Stepanov, G. V. (1979) *K probleme jazykovogo varirovanija. Ispanskij jazyk Ispanii i Ameriki* [Zum Problem der Sprachvarianz. Das Spanische in Spanien und Amerika], Moskva.

Strosetzki, Christoph/Tietz, Manfred, eds., (1989) *Einheit und Vielfalt der Iberoromania*, Hamburg.

Tauli, Valter (1968) *Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning*, Uppsala.

Tejnor, Antonín und Koll. (1982) „Soziolinguistische Untersuchungen zur Sprachkultur. Probleme der tschechischen Orthographie und des Fremdwortgebrauchs im Spiegel der öffentlichen Meinung", in: *Grundlagen der Sprachkultur. Beiträge der Prager Linguistik zur Sprachtheorie und Sprachpflege*, Teil 2, Scharnhorst, J./Ising, E., eds., Berlin, 272–302.

Trudgill, Peter (1999) "Standard English: Want it isn't", in: *International English. A guide to Varieties of Standard English*, Trudgill, Peter/Hannah, B., eds., London.

Vachek, Josef (1962) "On the interplay of the external and internal factors in the development of English", in: *Lingua* 11, 443–448.

– (1973) *Written Language. General Problems and Problems of English*, The Hague/Paris.

– (1989) *Written Language Revisited*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Valdman, Albert (1983) „Normes locales et francophonie", in: *La norme linguistique*, Bédard, É./Maurais, J., eds., Québec/Paris, 667–706.

Weinrich, Uriel (1953) *Languages in Contact*, New York.

Whiteley, Wilfred H. (1971) "Some factors influencing langue policies in Eastern Africa, in: *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*, Rubin, J./Jernudd, B. H., eds., Honolulu, 141–158.

František Daneš, Prag
(Tschechische Republik)

224. Sociolinguistic Aspects of Social Modernization
Soziolinguistische Aspekte gesellschaftlicher Modernisierung

1.   Modernity and language
2.   Three types of modernity
3.   Modernization: for whom?
4.   Literature (selected)

1. Modernity and language

1.1. Modernity-related processes

The topic of modernization is central to our understanding of society and language. Modernization of language refers to the most important project in the recent history of human communication: the establishment of new modes of communication, adequate to changes that took place in the world of the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. And modernization of language must be seen in that historical context. It cannot be equated with *any* change that results in a new state of language (cf. Cooper 1989, 149). Modernization is not confined to changes that 'improve' language. Admittedly, the term has been used in this way. However, with the benefit of hindsight we can observe that modernity has had many negative consequences. Neither Modern (nor Postmodern, for that matter) mean 'good' or 'per-fect'. Further, it is necessary to emphasize that modernization is not Westernization. There are many ways of Modern development, and the Western way is only one of them. It is useful to consider the issue of the Modern in language within the framework of three types of *modernity-related processes*:

A.   Processes that historically establish the Modern (*modernity-formation processes*, common in the *Early Modern Period*),

B.   Processes that aim at the maintenance of the Modern as it becomes prevalent (*modernity-maintenance processes*, appearing in the *Modern Period*), and

C.   Processes through which the Modern has been substantially altered since the 1960s (*modernity-expansion processes*, current in the *Post-Modern Period*).

The dates for each of these processes vary between the 18th century and the present, depending on the society concerned. But in each case the processes are interrelated through shared principles, such as industrialization or an emphasis on social equality. Details may differ: the range of equalization is obviously different in each of the three

types. The term modernization has mainly been applied to the modernity-forming 'developing' societies – with occasional references to the past of the First World. However, little attention has been directed in the modernization debate to modernity-maintenance processes, such as displayed in the interwar period in Europe or the USA. The identification of modernity-expansion, principally an achievement of the 1970s and 1980s, has revealed that in those societies where it occurred the Modern was being radically rebuilt through avenues unknown to modernity-maintenance systems. The discussions have substantially advanced our understanding of modernization. Jürgen Habermas is known for defending modernity in the face of pre- and post-modernism (Habermas 1981). His argument was a plea for the positive features of the Modern and a reminder that the three types of modernity fall within a single category. Some researchers have applied different terms for the postmodernity phase, such as 'late-modernity' or 'late capitalism' (cf. Harvey 1989, 63). Whatever the label may be, it is obvious that in the modernity-expansion processes we face a new subdivision of mankind's recent history.

1.2. Modernity-related processes and language management

Language is reactive to other socioeconomic phenomena and is thus continuously adapting to changes in other spheres. Modernity-related processes adjust language to the major developments of recent history connected with industrialization. Thus as societies establish modernity, aim to retain and subsequently search for ways to expand it, speakers feel that language becomes inadequate to the new situation and try to change it. The modernity-related processes that operate on language are examples of 'language management' processes (Jernudd/Neustupný 1987; Neustupný 1988; Jernudd 1993). The term language management covers what has often been referred to as language planning but its boundaries are wider. It comprises all behaviour that has language as its target, including language policy, the cultivation of language, language teaching and language acquisition, interpreting/translation, speakers' correction of language in discourse and speech therapy. One could also say *metalinguistic* behaviour, especially as linguistics is also one of the genres of language management (Neustupný 2002).

In the following discussion I use the terms *discourse management* to refer to management of individual problems in discourse, and 'organized management' for management that uses conscious strategies within complex networks. Modernity-related processes proceed through discourse management or through forms of management, organized in various degrees. Discourse management, where no 'language policy' or 'language planning' can be discerned, is the basic process. Language problems basically originate in discourse (interaction acts) from where they can be (but not necessarily are) transferred to organized language management. The final solution depends on another transfer, back to discourse (interaction) acts, which is the only site for the change of each individual's language. Management within society-wide networks, such as 'language policy', is one of the organized management systems. However, among the organized management systems an important role is performed by systems other than 'language policy', with language education playing a particularly prominent part (Neustupný/Nekvapil 2003).

