The Handbook of Educational Linguistics

Edited by

Bernard Spolsky and Francis M. Hult

CS-5134 /2010

18 Language Cultivation in Developed Contexts

JIŘÍ NEKVAPIL

The Concept of Language Cultivation

The word "cultivate" in the expression "language cultivation" means "to refine," or, put differently, "to improve something by making small changes." These "small changes" involve mainly orthography (e.g., substituting one letter for another in a particular group of words), the lexicon (e.g., introducing an appropriate term for a new phenomenon), or the style of a particular language (e.g., simplifying a certain manner of expression). However, it is not only a question of making changes in language but also of keeping it in good condition ("taking care of language"). "Language cultivation" presumes a pre-existing clarification of which variety is to be cultivated, for which language users it is to be cultivated – or, as the case may be, who is going to cultivate it – in the same way that "cultivation of soil" presumes a pre-existing clarification of, e.g., where the soil is located and to whom it belongs. It follows that dealing with a language or languages involves issues more fundamental than cultivation. These include mainly deciding which language will or will not be used in a particular community (or even in particular communication domains). This type of language treatment is often termed "status planning," while language cultivation is often referred to as "corpus planning" (or *Sprachkultur* in German, *jazyková kultura* in Czech, and similarly in Slavic languages). This chapter is devoted mainly to the latter type of language treatment.

What, however, is the object proper of "language cultivation"? A language such as French, German, or Czech is not a monolithic whole, but rather a complex of language varieties differentiated on the basis of territorial, social, functional, temporal, and other factors. Any variety of a particular language may potentially become the object of cultivation, but it is typically standard language that constitutes the main object of this treatment. As far as standard language is concerned – i.e., language with a scope not limited to a particular

region, operating on the level of the whole society, and capable of fulfilling the greatest cultural and civilization needs (Havránek, 1932a; Daneš, 2006) – two stages of cultivation may be distinguished: (1) the cultivation of a particular selected variety aimed at the formation of (multifunctional) standard language, (2) the cultivation of the already formed standard language. The two stages occur during different periods in the development of a particular society (an ethnic group, a nation), and it is possible to refer to stage (2) as language cultivation in "developed contexts." On the other hand, stage (1), often called "language modernization," suggests that the language cultivation theory is closely interlinked with the theory of standard language (see below).

The cultivation of standard language pursues certain goals. While the first group of goals is tacitly or overtly tied to status planning, which means that the goals are connected with the "non-linguistic" goals of the society as a whole (e.g., the emphasis on political or cultural independence), the second group is aimed at the effectiveness of the language itself as a tool of communication. The latter group is therefore the field of linguists and teachers to a greater extent than the former.

Let us now address the first group of goals of the cultivation of standard language. According to Fishman (2006), the aims of corpus planning (or language cultivation) linked with status planning comprise (1) language purity (versus vernacularity), (2) uniqueness (versus Westernization, or more precisely, internationalization), (3) classicization (versus "panification," a word coined from the Greek form "pan" meaning "relating to the whole of," see below), (4) the departure of a particular language variety from another, structurally close to it, or the contrary, one variety approaching another ("Ausbau" and "Einbau" in Fishman's terminology). Specialists in language cultivation achieve these goals by:

1   preventing elements of certain foreign languages from entering the language (or on the contrary, sustaining a vernacular language tolerant of foreign elements);
2   advocating the characteristic features of a particular language (or vice versa – bringing the language closer to "Western" languages, or more generally, internationalizing the language);
3   incorporating elements of a classical language into the language in question, for instance, Sanskrit into Hindi (alternatively, attempting to establish a new cultural and linguistic unified formation stretching across several languages on the basis of a more or less hypothetical ancient source language, cf. the attempts to establish the Illyric language on the territory of today's southern Slavs);
4   stressing the differences between two structurally close varieties (German *Ausbau*, cf. the situation of Serbian and Croatian after the break-up of the former Yugoslavia), or vice versa – bringing the varieties closer to one another (German *Einbau*, cf. the situation of Serbian and Croatian in Yugoslavia in most of the second half of the twentieth century).

