García de la Concha, V. (2005b) Opinión: La Real Academia Española y el Instituto Cervantes. *Revista Cervantes*.(septiembre - octubre 2005), 5.

- García de la Concha, V. (2006) Intervenciones en la presentación del Diccionario panhispánico de dudas: Discurso de D. Víctor García de la Concha. *Real Academia Española*. Available at: [www.rae.es](http://www.rae.es) [accessed 21.02.2006].
- García de la Concha, V. (2008) El español de los jóvenes. *Donde dice...Boletín de la Fundación del Español Urgente*. [online].(Jul-Sep 2008), 1-2.
- García Meseguer, A. (1988) *Lenguaje y discriminación sexual*, Barcelona: Montesinos.
- García Meseguer, A. (1994) *¿Es sexista la lengua española? una investigación sobre el género gramatical*, Barcelona: Paidós.
- García, O. (2008) Spanish as a Global Language. Special issue of *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 2, 1-2.
- Goatly, A. (1997) *The language of metaphors*, London: Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1985) *Selections from Cultural Writings*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gramsci, A., Hoare, Q. & Smith, G. N. (1971) *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Grijelmo, Á. (2001) *Defensa apasionada del idioma español*, Madrid: Suma de Letras.
- Grijelmo, Á. (2004a) *El genio del idioma*, Madrid: Taurus (Santillana Ediciones Generales).
- Grijelmo, Á. (2004b) *La punta de la lengua: críticas con humor sobre el idioma y el diccionario*, Madrid: Aguilar.
- Grijelmo, Á. (2004c) *La seducción de las palabras*, Madrid: Taurus.
- Grin, F. (2003) *Language policy evaluation and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Haugen, E. (1972) Dialect, Language, Nation. In Pride, J. B. & Holmes, J. (eds) *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 97-111.
- Herman, E. S. & Chomsky, N. (2002) *Manufacturing consent : the political economy of the mass media*, New York: Pantheon.
- Hodge, B. & Kress, G. R. (1979) *Language as ideology*, London: Routledge.
- Holborow, M. (1999) *The Politics of English: a Marxist view of language*, London: SAGE.
- Holmes, J. (1992) *An introduction to sociolinguistics*, London: Longman.
- Honey, J. (1997) *Language is power: the story of standard English and its enemies*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Huckin, T. R. (2007) Social approaches 6: Critical discourse analysis. Available at: [http://www.exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pubs/br/functionalsec3\\_6.htm](http://www.exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pubs/br/functionalsec3_6.htm). Accessed 26.07.2007.
- Humphrys, J. (2004) *Lost for words: the mangling and manipulating of the English language*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Humphrys, J. (2006) *Beyond words: how language reveals the way we live now*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Iberia (2008) Recomendaciones de uso de nuestro idioma. *Ronda Iberia*. 58.

- Iglesias Díaz, J. (2000) *La Real Academia Española es la máxima responsable de la degradación del lenguaje*, Madrid: Artes Gráficas Montes, SL.
- Imbert, G., Vidal Beneyto, J. & Bustamante, E. (1986) *El País o la referencia dominante*, Barcelona: Mitre.
- Instituto Cervantes (2007) Proyección panhispánica del Plan curricular. *Revista del Instituto Cervantes*. 41.
- Instituto Cervantes (2008a) Sedes en el mundo. Available at: [http://www.cervantes.es/sobre\\_instituto\\_cervantes/direcciones\\_contacto/sedes\\_mundo.htm](http://www.cervantes.es/sobre_instituto_cervantes/direcciones_contacto/sedes_mundo.htm) [accessed 27.09.2008].
- Instituto Cervantes (2008b) Tratamiento de las variedades lingüísticas del español. Available at: <http://ave.cervantes.es/trat.htm> [accessed 27.09.2008].
- Jenkins, J. (2007) *English as a Lingua Franca: attitude and identity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Joseph, J. E. (1987) *Eloquence and power: the rise of language standards and standard languages*, London: Pinter.
- Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. L. (2006) *The handbook of world Englishes*, Malden, Mass./Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Kerr, R. G. (2003) Changing discourse, the discourse of change: a critical analysis of discourse in the fields of English language teaching, governance and development. Doctoral thesis. Lancaster: University of Lancaster.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007) *World Englishes : implications for international communication and English language teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kramer, J. (2002) Asturian linguistic planning. Norm formation and normalization of a minor Romance language in the context of linguistics, literature and politics. *Zeitschrift Fur Romanische Philologie*, 118, 1, 146-148.
- Kress, G. & Leeuwen, T. v. (1996) *Reading images: the grammar of visual design*, London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. & Leeuwen, T. v. (2001) *Multimodal discourse: the modes and media of contemporary communication*, London: Arnold.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2000a) Regimenting Languages: Language Ideological Perspectives. In Kroskrity, P. V. (ed.) *Regimes of Language: ideologies, politics and identities*. Santa Fe/Oxford: School of American Research Press/James Currey, 1-34.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (ed.) (2000b) *Regimes of Language: ideologies, politics and identities*, Santa Fe/Oxford: School of American Research Press/James Currey.
- Lakoff, G. (1993) The contemporary theory of metaphor. In Ortony, A. (ed.) *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 202-251.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, R. T. (2000) *The language war*, Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