1.3. A typology of modernity-related processes

Language management is neither totally universal nor totally particular. Individual systems of language management belong to one of a relatively small number of types. The typological model used in this article assumes sociocultural phenomena are organized in clusters of interrelated features linked by common association with broad general principles (Neustupný 1989). Others have called this kind of patterning 'correlational typology'. The clusters of interrelated features are *types*. Examples of types are the Early Modern, Modern or Postmodern. According to this typological model types do not represent observer's imposed constructs but are actually operational in the societies under consideration. The typology that is most relevant for the understanding of modernization is a developmental typology. The initial developmental typology of what we now call language management was mostly concerned with the management of language conducted on behalf of whole societies (also called *language treatment*) and worked with only two types called the *policy approach* and the *cultivation approach*

(Neustupný 1972). The former in fact referred to management for modernity-formation, the latter for modernity-maintenance. Later the 'contemporary approach' was added, to cater for newly perceived modernity-expansion processes, and finally, using Khubchandani's theory of 'grass-roots pluralism' (Khubchandani 1983), Neustupný (1984) suggested that this typology be extended to explore a number of premodern approaches. However, the terminology using 'policy' and 'cultivation' was misleading. While Neustupný (1972) used the words simply as labels to cover clusters of features, readers assumed that policy or cultivation were the only (or the main) characteristics of the types and correctly pointed out that policy and cultivation often occurred side by side. Therefore, in this article the types will be called Early Modern (rather than 'policy'), Modern (rather than 'cultivation'), Postmodern (rather than 'contemporary') and Premodern. However, the Premodern type, placed before the commencement of modernization, is not discussed here.

We can assume that each type is characterized by a number of related rules, for example a number of general premises, maxims, strategies, ordinary rules and listing rules (Neustupný 1989a, 358ff). The most general principle underlying all of these rules in the case of modernization seems to be the principle of the industrial mode of production. However, the question of the hierarchy is not important. Crucial is the fact that all these rules form mutually supporting systems: the Early Modern, Modern and Postmodern. In the first, industrialization is not yet the dominant mode of production; in the second, the classical industrial mode has achieved prevalence and this prevalence is being maintained; in the third, the character of industrialization has further radically expanded into what has variously been called post-industrial, information-oriented or consumer society. There is no doubt that further modernity-related types will follow; this seems almost certain on the analogy of the large number of types that resulted, in the past, from the agriculturalization of human society. I now turn to consider separately how each of the three types of modernity develops. In the discussion, the terminology 'type', 'period' and occasionally 'paradigm' will be used interchangeably.

2. Three types of modernity

2.1. Early modern processes of language management

In Europe and the US the beginnings of the Early Modern type coincide with the emergence of the first processes of industrialization (Gerschenkron 1962; Cypher/Dietz 1997). The beginning of the new mode of production has traditionally been placed in mid-18th century, but there is a view among economic historians that this boundary must be pushed further back (Sylla/Toniolo 1991, 8). In industrially advanced European societies the type lost vitality before World War I, but it continues being operative in countries where industrialization commenced later or was, for various reasons, impeded.

Early Modern language management is associated with the following *general premises* of modernity-formation:

A. Machine-assisted production has commenced but has not become the dominant mode of production; technological development is supported by economic, social and political structures that gradually grow more complex; urbanization proceeds; and the period witnesses the appearance of the modern State, based on ethnicity.

B. The emergence of the new social structures overcomes premodern socioeconomic fragmentation.

C. Autonomous modern national societies begin to divide the world among themselves.

D. The power of aristocracy is radically limited; relative equalization of access by all citizens to the labour market occurs and social mobility develops.

E. The secular modern ideology of nationalism is born; some other new ideological values are individualism and universalism, although they do not reach their peak until the Modern period.

Not all five premises are necessarily present in each historical context. This is true in the case of principles employed within any typology (Neustupný 1989a, 361f). The fact results in processes of limited modernization that have attracted particular attention in the case of Japan and some other Asian countries. However, similar limitations on modernity can easily be found in European societies of the modernity-formation period.

There are various degrees of modernity in different systems. Modernity types cannot be reduced to closed categories with hard and fast lines that divide them from each other. Annamalai (1995) has correctly recognized that "modernization is defined by a bundle of features from different components and any of them can be considered individually neither necessary nor sufficient".

In the case of language, the general direction of management can be formulated in the following five *maxims*, which derive directly from the above principles:

A. Language must be adequate to the industrializing economy, society and culture.

B. Language must contribute to internal unity.

C. The national language is independent of other languages. (However, alliance may be struck with other modernizing languages, or languages that precede on the path of modernization.)

D. Relatively equal access to language for all participants is essential.

E. Language is an important symbol of ethnic communities (nations).

A considerable number of *strategies* of modernity-formation management exist; they define in what way the maxims are satisfied in language management. Most of the strategies listed below also occur in non-modernization environments. For example, neither development, nor standardization or literacy teaching are specific to modernization. What makes them modernization strategies is their co-occurrence and close relationship with the modernity-related premises and maxims. These strategies become modernization strategies only when they serve modernization. The relationship between the premises, maxims and strategies, in other words the incorporation of the strategies in extensive sociocultural clusters (types), is a crucial element of modernization.

A. Development strategies

Development takes place in many societies. Modern development (modernization) differs from earlier kinds of development in being a form of language management that is guided by the premises and maxims stated above. In order to develop language to serve industrial society, a considerable sophistication of language is required. This is true not only of language directly needed for machine-assisted production but for all aspects of so-

cial life (including science) and culture (thought, literature, etc.). Annamalai (1995/2001, 105ff) provides an excellent account how sensitive and extensive the process of adjustment has been in Tamil. The aim of development is also sometimes referred to as the requirement of 'efficiency' – structuring language to be maximally suited to its aims.

In considering various language situations we must distinguish at least three types. Languages which appear in the first type can be called *Innovation Languages*. Most communities enter the Early Modern period without a variety of language that could be directly used as the base of further development. This happens for example because no variety was widely used in a multiplicity of functions (Japanese), because the development of the language was interrupted prior to industrialization (Czech), or because a foreign or native but distant 'canon' language was employed. In these cases the selection and/or creation of a new variety is required. Large-scale *elaboration* occurs, affecting rules of spelling and morphology, the lexicon ("rules of coining technical terms": Asmah Haji Omar 1979, 102) and syntax. Such processes ultimately commence in discourse management but often cannot be completed without a good deal of organized language management, conducted in networks that represent the whole society (actually the top active layers of the society). However, in many cases this remains a largely unconscious discourse management process, as when terms of reference modernize (e.g. kinship terms for non-kinship relations are abandoned). Development affects the lexicon, but also whole 'functional varieties' (registers) of language, such as the language of science, in which new lexicon is matched with a number of new grammatical, stylistic and sociolinguistic rules. The Early Modern management type allows for relatively large-scale 'revolutionary' language development and reforms in corpus planning (reforms of spelling, morphology, large-scale changes in the lexicon). Secondly, there is a type that can be called 'Tradition Languages'. For example, some societies in Europe, after ridding themselves of Latin, developed on the basis of previous build up a highly sophisticated and uniform language used in the late premodern period. This was, for example, the situation with French or English. In these cases the late premodern

language was selected as the base of the Early Modern development. All that was needed was elaboration in vocabulary and polishing syntax and spelling. The adjustment needed was significant but not as extensive as in the case of the Innovating Languages. In some countries, such as Britain, most of these processes relied on unorganized management in discourse – written or spoken. Thirdly, societies that reach the Early Modern period later than others, can adopt a pre-packed Modern language that has developed elsewhere (Adoption Language). This procedure only works to a certain extent, because many other varieties remain within the system. Singapore is one example. Another example is Tamilnad. As Annamalai (1995) notes the presence of English holds back modernization of language in some respects (I believe this is the case of various functional styles, development of the lexicon, etc.). However, some other features of contemporary Tamil that belong to the Early Modern type are clearly connected with existing sociocultural premises and cannot be explained as an outcome of the presence of English, although it may be possible to charge them to the influence of colonialism.