The second group of goals of the cultivation of standard language comprises stability and uniformity of the language (in other words, the limitations imposed on its variation) as well as the functional elaboration of the language, i.e., the exact differentiation of individual linguistic means according to the functions they perform (e.g., the differentiation of various nominal suffixes according to the different meanings they express), and maximization of functional scope, i.e., making it possible for the language to be used for a variety of purposes (e.g., not only as the language of liturgy, but also of schooling and science).

However, it is not merely *language* cultivation that matters but also the cultivation of the communicative process, that is, the cultivation of the way language is used (including production as well as reception). Obviously, such cultivation must involve not only the use of standard language but also, essentially, the use of all varieties of the language and, in a multilingual environment, even different languages.

The Origin of "Language Cultivation" in the Prague School of Linguistics

Following the principle "Leave your language alone" (Hall, 1950), linguistic structuralism, which developed the ideas of Ferdinand de Saussure, was not particularly interested in the cultivation of (standard) language. The linguists of the Prague School (Havránek, Mathesius, Jakobson) are exceptional in this respect: while they addressed primarily the problems of the Czech linguistic situation, in the 1930s they formulated a more general theory and principles of language cultivation (drawing on some of their predecessors as well as contemporaries, for instance, the Swedish linguist A. Noreen – see in particular Noreen & Johannson, 1892 – or the Russian G. Vinokur – see especially Vinokur, 1925). Aiming primarily at weakening the position of purism as the leading principle of corpus planning (to use present-day terminology), the theory is characterized mainly by functionalism.

The cultivation activities of the Prague School focus on contemporary standard language. Its cultivation must be based on an exact description of the state of the present standard language, the goal being to identify the "norm" of standard language. The norm is a set of linguistic means and rules considered obligatory by language users. Language cultivation should benefit the contemporary language user; therefore it is based on the norm of standard language written and spoken during the past 50 years. In practical research this means studying the way standard language is used by "good authors" (of both fiction and non-fiction) and the educated classes. The descriptive stage may then be followed by the stage of cultivation which concentrates on current or potential problems – these are always present, to a greater or lesser extent, since standard language changes together with the development of the community of its users. The aim of cultivation activities is twofold: (1) to support the

stability of standard language, (2) to advance its functional differentiation and stylistic richness (Havránek, 1932b). Although achieving stability of standard language constitutes a primary goal of cultivation, it is not to be interpreted as an effort to conserve a particular state of the language. The fact that societies as well as languages develop is to be respected, the goal therefore being "flexible stability" of standard language (Mathesius, 1932). Nor does stability mean absolute uniformity – standard language serves a variety of purposes ("functions"), having various sets of linguistic means ("functional varieties") at its disposal to accommodate these demands. The following functions of standard language may be distinguished: conversational function, specialized theoretical function, specialized practical function, and aesthetic function. Systematic attention should be devoted primarily to the formation of specialized terminology, and in general "intellectualization" of language, that is, the adaptation of standard language

> to the goal of making possible precise and rigorous, if necessary, abstract statements, capable of expressing the continuity and complexity of thought, that is, to reinforce the intellectual side of speech. This intellectualization culminates in scientific (theoretical) speech, determined by the attempt to be as precise in expression as possible, to make statements which reflect the rigor of objective (scientific) thinking in which the terms approximate concepts and the sentences approximate logical judgements. (Havránek, 1932a: 45)

The stabilization of standard language is affected to a considerable extent by schooling, in which practically every member of the language community participates. The needs of schools (as well as of the general public) require that the desirable form of the standard language be codified, that is, it should be officially stated which linguistic means are correct and/or appropriate. Codification is embodied in three basic types of handbooks: dictionaries, grammars, and style manuals (Mathesius, 1932). Codification is carried out by specialists who follow three criteria when assessing the correctness or appropriateness of a particular linguistic means (Daneš, 1987):

1   compliance with the norm (Is the linguistic means well established, conventionalized, fully accepted in the language community?);
2   adequacy with respect to function (Is the linguistic means suitable, or appropriate for the performance of a particular function?);
3   systemic character (Does the linguistic means conform to the rules of the particular language system?).