- Lázaro Carreter, F. (1997) *El dardo en la palabra*, Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg/Círculo de Lectores.
- Lázaro Carreter, F. (2005) *El nuevo dardo en la palabra*, Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Lincoln, A. (1863) Gettysburg Address. *American Rhetoric Online Speech Bank*. Available at: <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/gettysburgaddress.htm> [accessed 18.08.2008].
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997) *English with an accent: language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*, London: Routledge.
- Lipski, J. M. (1994) *Latin American Spanish*, London: Longman.
- Lipski, J. M. (2008) *Varieties of Spanish in the United States*, Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Lledó Cunill, E. (1992) *El Sexismo y el androcentrismo en la lengua : análisis y propuestas de cambio*, Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Institut de Ciències de l'Educació.
- Lledó Cunill, E., Calero Fernández, M. Á. & Forgas, E. (2004) *De mujeres y diccionarios evolución de lo femenino en la 22ª edición del DRAE*, Madrid: Instituto de la Mujer.
- Locke, T. (2004) *Critical discourse analysis*, London/New York: Continuum.
- Lodares, J. R. (2000) *El paraíso políglota : historias de lenguas en la España moderna contadas sin prejuicios*, Madrid: Taurus.
- Lodares, J. R. (2001) *Gente de Cervantes : historia humana del idioma español*, Madrid: Taurus.
- Lodares, J. R. (2002) *Lengua y patria : sobre el nacionalismo lingüístico en España*, Madrid: Taurus.
- Lodares, J. R. (2005) *El porvenir del español*, Madrid: Santillana Ediciones.
- Luke, A. (2002) Beyond Science and Ideology Critique: Developments in Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 96-110.
- MacClancy, J. (1996) Bilingualism and multinationalism in the Basque Country. In Mar-Molinero, C. & Smith, A. (eds) *Nationalism and the Nation in the Iberian Peninsula*. London/New York: Berg, 207-21.
- Mar-Molinero, C. (2000a) The Iberian Peninsula: Conflicting Linguistic Nationalisms. In Barbour, S. & Carmichael, C. (eds) *Language and Nationalism in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mar-Molinero, C. (2000b) *The politics of language in the Spanish-speaking world : from colonisation to globalisation*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Mar-Molinero, C. (2004) Spanish as a world language: Language and identity in a global era. *Spanish in Context*, 1, 1, 3-20.
- Mar-Molinero, C. (2006a) The European Linguistic Legacy in a Global Era: Linguistic Imperialism, Spanish and the *Instituto Cervantes*. In Mar-Molinero, C. & Stevenson, P. (eds) *Language ideologies, policy and practice: Language and the Future of Europe*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Mar-Molinero, C. (2006b) Forces of Globalization in the Spanish-speaking world: Linguistic imperialism or grassroots adaptation. In Mar-Molinero,