B. Variation strategies

Attitudes to internal variation are of two kinds. On one hand linguistic variation is considered dangerous by the dominant groups because it can (and often does) provide support for separatist claims against the newly established state and can lead to the fragmentation of markets; on the other hand, variation is strong and as such undeniable, and cannot simply be ignored. In accordance with the premises and maxims of the Early Modern type, attitudes to language variation are negative.

A very common strategy in the case of Innovative Languages is *standardization* of language. Standardization takes place at various stages of history, but what I have in mind here is Modern standardization. It is connected with the modernization premises and maxims and means uniformation of language, selection of features that do not imply regional variation, elaboration, and codification of such features. Standardization is a process to which both development strategies and variation strategies contribute. However, its core is uniformation which is highly valued: Asmah Haji Omar placed it

before efficiency (development) in the title of her book on the modernization of Malay (1979). The neutral forms are commonly features of language of the most powerful area, the capital area of the state, but this feature is not universal (cf. Daneš 1988a, 1509). Under the conditions of modernization, language is developed and codified exclusively in its standard form. Dialects normally remain unaffected. The Standard of the most powerful community within a state becomes the official national language, unless it has to share the status with other languages. In this period the Standard is primarily used only as the written language; consistent standardization of the spoken language (pronunciation, etc.) normally commences in the Modern period and this is probably not only because models are technically difficult to provide. The national Standard also assumes the function of the language of education. However, Early Modern standardization does not fulfil only the uniformation function (Daneš 1988a, 1507); it is inevitable for a language which takes on the role of a language of science, where attention must be on content rather than form; it is also necessary for a language that is used as the vehicle of literature, where the esthetic function cannot be assigned except when a fixed norm exists. The language of literature is the laboratory where much of the processes of standardization takes place and this fact accounts for the great prestige of literature. In some languages the Standard is called the Literary Language (Literatursprache, spisovný jazyk) or receives one of a number of other names: for German alone, Daneš (1988a, 1506) lists Schriftsprache, Kultursprache, Buchsprache, Gemeinsprache and Einheitssprache. Languages of *ethnic communities* that are not organized and strong enough to fend for themselves follow the fate of dialects of the National language: they are suppressed and often virtually eliminated. (For example, Lusatian in Germany, Ainu in Japan, many Aboriginal languages in Australia.) Groups which have not achieved a high level of organization offer no resistance. But many non-dominant communities (*minorities*) fight for their survival, establishing separate Standards, elaborating them, having them accepted as languages of education, and finally achieving full range of their functional use (Hroch 1998). The Early Modern type provides a possibility of parallel claims for political in-

dependence. Old *canon languages* (Latin in Europe, Sanskrit in India, Classical Chinese in the Far East, etc., cf. Wienold 1987) are fatally weakened as carriers of premodern ideologies, but not always totally removed, because they serve as the source of lexical development and sometimes as symbols of religious or ethnic identity. *Diglossia* (Ferguson 1959) weakens gradually but its symbolic sources and consequences vary and the process is not uniform. In Japan a new system of diglossia was introduced in the late 19th century when two Standards (bungo and kogo) were developed in parallel. This diglossia was gradually removed, but the final stages had to wait until the end of World War II. Czech diglossia (Standard and Common language) is still alive today and unlikely to easily depart even though it has repeatedly been the subject of discussion (cf. Neustupný/Nekvapil 2003). As standardization proceeds, so does the application of the strategy of *hierarchization* of varieties: so-called status planning. Some varieties (such as the National or the Official language or languages) appear on the top of the hierarchy while other varieties whether of the same language or other languages, being in fact (or both in fact and theory) less important, are condemned to slow death, or actively targeted by official policies and directly annihilated. The strategy actually employed depends on the vitality of individual varieties and many other conditions. The adoption by India of so many languages after 1949 was probably acceptable because of the fact that, at the same time, a strict hierarchy was imposed, and possibly also because of the surviving spirit of what Khubchandani (1983, 25) called the *grassroots multilingualism*, which has not been completely forgotten. Language reforms, successful or less successful, are a feature of this period. Innovative Languages pass through a series of reforms that establish their norms. The Tradition Languages show less activity in this regard. However, attempts such as Basic English, although originating in the 1920s, ideologically rely on the Early Modern type. Basic English connects with the tradition of artificial languages such as Esperanto, which all imply a large-scale change of the existing language situation.

C. External variation strategies

An important feature of this period is *colonialism*. Some languages of colonially domi-

nated societies previously reached a high degree of sophistication but due to colonization remained underdeveloped as Modern Standards. The presence of the language of the metropolis bars their further development, even after colonialism has been superseded politically. External variation is well noticed and language management establishes strategies which lead to the acquisition of those varieties that are important for the society through active *language teaching*, frequently including *classical* languages, which are necessary as sources of terminology and sometimes as symbols of identity (e. g. Arabic). However, more characteristic is the teaching of 'modern' languages, i. e. languages that provide a bridge to other modernizing, or modernized societies. On the other hand, the purging of the influence of outside varieties that are unwelcome can take place (purism, cf. Jernudd and Shapiro 1989). A similar process is the establishment of authenticity (Fishman 1989, 86ff), an attempt to identify a community's 'true' identity through language. Purism, however, can fulfill other functions and is compatible with types other than the Early Modern. The strategy of *translation* plays an important role in the system. Translation is important to establish alliance with the developed world, but it also serves the development strategy because it is practiced as a means of elaborating the lexicon, grammar and style (Asmah Haji Omar 1987, 22ff). The role of translation cannot be overemphasized. It weakens in the Modern period but is reinforced again under the conditions of post-modernization. Standardization of language creates unity but it can also contribute to linguistic division (Daneš 1988a, 1509). For example, the Standardization of American English in the 19th century divided the language; in the 20th century Hindustani was standardized and codified under two different forms that carry different identities: Hindi and Urdu. In this way an internal variety is turned into external one.