The criteria constitute a hierarchy, the first being superordinate to the other two in case of a conflict among them (with the second criterion, in turn, superordinate to the third). The codification should reflect the known tendencies in the development of the norm of standard language and support them. Although codification is carried out primarily by specialists, much effort should

nevertheless be devoted to the positive reception of its results by the general public. The fact that the codification is backed by a prominent institution (e.g., the Academy) is not sufficient to guarantee such reception. Language codification does not have the character of a law or directive but rather that of an "(urgent) appeal" (the failure to comply with the norm is penalized only at school). The social acceptance of the codification may only be achieved through popularization and information campaigns as well as systematic language education (for more details on the classic Prague approach and some extensions see Garvin, 1973, 1993).

Later, the Prague theory distinguished between the cultivation of language and the cultivation of the communicative process (i.e., the use of language). Language cultivation is intended to ensure that language reaches a level that allows optimum communication. This constitutes the actual purpose of language cultivation (Hausenblas, 1979). The cultivation of the communicative process, however, comprises more than the use of standard language. It is also a matter of using non-standard varieties, a combination of these varieties, or a combination of standard and non-standard linguistic phenomena, as the case may be, in a manner appropriate to the function and situation (Homoláč & Nebeská, 2000). Thus the cultivation of the communicative process is tantamount to the processes of identification, elaboration, and popularization of stylistic norms (the appropriate selection of linguistic and textual means with respect to their purpose in communication). Such norms are not as binding as linguistic norms; they are more dynamic, variable, and often not rigorously codified, although they constitute a part of language education. Norms relating to communication in a multilingual environment have been out of the range of interest of the Prague School's theory and practice.

The Current State of Language Cultivation in Two National Contexts

It will not be possible to provide a general characteristic of the countries in question here due to space limitations. I shall therefore focus on the features I consider interesting and relevant with respect to the possible applications in the context of other states.

The Czech Republic

The current state of language cultivation in the Czech Republic represents a theoretical as well as institutional continuation of the language cultivation established in the first half of the twentieth century. Prague functionalism has defeated the proponents of the historical purity of the Czech language both in theory and in practice, and codification of standard language has begun to approach the contemporary norm to a greater extent. This was welcomed

especially by fiction writers, whose language also became regarded as a means of identifying the norm of standard language on the basis of the new theory. The Prague theory was implemented not only in the new dictionaries and grammars, but also in textbooks of Czech for primary and secondary schools. It is symptomatic that the textbooks were co-authored by the best linguists, the founders of the cultivation theory themselves, e.g., B. Havránek or later F. Daneš.

In the Czech Republic, like in other countries in Europe, orthography has received particular attention in schools as well as among the general public. Czech orthography has been codified since 1902 by the official handbook *The Rules of Czech Spelling* (Pravidla . . . 1902). Since its first publication, however, the handbook has not dealt merely with orthographic phenomena but also with morphology and orthoepy. Nor does it comprise rules alone. These can be found in the initial part of the handbook, with the other part providing an alphabetical list of words most difficult to use (with their forms in selected problematic cases since Czech is an inflectional language with complex morphology). Codification of Czech spelling has been dealt with by specialized committees almost continuously since the early twentieth century. The most important editions of the handbook, which brought quite fundamental changes, were published in 1902, 1913, 1941, 1957, and 1993. Since *The Rules* was co-authored by the most outstanding linguists (Gebauer, Havránek, Daneš), some of the innovations in the codification are also interesting from a theoretical point of view. For instance, the authors of *The Rules* published in 1957 adopted a novel approach to the codification of vowel length in foreign words – while the earlier codifications aimed at drawing the spelling closer to the pronunciation, the orthographic codification in 1957 attempted to influence and unify the varying pronunciation. Since the very beginning, the idea of *The Rules* has been tied to the modernization efforts of Czech society. The primary goals of the handbook comprised the rationalization of orthography, and consequently equal opportunity for all members of the society to apply the spelling rules. Since the first edition, *The Rules* has been oriented to the needs of the widest social stratum, namely people with a primary or secondary school education (codification has always catered for making it possible for the user to arrive at a relatively unambiguous decision about what is and what is not correct). However, in some areas of spelling, these goals proved to be more difficult to reach due to attempts at a codification based on the orthographic preferences of certain social groups (teachers, writers, the political elite).

