

THE POWER OF TOP-DOWN LANGUAGE PLANNING: A COMPARATIVE INVESTIGATION OF THREE EUROPEAN REGIONS



VUK VUKOTIĆ

Institute of the Lithuanian Language

ISSN 1392-0588 (spausdintas)

ISSN 2335-8769 (internetinis)

<https://doi.org/10.7220/2335-8769.71.1>

2019. 71

SUMMARY. The early research in language planning (LP), focusing on state-sponsored LP, has received justified criticism in the past decades: much of the investigation had presupposed a direct influence of LP decisions on language use, oversimplifying the complex notion of power.¹ Much of the research therefore became oriented to micro-level LP, where researchers could first observe and then explain actual changes in linguistic behaviour.² In this paper, I will argue that the state-sponsored LP is still a valuable research object and that, at this stage, it would be relevant to apply the comparative perspective. To abandon this state-sponsored LP without a proper comparative body of research would mean to leave the related fields without a clear picture of their scope and power in different countries. In this paper, this is illustrated with a comparison of the three Baltic, three Scandinavian, and four ex-Yugoslavian countries. The results show huge differences in power of state-sponsored LP, leading to the conclusion that more comparative research is necessary to fully grasp its scope and influence.

KEYWORDS: language planning, state-sponsored language planning, language planning institutions, language ideologies.

INTRODUCTION

There is a substantial body of research on state-sponsored LP in countries all over the world. However, the field still lacks comparative research, especially larger-scale research that would aim to develop comparative models and more universally applicable concepts. The result of this is a somewhat still unclear picture of how powerful and effective state-sponsored LP efforts really are. Take, for example, the notion of “purism,” an ideology commonly ascribed to Croatian, Lithuanian, and Norwegian *Nynorsk* LP. The analysis of the (admittedly similar) ideas and ideologies behind those instances of LP are insufficient to explain whether they, in fact,

¹ Liddicoat A. J., Baldauf R. B. *Language Planning in Local Contexts: Agents, Contexts and Interactions*. In *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters, 2008.

² Spolsky B. *Language Management*. Cambridge University Press, 2009; Nekvapil J. *Language Management Theory as One Approach in Language Policy and Planning*. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 2016, nr. 17, 11–22.

influence linguistic behaviour. Croatian purism is mostly an academic ideology, implemented to a certain degree in schools³ but the great majority of language speakers ignore it, as no institutional mechanism exists that would implement it. Lithuanian purism, on the other hand, is coercively implemented in the public space by two state institutions that are allowed to fine the non-use of Lithuanian language in public, and even (until 2019) the use of Lithuanian language that does not match norms, set by the same system of LP institutions.⁴ Nynorsk⁵ purism is rooted in the history of its standardization, further practiced by Nynorsk users, but if one looks at institutional practice today, Nynorsk LP is a celebration of “grass-roots” LP, as the Norwegian state-sponsored LP institutions can only succeed in reforms of Nynorsk by cooperating with linguistic societies, teachers, journalists, and “other, non-professional language users.”⁶

To bring about a clear picture of the nature and effectiveness of state-sponsored LP, I side with the researchers aiming to develop a clearly articulated method of how to compare LPs across the globe. Their largest comparative studies are based on one region (for example Pavlenko⁷ provides an overview of post-Soviet countries). Recently, a more daring comparison of radically different countries, such as Ukraine and South Africa, was taken up by Ludmilla A’Beckett and Theodorus du Plessis, whose study measures the *scope* of LP through a comparison of legislation, the sociolinguistic landscapes and ideologies, as well as a comparison of different areas of regulation.⁸ This paper proposes that models of LP can be constructed based on a comparison of (1) the legal basis, (2) the institutions and their power of influence, and (3) their goals. The legislative analysis would provide a broader context in which LP could potentially work, the analysis of the instruments (and their application) of LP would explain the real possibility of influencing language use.

This study is based on only 10 countries, as a preliminary illustration of what future studies could look like. I therefore start from the three European regions, a

³ Kordić S. *Jezik i nacionalizam*. Zagreb: Durieux, 2010.

⁴ Vaicekauskienė L., Šepetytė N. Lithuanian Language Planning: A Battle for Language and Power. In *Language Planning in the Post-Communist Era*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, 193–218.

⁵ This is one of the two official Norwegian standards, often connected to the ideology of purism, as the author, Ivar Aasen, gathered data for the standards from those dialectal areas he considered to be least influenced by Danish and Low German.

⁶ Røynealand U. The Voice from Felow. Norwegian Language Reforms in the 21st Century. In *In Search of Universal Grammar: From Old Norse to Zoque*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2013, 53–76.

⁷ Pavlenko A. Multilingualism in Post-Soviet Countries: Language Revival, Language Removal, and Sociolinguistic Theory. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 2008, nr. 11, 275–314.