D. Equalization strategies

Increasing access to language is an important prerequisite for economic development. Since a reasonably well-educated labour force is needed, access to written language is provided through *literacy teaching*, formerly subject to considerable limitations. Literacy level is raised to what I have previously called *restricted literacy* (Neustupný 1984a,

118). The figures available for various European nations and for Japan show that at the very end of the Early Modern period sometimes over 20% of the population were still illiterate. While it is true that literacy is not just a device for modernization, modernization certainly requires literacy, though not *perfect literacy*. Not all members of society are intended to be linguistically equal. Among specific areas of language it is especially the *politeness sector* which is affected by equalization strategies: the weight of status (power) decreases while the role of intimacy (solidarity) increases. The theories of Brown and Gilman (1960) come to mind. However, the removal of hierarchical networks also takes place in many other areas of language use. Of course, equalization of access is only relative and does not attend to the needs of various minority groups. We can speak of language elites (Fishman 1989, 119) which include the upper class and the upper middle class of the majority community, and which in fact 'own' the language.

E.   Symbolic strategies

Language management strategies are applied to establish the image of usually one variety of language (the Standard) as "our beloved national language", i. e. as a powerful symbol of ethnicity. The role of linguistics as a means of establishing authenticity is prominent in those communities where establishment of identity is on the agenda of the day. Philology and the study of language in general is highly regarded. Understandably, this is not only a symbolic fact: when Jernudd (1981) claimed that students from Third World countries who study at Western universities need training in particular branches of linguistics that helps them solve language problems in their home countries, he had in mind a modernity-formation situation, where the understanding of a wide range of language problems is an important asset. The Early Modern type was characteristic not only for 19th century European languages but survived in Japan until after World War II and has held sway in many Asian and African societies of the postwar period.

2.2. Modern processes of language management

Modernity-formation in Western, Northern and some Central European societies was more or less completed around World War I.

The classical industrial mode (classical in contrast to later *postindustrial* developments) had achieved prevalence – where prevalence means relative establishment, not complete domination – and stability. In the case of language, too, the Modern type of language management took over from the Early Modern type as the prevalent type within these societies. However, the achievement was often overestimated. Seen from our experience today the subsequent modernity-maintenance period, which lasted in the most 'modern' societies till the 1950s or 1960s (and in other societies, such as Japan, still longer) only represented a relatively uneventful period at a relatively low level of modernity before a further course of modernization took place. Furthermore, the term Modern suggests teleology, development towards a particular goal; in fact, there is no goal in any of the modernity-related processes, just initial conditions that accumulate and impel the process forward. Nevertheless, the name has been given, and it is difficult to take it away. At the level of *general premises* which govern the whole society, the following principles of this modernity-maintenance type stand out.

A. A period of internal extension and micro-adjustments to the already achieved industrial and social development. The whole society is now integrated into a single network.

B. Internal stratification (ethnic, class, or similar) remains unattended to; society consists of individuals. On the other hand, conflict and protest arising from internal stratification are abundant.

C. Modern societies are relatively isolated from each other – they further develop within themselves. No major changes in external relations take place, including the relationship between dominating and dominated societies.

D. Improved access to the national product by a wide range of population, including at least the middle class. However, full-scale equality is not the aim.

E. The ideology of nationalism recedes to the background, and emphasis on democracy (equal access for everyone) and individualism comes to the fore. Understandably, this ideology is unrelated to the degree of actually achieving equality or individual's rights. Class, ethnic and other variation are intentionally ignored.

Maxims generated by these general premises create the type of Modern languages. Such languages:

A. Contain at least one fully developed variety.
B. The central variety (normally the Standard) stands for language as such. This variety is conceived as stable.
C. Externally, relations with other languages are of little importance.
D. A large percentage of the population has access to the central variety of language; however, the variety remains the 'property' of the middle class.
E. Emotional commitment of the community to its language is diminished.

It is not surprising that on the basis of these maxims only a very modest system of language management *strategies* develops.

A.   Development strategies

This is the period of the strategy expressed by the slogan "leave your language alone" (Hall 1950). Relatively small changes are allowed, but reforms are excluded. When deliberate adjustments to language are needed, they are achieved through elaboration processes that can be called *language cultivation*. In the words of the pre-war Prague School, language must be kept adequate to its functions (Havránek 1932 in Garvin 1964; Daneš 1988b, 1698). This requires, additions and changes in the inventory of language (for example, in its lexicon), and also changes in the use of language. The Prague School, which proposed the most elaborate Modern theory of language management, viewed the needs of the novel use as the consequence of intellectualisation and automatization of language (Havránek [1932] 1964, 6 ff). Small adjustments in the lexicon and style are introduced, and work on orthoepy proceeds. Most European societies of the interwar period, practised relatively active varieties of language cultivation. English-speaking societies show a more passive approach, where the State rarely intervenes. Japan also displays a pattern in the 1960s to 1980s in which passive attitudes dominate. It should not surprise, that even when the Modern type is prevalent, the Early Modern type still can survive. In the 1930s the Prague School linguists, standing firm in their Modern positions, launched an attack on surviving Czech purists (cf. Havránek/Weingart 1932) and eradicated their influence. In many other countries purism sur-

vived much longer, either because the Modern type was weak or because it fulfilled other functions (Neustupný 1989b, passim).

B.   Variation strategies

Attention of language management concentrates on the National language (the Standard) and the existence of other varieties is *ignored*. Although phenomena such as minority ethnic languages or class variation in language survive, they are not attended to at the more complex (organized) levels of language management. In mid-1960s, the official Modern picture of Australia was one of a middle class Anglo-Celtic society. At the time, wide range stratification, including many immigrant groups, existed but the official perception was still Modern. The prestige of the Standard National language is paramount and at the level of simple discourse correction by individuals we can witness adjustment towards this prestigious variety, not only in writing but in speaking as well. Dialectal features in speech are negatively evaluated and removed in the speech of those who wish to climb the social ladder. Overall, regional and social dialects survive. The spoken language is accorded considerable attention because semiformal situations using the spoken language substantially increase. This is the time of (semiformal) parties, the telephone starts to be widely used, radio broadcasting commences and public speaking at meetings descends to the level of the common educated citizen. The *stability of language* over time is of importance. Except for changes necessary to keep them "adequate to their function", Standard languages seem to stop changing. The norm is fixed and although small adaptations occur, larger changes that would affect the norm, are banned. While in the Early Modern period reforms of language occurred frequently, the modernity-maintenance type does not allow for incursions into language. In Japan the last far-reaching language reforms occurred at the end of the 1940s, still under the modernity-formation type; since then there have been only small adaptations to actual usage. For the Modern period the idea of changing language artificially is ridiculous: artificial languages, such as Esperanto or Basic English, elicit no more than a smile. One difficult question for Modern societies to solve are *personal names*. Names incongruous with norms of the National Language remain as a residue after