The Rules is considered a basic codification manual in the Czech Republic. At schools and elsewhere, spelling is assigned excessive importance while other linguistic problems, such as the appropriate usage of words (lexical and stylistic problems) and the construction and reception of texts in general, are relegated to the background. The obligatory character of the orthographic rules is enforced particularly by the relatively centralized school system. In the first place, the use of the handbook at schools is authorized by the Ministry of Education, just like the use of textbooks of Czech. Moreover, the Ministry

of Education does not authorize the use of any school textbook unless it complies with the current codification.

However extensive the authority of the Ministry of Education is, the cultivation activities proper are centered around the university departments of Czech and primarily the Czech Language Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences. The Institute came into existence in 1947 through the transformation of the former Office of the Czech Lexicon, founded in 1911. Financed by the state, it has produced the majority of fundamental works dealing with the Czech language, including those performing the codification function (these include, in addition to orthography handbooks, especially dictionaries). The Institute publishes the journal *Naše řeč* ('Our Language', founded in 1916), devoted exclusively to the cultivation of Czech. One of the departments of the Institute, the Department of Language Cultivation, runs a linguistic consulting center for the general public. This center responds to linguistic queries over the telephone or by internet. The members of the Institute, together with university linguists, collaborate with television and radio stations on programs dealing with the problems of contemporary Czech language. They are also the authors of "language columns" in a number of newspapers and periodicals (the genre of "language column," a short article about an interesting or topical linguistic phenomenon, has become popular in the Czech Republic, not only among linguists but also among readers). Recently, the cultivation activities may also rely on a computerized corpus of the Czech language managed by Charles University in Prague, which contains more than 200 million words.

The Prague School theory of language cultivation has won recognition not only in the Czech Republic, where it is still a current issue, but also abroad. It became particularly popular in other Slavic countries but also, for instance, in Germany (see Schanhorst, 1999); its individual features are acknowledged worldwide. The theory, however, also had certain weaknesses. These include the fact that it focused exclusively on the problems of language as an effective means of communication. The relationship between language cultivation and status planning never became the object of systematic research, with status planning itself being left to the political elite. Linguists have devoted little attention to the numerous ethnic minorities, and even less to the problems of the coexistence of the Czech language and minority languages in one state. The social dimension of cultivation, performed in a number of cases for the benefit of the middle classes, was underestimated, while emphasis was placed on the technical (functional) aspects of the cultivation of standard Czech.

Sweden

There is a long tradition of institutional cultivation of the Swedish language in Sweden. Following the French model, the Swedish Academy (founded in 1786, while the French Academy was founded as early as 1635) has become the most important institution devoted to Swedish. The primary function of the Swedish Academy, like that of the French Academy, was "to give the Swedish

language purity, strength and literary distinction especially as concerns the art of poetry and eloquence and as concerns the sciences . . ." (from the statute, quoted in Jernudd, 1991: 48). During the twentieth century other institutions came into existence, such as the Swedish Language Council (founded in 1944) and the Swedish Centre of Technical Terminology (1941). Generally, the Swedish cultivation institutions have pursued goals similar to those of the Czech cultivation centers mentioned above. The only marked difference consists in the greater effort devoted to the elaboration of terminology in Sweden, and the closer coordination of the cultivation of Swedish and the languages of the neighboring countries (in particular Norway and Denmark). Both the Czech and Swedish approaches to cultivation have been characterized by a strong functionalist position. Its ideological and political "neutrality," however, began to be questioned by sociologically more adequate sociolinguistic research, which won recognition in Sweden in the last third of the twentieth century (Teleman, 2005).

The language situation in Sweden at the end of the twentieth century can be characterized by three general features: (1) the increasing influence of English, (2) the growing multilingualism in Swedish society, (3) the rising demand for good knowledge of both written and spoken language. These three factors, which may certainly be found also in other developed countries, are accompanied by a number of language policy problems (Hult, 2004; Melander, 2004). As far as English is concerned, its importance for Sweden is undisputed, and the need to advance the teaching of English and its use in numerous situations is generally acknowledged. Still, to what extent, if at all, should English be allowed to exclude Swedish from certain communicative domains? Sweden is home to the speakers of five legally recognized language minorities, but the number of immigrants bringing their mother tongues along with them is on the increase (about 200 languages). In this situation, how can they be taught their respective languages at a high level while acquiring good knowledge of Swedish as a second language at the same time? Moreover, what is to be understood as good knowledge of Swedish in a multicultural society? Good knowledge of a language is indispensable in many situations typical of today's information society, both at work and in private – yet, how can all social strata be guaranteed equal opportunities to acquire such knowledge?