- C. & Stewart, M. (eds) *Globalization and language in the Spanish-speaking world: Macro and micro perspectives*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave, 8-27.
- Mar-Moliner, C. (2008) Subverting Cervantes: Language Authority in Global Spanish. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 2, 1, 27 - 47.
- Mar-Moliner, C. & Stewart, M. (2006) *Globalization and language in the Spanish speaking world : macro and micro perspectives*, New York ; Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marcos Marín, F. (2000) El español en internet. In Instituto Cervantes (ed.) *El español en el mundo: Anuario 2000*. Madrid: Instituto Cervantes/Plaza Janés.
- Marcos Marín, F. (2006) *Los retos del español*, Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Martínez Ferrer, J. (1995) *Bilingüismo y enseñanza en Aragón : un análisis del rendimiento lectoescritor en las comarcas bilingües*, Zaragoza: Edicions de l'Astral.
- Mateo, M. (2005) Language policy and planning of the status of Basque, I: the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC). *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2005, 174, 9.
- Mesthrie, R. & Bhatt, R. M. (2008) *World Englishes: the study of new linguistic varieties*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, M. (2001) Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds) *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage, 14-31.
- Milani, T. (2007) Debating Swedish: Language Politics and Ideology in Contemporary Sweden. *Centre for Research on Bilingualism*. Doctoral thesis. Stockholm University.
- Millán, J. A. (2005) *Perdón imposible : guía para una puntuación más rica y consciente*, Barcelona: Círculo de Lectores.
- Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. (1985) *Authority in language: investigating language prescription and standardisation*, London: Routledge/Kegan Paul.
- Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. (1999) *Authority in language: investigating Standard English*, London: Routledge.
- Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (2007) Presupuestos generales del estado: Sección 18 Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia. Available at: [http://www.spgp.pap.meh.es/Presup/PGE2007Ley/PGE-ROM/doc/2/1/1/2/2/15/N\\_07\\_S\\_V\\_1\\_101\\_2\\_2\\_2\\_118\\_1\\_1\\_1.PDF](http://www.spgp.pap.meh.es/Presup/PGE2007Ley/PGE-ROM/doc/2/1/1/2/2/15/N_07_S_V_1_101_2_2_2_118_1_1_1.PDF) [accessed 27.09.2008].
- Monteagudo, H. (1999) *Historia social da lingua galega : idioma, sociedade e cultura a través do tempo*, Vigo: Galaxia.
- Moore, B. (2001) *Who's centric now?: the present state of post-colonial Englishes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moreno de Alba, J. G. (2003) *La lengua española en México*, México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

- Moreno Fernández, F. & Otero, J. (2008) The status and future of Spanish among the main international languages: quantitative dimensions. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 2, 1-2, 67-83.
- Nagel, T. (1986) *The view from nowhere*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nebrija, E. A. d. (1492) *Gramática castellana*, Salamanca: [s.n.].
- Nerlich, B., Hamilton, C. A. & Rowe, V. (2002) Conceptualising foot and mouth disease: the socio-cultural role of metaphors, frames and narratives. *Metaphorik.de*, 2, 90-108.
- Paffey, D. & Mar-Molinero, C. (2009) Globalisation, linguistic norms and language authorities: Spain and the Panhispanic Language Policy. In Lacorte, M. & Leeman, J. (eds) *Español en Estados Unidos y otros contextos de contacto. Sociolingüística, ideología y pedagogía / Spanish in the United States and other contact environments. Sociolinguistics, ideology and pedagogy*. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert 159-173.
- Página de la Lengua Española (2006) Página de la Lengua Española Available at: <http://dat.etsit.upm.es/~mmonjas/info.html> [accessed 28.06.2006].
- Parakrama, A. (1995) *De-hegemonizing language standards : learning from (post)colonial Englishes about 'English'*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Pascual Rodríguez, J. A. (2006) Interview at Real Academia Española, Madrid, with Paffey, D. 23.03.2006.
- Payán Sotomayor, P. M. (1993) *El Habla de Cádiz*, Cádiz: Quorum Libros Editores.
- Penny, R. (2002) *A History of the Spanish Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2007) *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*, London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic imperialism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pinker, S. (1995) *The language instinct: the new science of language and mind*, London: Penguin.
- Platt, J., Weber, H. & Lian, H. M. (1984) *The new Englishes*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Real Academia Española (1989) *Diccionario manual e ilustrado de la lengua española*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Real Academia Española (1995) *Estatutos y Reglamento de la Real Academia Española*, Madrid: Real Academia Española.
- Real Academia Española (1999) *Ortografía de la lengua española*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Real Academia Española (2001) *Diccionario de la lengua española*, Madrid: Espasa.
- Real Academia Española (2005) Origen y fines. *Real Academia Española [online]*. Available at: <http://www.rae.es> [accessed 27.07.2005].
- Real Academia Española (2006a) Diccionario del estudiante: Un diccionario necesario. *Real Academia Española*. Available at: <http://www.rae.es> [accessed 21.02.2006].