minority languages are de facto removed, or after reforms of the Early Modern period are completed. The trend, already present under the Early Modern type to assimilate foreign names into the majority system and regulate indigenous ones (when they appear in some way deviant) continues in the Modern type. Jernudd (1995) has collected examples from six countries. In his examples strict assimilation tends to dominate the approach to the problem in the Early Modern systems while in pre-war Sweden assimilation to the (majority) norm was only indirectly guided. The same can be said about the process through which immigrants anglicized their names in English-speaking countries.

C.   External variation strategies

Colonialism is further developed and stabilized, even though anti-colonial movements are imminent, and many vernaculars are preparing to become national standards. Outside varieties are not considered a major issue. *Purism* next to disappears. Classical languages tend to vanish from schools although they may be retained thanks to the survival of some strategies of the Early Modern type. Modern foreign *language teaching* finds itself at the periphery and is largely left in the realm of the grammar translation method. Only partially does it apply the direct method or the audio-lingual method of teaching, which are Modern approaches; they have contributed to the teaching of spoken language, but have not really showed sufficient strength necessary to achieve improved acquisition. *Translation* is well but does not succeed in retaining the unique position it formerly occupied.

D.   Equalization strategies

Equal access to language is supposed to have already been achieved. In fact, however, only the middle classes have fully succeeded. *Literacy* is frequently reported to be in the vicinity of 99 per cent, but wide-spread functional illiteracy, around 10–20% of the population, persists (Neustupný 1984a, 119). This is the time with regard to which Graff (1994) could not state "I cannot recall a time when literacy was not in a crisis" (p.38): there was no feeling that anything would be going wrong. In the 1960s Goody wondered why so little interest in literacy was shown by social scientists who in 'advanced' societies were taking the existence of writing for granted (Goody

1968). Goody's own interest was the mark of an incipient new paradigm.

E.   Symbolic strategies

The passive attitude to language management is reflected in various theories of language management, such as the Prague School theory of language cultivation. It is of interest to note that the Prague School only acknowledged the need for weak cultivation of language and did not touch on the issue of language policy, notwithstanding that the Czechoslovak state comprised large and active ethnic minorities (Neustupný/Nekvapil 2003). An interest in language policy was simply outside the horizon of the Modern Paradigm. Modern attitudes still survive within more recent approaches both in Europe and elsewhere. Although the overall paradigm has changed, individual old features have made their entry into the 21st century.

2.3. Postmodern processes of language management

In the USA, Canada, Australia and gradually in Western, Northern and some Central European languages (and in Asia in Japanese), modernity-expansion (postmodernization) strategies started emerging from the 1960s onwards. The character of industrial production has further changed, now encompassing, within a hierarchical world order, all members of society. The way of thinking and speaking about this far-reaching change has been altered. The term *postmodern* started being used with regard to individual areas of culture (Bertens 1995, 3ff) and it was only later that the awareness of the encompassing character of the change was acknowledged and *postmodern* started being employed in reference to social and economic facts as well.

In the case of the Postmodern type, the following characteristics appear at the level of *general premises*.

A.   The economy undergoes a new *post-industrial* development and this provides conditions under which variation and conflict in society are no longer potentially lethal. Not only production and trade, but also services and consumption are radically expanded. The role of science and technology greatly increases and provides the base for a social system informed by human knowledge. At the same time concern about the environment becomes very strong.

B. Through international movement of population societies grow more complicated ethnically. Previously existing ethnic and social variation moves to focus and variation becomes one of the most frequently discussed phenomena of society and culture. The idea of multiculturalism appears. Michel Maffesoli spoke of a new movement from individualism to collectivism (quoted in Featherstone 2000, 13).

C. There is internationalization or globalization of production and markets. This leads to radically increased international contacts of all kind. Internationalization and globalization require a world system in which hierarchization takes place and such hierarchization is often negatively evaluated. Surviving economic inequality, mostly derived from the colonial past, negatively affects the completion of modernization and beginning of postmodernization in 'periphery' societies as emphasized in the dependency World System theory.

D. There is a new wave of equalization which pays less attention to social class but emphasizes equalization across sexes, age, ethnic boundaries, etc. Economic production has increased to such extent that it is now not only workable but also necessary to include all social strata in the distribution process. On the other hand, a large number of cases of inequality remain. Multinational companies and media magnates hold enormous power. On the other hand, the power of non-governmental organizations of citizens is also growing.

E. The ideology that develops is that of postmodernism, which can be divided into two seemingly opposite streams: humanism and rationalism. I further discuss this dichotomy under 2.3 and 3.

These premises furnish a picture of the Postmodern which is remote from that painted by enthusiastic proponents of the type, who suggest that here lies the solution to all social problems of mankind. The truth is nothing of the kind. Substantial problems remain and are unlikely to be removed in the near future. Nevertheless it is necessary to accept that while certainly new problems have appeared, some of the older ones – primarily those connected with variation and some forms of inequality – are in fact receiving attention.

Maxims which are generated by these general premises lead to important changes in the type of Postmodern languages.

A. Languages develop further in their vocabularies and means of expression. An important new addition to languages are electronic media which substantially change the character of various aspects of communication.

B. Internal variation, along the regional, class, ethnic, sex or other dimensions, gains prominence. It is displayed and celebrated rather than concealed.

C. The linguistic world consists of a large number of languages which are formally equal but among which, in fact, new hierarchization occurs. Newly emerging languages – such as Japanese, Chinese or Korean – are taught even at the primary level. Of course, among all world languages English is the most equal of all and somewhat outdated though easy-to-use terms such as 'linguistic imperialism' have been applied to this situation.

D. Sex, age and other types of language discrimination are targeted for removal.

E. One type of postmodern ideology of language glorifies language variation. Another type builds on the concept of rationalization – the idea that language must efficiently serve economy and society.