In pursuing a solution to the above-mentioned problems, as well as a number of other related ones, the Swedish Government set up a Parliamentary Committee in 2000, which presented its comprehensive report (735 pages) to the Minister of Culture in 2002. It provided an outline of an action program for the Swedish language (Committee on the Swedish Language, 2002).[1] The primary goals of the program include "firstly, to advance the position of Swedish, and secondly, to ensure that everyone in Sweden has equally good opportunities to acquire the Swedish language." The program (comprising 80 recommendations) focuses on the Swedish language; nevertheless, it is a complex proposal for a language policy since it does not neglect the other languages used in Sweden, dealing with Swedish in relation to these languages. It is also a

prominent feature of the program that its recommendations result not only from status planning, but also from corpus and acquisition language planning, as is evident from the three primary objectives to be accomplished: "Swedish shall be a complete language, serving and uniting our society. Swedish in official and public use shall be correct and shall function well. Everyone shall have a right to language: Swedish, their mother tongue, and foreign languages."

Pursuing these goals involves vast cultivation activity. As far as the first goal is concerned, the objective of the proposed recommendations is that Swedish should or could be used alongside English in a number of areas, such as schools and universities, research, public administration, working life, the consumer area, culture, the media, which would stimulate a systematic development of the expressive potential of the Swedish language (its lexis and text patterns and genres in particular). The second goal takes into account the need for the citizens in a democratic society to be able to communicate with "their" social institutions (including the EU institutions), which requires the administrative and legal texts produced by these institutions to be highly comprehensible – the cultivation measures therefore promote the "plain language" functional variety (with specific features in syntax and style). At first glance, the third goal seems to relate only to acquisition planning. However, this is not the case: ensuring that all people have equally good opportunities to acquire a language also involves tackling to what extent the texts, the script, even the structure of the language, are "socially open" to all – and this may become a task of language cultivation. It is one of the objectives of plain language movements to make the particular texts comprehensible to everyone, irrespective of educational background. Concerning the structure of standard language, it can be variable enough to absorb features of social or regional dialects, which makes the standard language more easily accessible to the speakers of those dialects.

Finally, note the dialectical relation between corpus and status planning in the above action program. The intended cultivation activities (corpus planning) result logically from the status planning: if Swedish is to remain a complete language, a language fully functional even in such domains as education and research, much attention should be devoted to the development of terminology. And it follows logically that such a complete language, the object of deliberate permanent cultivation, may easily be planned to acquire the status of a universal means serving the whole society and unifying it.

Language Management in the Postmodern Era

Language cultivation is a type of organized language management characteristic of the era of social modernization (Neustupný, 2006). Typically, the development of language cultivation approaches is therefore tied to the formation and maintenance of standard languages. On the contrary, in today's developed societies, characterized to a varying degree by postmodern features, the

processes of language destandardization may be observed (Mattheier, 1997; Spiekermann, 2005; Daneš, 2006). Destandardization means on the one hand that standard language ceases to be used in certain situations or communicative domains, and on the other that it is becoming increasingly varied as it incorporates, to a much larger extent, elements extrinsic to it until now. Language destandardization may be due to the following:

1   the need for generally accepted language standards ceases to be acknowledged in societies professing the ideology of postmodernism;
2   the awareness of the obligatory character of social norms acquired at school is in decline;
3   the codification of standards, carried out by the intellectual elites during the period of social modernization, has departed from the language used by the majority of speakers today;
4   the codification of standards has become decentralized, in Garvin's terminology (1993: 42) this may be characterized as a shift from the "academy-governed style of codification" toward the "free-enterprise style of codification."

In this situation, specialists in language cultivation may choose between two directions to take: they may either criticize the deviations from the norm, evaluating them as mistakes; or gradually adjust the standard language, increasing its variability and advancing higher tolerance toward variation in general. While cultivation usually proceeds in both directions at the same time (depending also on particular communicative domains), the latter direction seems to be preferred in postmodern societies which value plurality and diversity.