- Real Academia Española (2006b) Diccionario panhispánico de dudas: Artículos de muestra. *Real Academia Española*. Available at: <http://www.rae.es> [accessed 21.02.2006].
- Real Academia Española (2006c) Diccionario panhispánico de dudas: Características. *Real Academia Española*. Available at: <http://www.rae.es> [accessed 21.02.2006].
- Real Academia Española (2006d) Lexicografía y Gramática: Nueva Gramática de la lengua española - Carácter. *Real Academia Española*. Available at: <http://www.rae.es> [accessed 21.02.2006].
- Real Academia Española (2006e) Lexicografía y Gramática: Nueva Gramática de la lengua española - Objetivos. *Real Academia Española*. Available at: <http://www.rae.es> [accessed 21.02.2006].
- Real Academia Española & Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2005) *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*, Madrid: Santillana.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001) *Discourse and discrimination: rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Ricento, T. (2000a) Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Introduction. In Ricento, T. (ed.) *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: focus on English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1-8.
- Ricento, T. (ed.) (2000b) *Ideology, politics, and language policies: focus on English*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Richardson, J. E. (2007) *Analysing newspapers: an approach from critical discourse analysis*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roca, A. & Lipski, J. M. (1993) *Spanish in the United States: linguistic contact and diversity*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- RTVE (2006) *Informa: Enciende tu imaginación*. Madrid: Radio Televisión Española.
- Salvador, G. (1994) *Un vehículo para la cohesión lingüística: el español hablado en los culebrones*, Burgos: Caja de Burgos, Área de Cultura, Obra social.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A. & Kroskrity, P. V. (1998) *Language ideologies: practice and theory*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schiffman, H. F. (1996) *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Schmidt-Riese, R. (2002) Linguistic planning of the Asturian language. The standardization and normalization of a minor Romance language within the arena of linguistics, literature and politics. *Romance Philology*, 55, 342-350.
- SEGIB (2008) ¿Qué es la SEGIB?, *Secretaría General Iberoamericana*. Available at: <http://www.segib.org/ques.php?idioma=esp> [accessed 30.07.2008].
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004) Putting English in its place: English as a lingua franca in Europe. *First Annual Lecture of the Centre for Applied Language Research*. University of Southampton, U.K.
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006) *Language policy: hidden agendas and new approaches*, London: Routledge.
- Siguán, M. (1992) *España plurilingüe*, Madrid: Alianza.

- SIL International (2005) *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, 15th edn. Dallas, Tex.: SIL International. Available at: <http://www.ethnologue.com> [accessed 18.07.2005].
- Silverstein, M. (1985) Language and the Culture of Gender: at the Intersection of structure, usage and ideology. In Mertz, E. & Parmentier, R. J. (eds) *Semiotic Mediation*. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press, 219-259.
- Silverstein, M. (1996) Monoglot 'standard' in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In Brenneis, D. & Macaulay, R. (eds) *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*. Boulder: Westview Press, 284-306.
- Silverstein, M. (1998) Contemporary transformations of local linguistic communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 27, 401-426.
- Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stewart, M. (1999) *The Spanish language today*, London: Routledge.
- Tejerina, B. (1992) *Nacionalismo y lengua : los procesos de cambio lingüístico en el País Vasco*, Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas/Siglo XXI.
- Thompson, R. W. (1992) Spanish as a pluricentric language. In Clyne, M. (ed.) *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Toolan, M. J. (2002) *Critical discourse analysis: critical concepts in linguistics*, London: Routledge.
- Torrent-Lenzen, A. (2006) *Unidad y pluricentrismo en la comunidad hispanohablante: cultivo y mantenimiento de una norma panhispánica unificada*, Titz: Lenzen.
- Truss, L. (2003) *Eats, shoots & leaves: the zero tolerance approach to punctuation*, London: Profile.
- Turell, M. T. (2001) *Multilingualism in Spain : sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of linguistic minority groups*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Van Dijk, T. (1985) *Handbook of discourse analysis*, London: Academic Press.
- Van Dijk, T. (1991) *Racism and the press*, London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. (1996) *Discourse, racism, and ideology*, Tenerife, Spain: RCEI Ediciones.
- Van Dijk, T. (1998a) *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*, London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. (1998b) Opinions and Ideologies in the Press. In Bell, A. & Garrett, P. (eds) *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell, 21-63.
- Van Dijk, T. (2001a) Critical discourse analysis. In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. (eds) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 352-371.
- Van Dijk, T. (2001b) Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 95-120.
- Van Dijk, T. (2006) Ideology and Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11, 2, 115-140.

- Van Noppen, J.-P. (2004) CDA: A discipline come of age? (Review of Toolan 2002). *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8, 1, 107-126.
- Wodak, R. (2001) What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds) *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage, 1-13.
- Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Liebhart, K. (1999) *The discursive construction of national identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Woolard, K. (1998) Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. & Kroskrity, P. V. (eds) *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-27.
- Woolard, K. (2007) La autoridad lingüística del español y las ideologías de la autenticidad y el anonimato. In Del Valle, J. (ed.) *La lengua, ¿patria común?: Ideas e ideologías del español*. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 129-142.
- Woolard, K. & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994) Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 55-82.
- Zamora Vicente, A. (1999) *La Real Academia Española*, Madrid: Espasa.