Under these general language maxims develops the Postmodern type of strong language management which is characterized by the following *strategies*. Some of these strategies appear sooner than others and not all of them are applied in all systems. The following survey of these strategies will show that while attending to the project of modernization linguists have not yet detached themselves from the pattern of ignoring social facts that generate language problems.

A. Development strategies

New language terminologies and media are attended to, but these activities frequently take place outside the established language treatment networks (for example, in companies: Jernudd 1997). A number of 'rationalizing' strategies appears: removal of traditional measures and currency systems, introduction of post-codes, electronic mail, internet, etc. The newly created computer terminology permeates other areas. International terminology coordination com-

mences in a number of agencies (cf. INFO-TERM, Jernudd 1983, 349). Some questions have remained unattended so far. The most important among them is what human communication is most 'human'. Among the newly developed forms of communication, patterns appear that seem to diverge from human-like communication. In this situation it is necessary to consider what are the most appropriate ways of communication. Needless to say, this must not become a one-sidedly humanistic project. Rationalistic arguments must also be considered.

B. Variation strategies

Strategies are applied in order to support existing language variation. Such strategies aim at the removal of negative evaluation, support of the use of the varieties and, in the case of some of them, at their teaching. In the 1970s ethnic communities were rediscovered and stickers saying 'different is beautiful' were seen on bumper bars. Linguistic *multiculturalism* appeared on the scene, cf. the Australian *national language policy* of the 1980s (Lo Bianco 1987; Clyne 1991; Ozolins 1993). While multiculturalism is a humanistic project, from the stance of rationalism changes such as the legal codification of *official languages* advance in some societies, for example in the United States. These trends cannot easily be dismissed. They are inherent within the Postmodern type of language management. The *Standard language* weakens its norm, and regional dialects gain more acceptibility. This trend gave Mattheier the opportunity to give prominence to the concept of Standardization and De-Standardization of languages (Mattheier 1997). A similar trend towards the acceptance of dialects is also characteristic for Japan (Neustupný 1995). The idea that standardization is inevitable in order to teach a language does not appear as obvious any more (Hübschmannová/Neustupný 1996, 102f). The renewed concern with the situation of Common Czech in the 1990s (Daneš 1997; Daneš 2003) also belongs to the same class of problems. Although Common Czech is not a threatened variety, the question is what functional role it should be allowed to play. On the other hand, 'unnecessary' variation that blocks access to language (such as the difficult language of law and administration) is partially removed through the *plain language* movements. In this case the equalization strategy

gives assistance because the old usage is seen as supporting the interests of the elites. The plain language movement is not a phenomenon particular to English (for Swedish see Jernudd 1983, 359) *Pidgins and creoles* are taken seriously (Hymes 1971). The language of non-native speakers becomes more acceptable and attracts the attention of linguists (Neustupný 1985; Clyne 1994).

At the level of *discourse correction* by individuals the trend towards standardization of speech continues. Dialects are further eroded, and ethnic languages tend to be more and more weakened or entirely lost in each subsequent generation of speakers. While the variation supporting strategies are governed by the humanistic maxim, these variation-reducing strategies can be assigned to rationalism.

C. External variation strategies

Colonialism has disappeared under that name but the inequality of development has remained. It results in the varying power of languages with English, the language of globalization, being on the top of the international hierarchy, followed by languages of the economically strongest countries, including now also some of the nouveau riche, such as Japanese and prospectively Chinese. Some former colonial languages stay under the spell of former colonial languages and struggle to further develop. Many weak languages are in a difficult situation or die. This is a logical extension of modernization strategies into the contemporary Postmodern society. External variation is positively managed through revitalized *language teaching* which now connects with governmental language treatment networks. Some organized language management networks give the impression of being mostly concerned about language acquisition (cf. Australia, Lo Bianco 1987). Language teaching is now dominated by the communicative approach. The range of languages taught widens beyond the previously accepted 'modernity-maintenance' range. In Australia any one of approximately 50 languages can be studied for a high-school-final/university-entrance examination (however, most of these are immigrant languages, cf. Clyne 1991). The role of *English as the international language* is conspicuous. Although English is often welcome, important objections have been raised against it (Phillipson 1992). It seems that we must take into consideration two aspects of

English: it can be used as an international language, but also as a language that supports economic, social and cultural hegemony of the 'English-speaking' countries. It is significant that even when used in the former function, the form of English is normally identical with native English. A considerable pressure of English on other languages appears and this also becomes the concern of language management. The question of 'language and globalization' has not yet received full and adequate attention (however, cf. comments in Jernudd 1997, 15). Equally underdeveloped is the question of international language management, not in the sense of what language ought to be used where, but to what extent one community can require planning, or engage in planning, with regard to another community. This problem has been touched on in 2000 by the Japanese National Language Council which made a decision about how the order of Japanese personal names should be rendered in English. Another issue that crosses the boundaries of a single country is the question of retention of languages as a common human cultural heritage.

D. Equalization strategies

Policies are established to remove all kinds of language *discrimination* (ethnic, sex, age, handicapped speakers, etc.). For example gender discrimination in language has been intensively managed since the 1970s in English-speaking communities. *Literacy*, i. e. the mastery of the written language, is reassessed and it is widely accepted that functional illiteracy reaches considerable levels even within so-called highly developed countries (Verhoeven, ed. 1994). For example, Doets (1994, 331) showed that 11 to 17% of Dutch adults experienced problems in writing their language. Situation in the Postmodern languages leads to the abandonment of the myth of perfect literacy. Access to information is skewed by the centralization of control of mass media. Threats to privacy of information and communication increase with computerization of society. Computerization creates new problems because not all social strata have equal access (e. g. women and the elderly still experience problems in using computers and the internet). On the other hand equalization can be identified in the appearance of local radio and press and in the availability of internet information to a very large percentage of the world population. The idea of language rights has been present in language planning for several decades (Kloss 1971). This is a Postmodern project. For so-called corpus management it has been elaborated by Neustupný (1984) but its focus has remained in status management and the question which varieties ought to be used for what purpose (Skutnabb-Kangas/Phillipson 1995).

However, one of the most important additions to the language situation of the Postmodern period is the marking of language as satisfying the interests of particular speakers, and targeting language with the realization that power relationships are involved. This behaviour towards language builds on previously prepared grounds. Work such as Jernudd and Neustupný 1987, Fairclough 1989, Tollefson 1991 or Phillipson 1992 document the varying bases of the corresponding language management theories.