The uniformity of standard language is no longer considered obvious even in an area of language traditionally codified in the greatest detail – orthography. The reception of *The Rules of Czech Spelling* from 1993 is particularly illuminating in this respect. Though it introduced few alterations, it met with such opposition on the part of the general public that the Ministry of Education was forced to suspend its use in schools until a year later when *The Rules* was supplemented with further permitted spelling variants. On the whole, the Czech language situation has become favorable to the formation of a spelling of Czech comprising variants specific for individual functional varieties of the standard language. Specific spelling phenomena may be found in the language of fiction writers or scientists (who defend them publicly against the attempts of the codifiers at uniformity in language); specific spelling phenomena abound in e-mail communication. In other words, the following tendency seems to have begun asserting itself: the uniform spelling of the standard language is becoming decentralized and differentiated into the spelling of the language of fiction, of science, spelling for everyday use, etc. The functional differentiation of standard spelling coexists with that long established in the codification of standard pronunciation, where the categories of high, neutral, and low style are employed.

The new social situation, which stresses plurality and diversity, also restructures relations between linguistic institutions (the centers of cultivation activity) and the public (the citizens and organizations). Let us note here that the primary institution established to cater for contact between the linguists and the general public is a consulting center – an institution providing advice rather than a coercive body. The web site of the Language Consulting Centre of the Czech Language Institute presents the activity of the center to the public as follows: "We do not aim merely at providing a yes-no answer to your queries, but rather at explaining or explicating the solution to you. Nor do we proscribe, order, and 'guard'. We advise, explain, and recommend." However, the linguists answering the language queries do not only provide adequate service; they draw on the language queries themselves since they represent a valuable source of sociolinguistic information on the linguistic behavior and attitudes of the inquirers (individual members of the public, journalists, fiction writers, teachers, secretaries or institutions, civil service authorities, business organizations, etc.), which may be further used in (theoretical) linguistics research. The linguists aim to hold a *dialogue* with the public (Uhlířová, 2002). The web site of the Language Consulting Centre itself invites the readers to enter into such a dialogue in the section "We ask" with questions (and suggested answers) such as:

"What do you think about words that have more than one inflectional suffix in a particular case? (e.g., popel*a* – popel*e* – popel*u*).
A) It is a case of inconsistency that should be eliminated. Only one form should be prescribed in order to avoid chaos in language.
B) It is natural and alright – it is a question of the development of the language, or a matter of choice (e.g., between a neutral and colloquial form).
C) Another opinion or comment."

(My translation)

As mentioned above, language cultivation as a treatment of language typical of the period of social modernization barely pays any attention to the fact that the language, that is, the object of cultivation, is used in a multilingual environment; the existence of other languages is acknowledged at most as a threat to the purity of the cultivated language (cf. the ideology of purism). Minority languages are ignored, let alone made the object of cultivation. However, the situation is changing nowadays – while established languages display features of destandardization processes (as discussed above), a number of minority languages are being standardized in developed social contexts today. Yet, what should standardization in the postmodern era look like? Apparently, it can no longer be the standardization with the functions and features typical of language standardization in the period of social modernization. An example of "an undeveloped language in a developed context" is Romani, a language currently spoken, in addition to Czech (or Slovak), by approximately 100,000 people in the territory of the Czech Republic. It was not

until the social changes in 1989 that the Roma ethnicity was formally recognized, and only the spelling of Romani is fully standardized in the Czech Republic nowadays. On the other hand, the social and territorial differentiation of the Romani language is being researched, a Romani–Czech dictionary has been compiled, and a detailed textbook of Romani published. Romani is employed as an auxiliary language at the first grades of primary schools, albeit to a limited extent; its standardization is therefore a pressing issue. Although the position of Romani as a minority language is specific in various respects (the Roma live in a number of European and non-European countries, none of which constitutes a natural sociocultural center for them), the extent to which the models of standardization developed on the basis of Romani are applicable to other languages as well poses a highly interesting question. One of these models, a model for the postmodern era, may be briefly characterized by the following features: "1. The standard is polycentric. 2. The standard is selectively elaborated. 3. There is no codification that is binding for participants. 4. The standard is a mixed home language. 5. The standard is a symbol of ethnic contribution to the world. 6. The standard is the property of all, not only the elites" (Hübschmannová & Neustupný, 1996: 107; see also Hübschmannová & Neustupný, 2004).

To conclude: language cultivation is becoming a rather complex activity in the new era – it is no longer concerned only with the language (or better still, languages!) in the narrow sense of the word, but also with communication (discourse). Obviously, it is interconnected with status planning, and therefore affected, however vicariously, also by specialists in fields other than linguistics and by politicians, their interests, and ideologies; it is performed not only by linguists from governmental and non-governmental bodies but also increasingly by various groups of language users as well as by individual writers or speakers. In the new era the theory of language cultivation will therefore require a broader theoretical framework than in the period of classical and post-classical language planning. In this respect, a good option seems to be Language Management Theory (Jernudd & Neustupný, 1987; Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003), which places less emphasis on the technical aspects of planning, focusing instead on agency. It comprises not only top-down processes, but also bottom-up ones, being "an academic response to people in power in reaction against central imposition" (Jernudd, 1993: 134). It incorporates the micro and macro dimensions of planning, while paying detailed attention to the whole "language policy cycle" (Canagarajah, 2006: 158; Nekvapil, 2006).

NOTES

1   The Report became the basis of the Government bill Bästa språket ('The Best Language'), approved by the Swedish Parliament in 2005.

REFERENCES

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Ethnographic methods in language policy. In T. Ricento (ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy* (pp. 153–169). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Committee on the Swedish Language (2002). *Speech: Draft Action Programme for the Swedish Language. Summary* (SOU 2002: 27). Stockholm: Statens Offentliga Utredningar.

Daneš, F. (1987). Values and attitudes in language standardization. In J. Chloupek & J. Nekvapil (eds.), *Reader in Czech Sociolinguistic.* (pp. 206–245). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Daneš, F. (2006). Herausbildung und Reform von Standardsprachen und Destandardisierung [Development and Reform of Standard Languages and Destandardization]. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (pp. 2197–2209). Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Fishman, J. A. (2006). *Do Not Leave Your Language Alone.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Garvin, P. (1973). Some comments on language planning. In J. Rubin & R. Shuy (eds.), *Language Planning: Current Issues and Research* (pp. 24–33). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Garvin, P. (1993). A conceptual framework for the study of language standardization. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 100/101, 37–54.

Hall, R. A. (1950). *Leave Your Language Alone!* Ithaca, NY: Linguistica.

Hausenblas, K. (1979). Kultura jazykového komunikování [Cultivation of linguistic communication]. In J. Kuchař (ed.), *Aktuální otázky jazykové kultury v socialistické společnosti* [Current Problems of Language Cultivation in Socialist Countries] (pp. 122–131). Prague: Academia.

Havránek, B. (1932a). Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura [The task of the standard language and its cultivation]. In B. Havránek & M. Weingart (eds.), *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* [Standard Czech and the Cultivation of Language] (pp. 32–84). Prague: Melantrich. (Partially translated into English in P. L. Garvin (ed.) (1964). *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style* (pp. 3–16). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Havránek, B. (1932b). Obecné zásady pro kulturu jazyka [General principles for the cultivation of good language]. In B. Havránek & M. Weingart (eds.), *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* [Standard Czech and the Cultivation of Language] (pp. 245–258). Prague: Melantrich. English translation in J. Rubin & R. Shuy, (eds.) (1973). *Language Planning: Current Issues and Research* (pp. 102–111). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Homoláč, J. & Nebeská, I. (2000). Příspěvek ke kritické analýze pojmu jazyková norma [A contribution to the critical analysis of the concept language norm]. *Slovo a slovesnost* [Word and Verbal Art], 61, 102–109.

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

Hübschmannová, M. & Neustupný, J. V. (2004). "Terminological" processes in north-central Romani. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 5, 83–108.

Hult, F. M. (2004). Planning for multilingualism and minority language rights in Sweden. *Language Policy*, 3, 181–201.

Jernudd, B. H. (1991). *Lectures on Language Problems*. Delhi: Bahri Publications.

Jernudd, B. H. (1993). Language planning from a management perspective: An inter- pretation of findings. In E. H. Jahr (ed.), *Language Conflict and Language Planning* (pp. 133–142). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jernudd, B. H. & Neustupný, J. V. (1987). Language plannning: For whom? In L. Laforge (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning, May 25–29, 1986, Ottawa* (pp. 69–84). Québec: Les Presses de L'Université Laval.