E. Symbolic strategies

There are two ideologies of postmodernism in language, and both of them agree with the general premises of the type. The first ideology is a *humanistic* one. It connects with social theories of interest, power, domination, inequality, linguistic imperialism and others. It glorifies variation, is concerned with the role of English, and takes a strong stance against discrimination. This ideology is typically generated by participants in language management who hold independent positions (scholars, other intellectuals, opposition politicians). The other ideology can be designated as *rationalistic* (without the implication of an automatic positive evaluation). It is normally advocated by governments and those who are close to them. It emphasises economic and social needs of the communities in question, and stands for maintenance rather than relaxation of norms. The humanistic ideology arrived first. Rationalism appeared in language management mainly in the 1990s and created the impression that the paradigm had changed. This is not so. Both humanism and rationalism are compatible with the Postmodern type of language management. Language managers must learn how to deal with both of them at the same time.

3. Modernization: for whom?

Modernity-related processes are not value-neutral. However, it would be incorrect to

assume that modernization always promotes the interests of a particular social group over others. Admittedly, some strategies favour in the first instance industrialists and their associated networks. However, many strategies are in the interest of a number of social groups. For example, the transition from education presented in a canon language to education in a vernacular may be intended as a strategy to produce a large number of high quality graduates for the labour market and as such is in the interest of industrialists. At the same time it broadens the action radius of individuals who receive such education. The historical process of modernization of Asian, African and Latin American societies of the 1960s cannot be considered in isolation from the global political environment. This was the period of struggle between the Western capitalist and the Soviet systems. Modernization became a powerfull program to check Soviet influence. It is in this period that the term *language planning* was coined, language modernization theory flourished, the Ford Foundation became interested in language matters, and large projects such as the International Project on Language Planning Processes were funded. No doubt, as the projects progressed, interests of the academics who actually worked on them were superimposed upon the interests of the US government, and it is the task of future research to show the interplay of all the agents involved. The question of interests is present in the Postmodern period. Sometimes, the only beneficiaries of humanistic strategies supporting immigrant languages are the intellectuals who propose them. Sometimes such strategies are welcome by immigrants themselves. However, they are not necessarily preferred by employers who desire monolingual education in a majority language. One of the most important issues linguists face with regard to modernization is how to interpret the interest and power structure of globalization. The dichotomy is not merely between the dominating and the dominated. The matter is not simple. It seems to remain unresolved for some time.

Acknowledgements

4. Literature (selected)

Annamalai, E. (1995) "Modernization of language: The case of Tamil", in: *Language Standardization and Modernization: Dynamics of Language Planning*, Imitiaz Hasnain, ed., New Delhi.

– (2001) *Managing Multingualism in India: Political and Linguistic Manifestations*, New Delhi.

Asmah Haji Omar (1979) *Language Planning for Unity and Efficiency*, Kuala Lumpur.

– (1987) *Malay in its Sociocultural Context*, Kuala Lumpur.

Bertens, H. (1995) *The Idea of the Postmodern. A History*, London.

Brown, R./Gilman, A. (1960) "The pronouns of power and solidarity", in: *Style in Language*, T. Sebeok, ed., Cambridge, Mass., 253–76.

Clyne, Michael G. (1991) *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*, Cambridge.

– (1994) *Inter-cultural Communication at Work*, Cambridge.

Cooper, R.L. (1989) *Language Planning and Social Change*, Cambridge.

Cypher, J.M./Dietz, J.L (1997) *The Process of Economic Development*, London.

Daneš, F. (1988a) „Herausbildung und Reform von Standardsprachen", in: *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, Ammon, U. /Dittmar, N./Mattheier, K.J., eds., Berlin, 1505–1516.

– (1988b) „Sprachkultur", in: *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, Ammon, U. /Dittmar, N./Mattheier, K.J., eds., Berlin, 1697–1703.

– (1997) „Was geschieht mit dem heutigen Tschechischen (Triebkräfte und Perspektiven)", in: Mattheier/Radtke 1997, 201–213.

– (2003) "The present-day situationn of Czech", in: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 9–18.

Doets, C. (1994) "Assessment of adult literacy levels: the Dutch case", in: *Functional Literacy*, Verhoeven, L., ed., Amsterdam, 321–332.

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*, London.

Featherstone, M. (2000) "Globalizing the post modern: Reflexions on consumer culture and post modernism", in: *IHJ (International House of Japan) Bulletin* 20/2, 11–16.

Ferguson, C.A. (1959) "Diglossia", in: *Word* 15, 325–40.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1989) *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*, Clevendon.

Garvin, P., ed., (1964) *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, Washington.

Gerschenkron, A. (1962) *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*, Cambridge, Mass.

Goody, J. (1968) *Literacy in Traditional Societies*, Cambridge.

Graff, H.J. (1994) "Literacy, myths and legacies: lessons from the history of literacy", in: Verhoeven 1994, 37–60.

Habermas, J. (1981) „Die Moderne – ein unvollendetes Projekt", in: *Kleine politische Schriften* I–IV, Frankfurt.

Hall, R.A. (1950) *Leave Your Language Alone!* Linguistica Press.

Harvey, D. (1989) *The Codition of Postmodernity*, Oxford.

Havránek, B. (1932) „Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura [The purposes of a standard language and its cultivation]", in: Havránek/Weingart (1932). Section 2 of this paper is available in Garvin (1964).

–/Weingart, M., eds., (1932) *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* [Standard Czech and the Cultivation of Language], Prague.

Hroch, M. (1998) "The social interpretation of linguistic demands in European national movements," in: *Regional and National Identities in Europe in the XIXth and XXth Centuries*, Haupt, H-G. /Müller, M.G./Woolf, S., eds., Kluwer Law International, 67–96.

Hübschmannová, M./Neustupný, J.V. (1996) "The Slovak-and-Czech dialect of Romani and its standardization", in: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 120, 85–109.

Hymes, D. (1971) *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, Cambridge.

Inglehart, R. (1997) *Modernization and Postmodernization*, Princeton.

Jernudd, B.H. (1981) "Planning language treatment: Linguistics for the Third World", in: *Language in Society* 10, 43–52.

– (1983) "Evaluation of language planning", in: *Progress in Language Planning*, Cobarrubias, J./ Fishman, J., eds., Berlin, 345–378.

– (1993) "Language planning from a management perspective: An interpretation of findings", in: *Language Conflict and Language Planning*, Jahr, Ernst Hakon, ed., Berlin, 133–142.

– (1995) "Personal names and human rights", in: *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove/Phillipson, Robert, eds., Berlin, 121–132.

– (1997) "New agencies in language planning. Corporations and firms as language managers", in: *TermNet News* 56/57, 14–17.