Mathesius, V. (1932). O požadavku stability ve spisovném jazyce [On the requirement of stability for the standard language]. In B. Havránek & M. Weingart (eds.), *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* [Standard Czech and the Cultivation of Language] (pp. 14–31). Prague: Melantrich. French translation in É. Bédard & J. Maurais (eds.) (1983). *La norme linguistique* [The language norm] (pp. 809–813). Québec, Paris: Conseil de la langue française/Le Robert.

Mattheier, K. J. (1997). Über Destandardisierung, Umstandardisierung und Stand- ardisierung in modernen europäischen Sprachen [On destandardization, restandardization and standardization in modern European languages]. In K. J. Mattheier & E. Radtke (eds.), *Standardisierung und Destandardisierung europäischer Sprachen* [Standardization and Destandardization of European Languages] (pp. 1–9). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Melander, B. (2004). A Language Policy for Sweden. Paper read at the conference Small States and Minorities, Reykjavík, September 17–18.

Nekvapil, J. (2006). From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica*, 20, 92–104.

Neustupný, J. V. (2006). Sociolinguistic aspects of social modernization. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (pp. 2209–2223). Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Neustupný, J. V. & Nekvapil, J. (2003). Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 4, 181–366. Reprinted in R. B. Baldauf & R. Kaplan (eds.) (2006). *Language Planning and Policy in Europe* (vol. 2, pp. 16–201). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Noreen, A. & Johannson, A. (1892). Über Sprachrichtigkeit [On linguistic correctness]. *Indogermanische Forschungen. Zeitschrift für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde* [Journal of Indo-Germanic Studies], 1, 95–157.

Pravidla hledící k českému pravopisu a tvarosloví s abecedním seznamem slov a tvarů (1902). [The rules regarding Czech orthography and morphology with an alphabetical list of words and forms]. Praha: Císařský královský školní knihosklad.

Scharnhorst, J. (ed.) (1999). *Sprachkultur und Sprachgeschichte* [The Cultivation of Language and Linguistic Changes]. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Spiekermann, H. (2005). Regionale Standardisierung, nationale Destandardisierung [Regional standardization, national destandardization]. In L. M. Eichinger & W. Kallmeyer (eds.), *Standardvariation: Wie viel Variation verträgt die deutsche Sprache?* [Variation in the Standard: How Much Variation Can the German Language With- stand?] (pp. 100–125). Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Teleman, U. (2005). Language cultivation and language planning II: Sweden. In O. Bandle et al. (eds.), *The Nordic Languages* (vol. 2, pp. 1970–1983). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Uhlířová, L. (2002). Jazyková poradna v měnící se komunikační situaci u nás [Language consulting service in the light of recent communication changes in the Czech Republic]. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review*, 38, 443–455.

Vinokur, G. (1925). *Kul'tura jazyka: Očerki lingvističeskoj texnologii.* [Language Cultivation: An Outline of Linguistic Technology]. Moscow: Rabotnik prosveščenija.

FURTHER READING

Chloupek, J. & Nekvapil, J. (eds.) (1993). *Studies in Functional Stylistics.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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

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

Janich, N. & Greule, A. (eds.) (2002). *Sprachkulturen in Europa: Ein internationales Handbuch* [Language Cultivation in European Countries: An International Handbook]. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Kaplan, R. B. & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1997). *Language Planning from Practice to Theory.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kondrašov, N. A. (ed.) (1988). *Teorija literaturnogo jazyka v rabotax učěnyx ČSSR.* [Theory of the Standard Language in the Scholarly Works from the Former Czechoslovakia]. (= Novoe v zarubežnoj lingvistike [New trends in linguistics abroad] XX). Moscow: Progress.

Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (eds.) (2009). *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Neustupný, J. V. (1978). *Post-Structural Approaches to Language.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Scharnhorst, J. & Ising, E. (eds.) (1976/1982). *Grundlagen der Sprachkultur: Beiträge der Prager Linguistik zur Sprachtheorie und Sprachpflege* [Fundamentals of the Cultivation of Language: Prague School Contributions to the Theory of Language and Language Cultivation], vol. 1, 2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.