– /Neustupný, J.V. (1987) "Language planning: For whom?", in: *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning*, Laforge, L., ed., Québec, 71–84.

– /Shapiro, M.J., eds., (1989) *The Politics of Language Purism*, Berlin.

Khubchandani, L.M. (1983) *Plural Languages, Plural Cultures*, Honolulu.

Kloss, H. (1971) "Language rights of immigrant groups", in: *International Migration Review* 5/2, 250–68.

Lo Bianco, J. (1987) *National Policy on Languages*, Canberra.

Mathesius, V. (1932) "O požadavku stability ve spisovném jazyce", in: Havránek/Weingart 1932. German translation: "Über die Notwendigkeit der Stabilität in der Literatursprache", in: *Grundlagen der Sprachkultur* 1, Scharnhorst, J./ Ising, E., eds., Berlin, 1976, 86–102.

Mattheier, K.J. (1997) "Über Destandardisierung, Umstandardisierung und Standardisierung in modernen europäischen Sprachen", in: *Standardisierung und Destandardisierung europäischer Sprachen*, Mattheier K.J./Radtke, E., eds., 1–9.

Neustupný, J.V. (1972) "Basic types of language treatment", in: *Linguistic Communications* 1. Reprinted in: *Advances in Language Planning*, The Hague, 37–48.

– (1984a) "Literacy and minorities: Divergent perceptions", in: *Linguistic Minorities and Literacy*, Coulmas, F., ed., The Hague, 115–128.

– (1984b) "Language planning and human rights", in: *Panagani, Essays in Honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan*, Manila, 66–74.

– (1985) "Problems in Australian-Japanese contact situations", in: *Cross-cultural Encounters: Communication and Mis-Communication*, Pride, J.B., ed., Melbourne, 161–170.

– (1988) "Problems of English contact discourse and language planning." Paper presented at the 1988 *Regional Seminar on Language Planning in a Multilingual Setting*, National University of Singapore. Appeared in: *English and Language Planning: A Southeast Asian Contribution*, Kandiah, T./Kwan-Terry, J., eds., Singapore, 1994, 50–69.

– (1989a) "The role of typologies in understanding Japanese culture and society", in: *Constructs for Understanding Japan*, Sugimoto, Y./Mouer, R., eds., London, 344–380.

– (1989b) "Language purism as a type of language correction", in: Jernudd/Shapiro, 211–223.

– (1995) "Kindaika o koete – Nihongo no posutomodan no ayumi" [Beyond modernization: The history of the postmodernization of Japanese], in: *Gengo* 24/9, 76–83.

Neustupný, J. V. (2002) "Sociolinguistika a jazy-
kový management [Sociolinguistics and language
management]", in: *Czech Sociological Review* 38,
429–442.

Neustupný, J.V./Nekvapil, J. (2003) "Language
management in the Czech Republic", in: *Current
Issues in Language Planning* 4, 181–366.

Ozolins, U. (1993) *The Politics of Language in
Australia*, Cambridge.

Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*, Ox-
ford.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T./Phillipson, R., eds. (1994)
*Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic
Discrimination*, Berlin.

Sylla, R./Toniolo, G. (1991) *Patterns of European
Industrialization*, London.

Tollefson, J.W. (1991) *Planning Language, Plan-
ning Inequality*, London.

Verhoeven, L., ed. (1994) *Functional Literacy*,
Amsterdam.

Wienold, G. (1987) „Kanon und Hierarchiebil-
dung in Sprache und Literatur. Sprachentwick-
lungstyp, Diglossie und Polysystem", in: *Kanon
und Zensur*, Assmann, Aleida/Jan, eds., Munich.

J. V. Neustupný, Melbourne (Australia)

225. The Development of Languages for Special Purposes
Herausbildung von Fachsprachen

1. Approaches to the study of LSP
2. Sociolinguistic aspects of LSP development
3. A concluding remark
4. Literature (selected)

1. Approaches to the study of LSP

1.1. The term *language for special purposes*,
or *language for specific purposes* (cf. Hoff-
mann 1988) is used with a variety of mean-
ings (cf. art. 25; art. 136; Ammon 1998/
1999a), and the word-forming structure of
its equivalents in national languages makes
its various aspects explicit: cf. e.g. the
German equivalent 'Fachsprache' (Laurén
1994). As the English term 'language for
special purposes' (henceforth LSP) suggests,
the relevant linguistic phenomena (forms,
varieties) are defined on the basis of the pur-
poses they serve, or their functions. It is
therefore logical to work with the concept of
LSP proceeding from Prague inter-war func-
tionalism. As is well-known, this was based
on the general idea that "seen from the func-
tionalist viewpoint, language is a system of
purposeful means of expression" (PLC
1929/1983, 77). The authors connected with
the Prague Linguistic Circle asserted the
opinion that a special language should not
be identified with "the sum of peculiarities
of vocabulary and phraseology differing
from common usage", i.e. with terminology
in particular, and they urged that the
special-purpose discourse and texts should

be investigated as a whole (Vančura 1936,
161; Pytelka 1972). However, it was not until
about 1970 that this research program
started being implemented in connection
with the communicative and pragmatic
orientation of linguistics (cf. Helbig 1986)
and linguists (and sociologists) focused
on specialized communication as such in
more detail, including the question of how
specialized communication is produced in
the everyday interaction among the speakers
(Drew/Heritage 1992; Lynch 1993). Never-
theless, the study of terminology has not lost
its importance within the framework of the
investigation of LSP, as demonstrated by the
contents of the monumental handbook
edited by Hoffmann, Kalverkämper and
Wiegand (1998/1999) as well as its full
title *Fachsprachen/ Languages for Special
Purposes. Ein internationales Handbuch zur
Fachsprachenforschung und Terminologie-
wissenschaft/An International Handbook of
Special-Language and Terminology Re-
search*. Nowadays the term LSP, or 'Fach-
sprache', thus refers to a research area with-
in which various phenomena of different
degrees of complexity are being analyzed:
(i) specific lexical sets, terminology in par-
ticular; (ii) sets of linguistic means (i.e. not
only lexical ones) having special functions;
(iii) specialized texts and their genres;
(iv) specialized communication, including
specialized oral communication. These four
analytical subjects have not been usually

Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft

Handbooks of Linguistics
and Communication Science

Manuels de linguistique et
des sciences de communication

Mitbegründet von Gerold Ungeheuer (†)
Mitherausgegeben 1985−2001 von Hugo Steger

Herausgegeben von / Edited by / Edités par
Herbert Ernst Wiegand

Band 3.3

2. Auflage

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York