⁸ A’Beckett L., du Plessis T. Shall we compare ‘apples’ and ‘oranges’? Measuring the scope of the language legislation in Ukraine and South Africa. In *In Pursuit of Societal Harmony: Reviewing the Experiences and Approaches in Officially Monolingual and Officially Multilingual Countries*. Bloemfontein: SUN MeDIA, 2017, 2–29.

strategy chosen in order to better separate the individual from the regional and the European – the Baltic (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania), Scandinavia (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) and ex-Yugoslav region (Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia). I also limit the research object to the planning of the *majority language*. The data for the research includes studies of individual countries' and regional LPs, an analysis of LP-related documents in these countries, and personal communication / interviews with local scholars. A rich linguistic literature (both in English and continental Scandinavian languages, which I am able to read) exists about the LP of Scandinavian countries, that provides insight into both the institutional design of LPs and the ideologies behind them. Studies on ex-Yugoslav countries are also numerous, although more for Croatia and Serbia than BiH and Montenegro, but the documents available online were understandable to me in the local languages. In the last decade or so, the Baltic sociolinguistic literature was enriched with sociolinguistic and LP scholarship, providing valuable data for this research. As I only speak and read Lithuanian, I had to rely on English-language scholarship for Latvia and Estonia; fortunately, most of the Latvian and Estonian laws and LP documents are translated to English and available online.

LANGUAGE PLANNING, POLICY, AND POWER

The academic field often called *language planning and language policy*, has been developing fast since the 1960s, discussing the issues of language dominance, equality, and lately looking into the effects of globalization and the role of global English. Often, *language planning* was distinguished from *policy* – the term *planning* referred to interventions and control; while *policy* referred to principles and rules.⁹ Other scholars see language planning (LP) as superordinate to policy, defining it as “a body of ideas, laws and regulations (language policy), change rules, beliefs, and practices intended to achieve a planned change (or to stop change from happening) in the language use in one or more communities.”¹⁰ Nevertheless, in practice, the terms were often used interchangeably.

Bernard Spolsky offers a holistic definition of language policy as a system of linguistic choice-making, consisting of: 1) *practices* (linguistic choices), 2) *beliefs* or *ideologies*, and 3) *management*.¹¹ Practices are observable linguistic choices people make, and management is the visible part of a language policy (by someone or a

⁹ Shohamy E. G. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

¹⁰ Kaplan R. B., Baldauf R. B. *Language planning from practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997.

¹¹ Spolsky B. *Ibid.*, 2009.

group to modify the linguistic practices or beliefs of a certain group). Beliefs or ideologies “help account for the individual choice”¹². In this paper, I prefer the term language planning, as used by Kaplan and Baldauf, because in my research I include both formal policies and the practice of LP institutions.

The second logical question is, Does explicit state-sponsored LP work? Is it powerful enough to influence linguistic behaviour? The notion of power occupies a central role in critical discourse studies and critical sociolinguistics, building upon Foucauldian or Frankfurtian notions of power. In this article, I limit myself to an exploration of power in terms of the possibility of the state to influence certain domains of language use, without speculating whether they will produce an actual change in linguistic behaviour beyond that sphere (or stop / induce language change in society as a whole), as the goal is to provide a comparison of which domains of language use are under the influence of the state.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE THREE REGIONS

As contemporary nation-states, all the countries included in the study exhibit a number of similarities in their LP history. All the Baltic, ex-Yugoslav countries, and Norway have “late” language standards that emerged during nation-building in the 19th century. Denmark and Sweden, on the other hand, have “early” standards, based on the translations of the Bible that became widespread and established during the Reformation. Literacy rates are – as in all European countries – quite high, standard languages are taught for the whole duration of obligatory schooling.

20th century history sets the regions further apart. In the Baltics, the first part of the century is characterized by the establishment of the nation-state and, with it, of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian language standards through schooling and media. The second part is characterized by Soviet modernity and varying grades of Russification policy: less in Lithuania, more in Estonia and Latvia, although not nearly as strong as in Central Asia or Belarus, where a full language shift to Russian occurred in urban centres.¹³ The main media and education system remained largely in the three respective languages. However, many more Russian-speaking people from other Soviet republics immigrated to Estonia and Latvia rather than to Lithuania, which is the reason why the former two became more focused on *status* planning and the latter on *corpus* planning after the fall of the Soviet Union.¹⁴ In Scandinavia,

¹² *Ibid.*, 5.

¹³ Pavlenko A. *Ibid.*, 2008, 283.

¹⁴ Hogan-Brun G. Language-in-education across the Baltic: policies, practices and challenges. *Comparative Education*, 2007, nr. 43, 553–570.

pan-national cooperation (political, economic, and cultural) had been on the rise throughout the century, and LP has focused on developing mutual intelligibility in Scandinavia. Norway stands out in this context, as its inner LP was focused (especially right before and after World War II) on bringing the two written standards – Bokmål and Nynorsk – closer together, a project that ultimately failed, resulting in the lower authority of language institutions and a general distrust in top-down language planning.¹⁵ In the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1918–1941), the official language was called Serbian-Croatian-Slovene, but no active pan-national LP was taken up by the state, as three separate standard language traditions continued to develop in centers of power – Belgrade, Zagreb, and Ljubljana – despite the declared unity in the Constitution. In the period after World War II, the new Socialist Federation of Yugoslavia engaged in a more active assimilationist LP. Four of the states within the Federation: Bosnia, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia, were expected to slowly reform their standards towards a unified Serbo-Croatian language standard, which caused unrest and protest amongst some of the intelligentsia.¹⁶

After the 1990s, the Baltic and ex-Yugoslav countries exhibit a more isolated language policy; in the Baltics, virtually no institutional and political cooperation exists among these three countries. In the ex-Yugoslav space the policies are formatted so that the language standards become *further apart* from each other.¹⁷ In Scandinavia, the policy of mutual intelligibility progressed to a policy of a “Nordic linguistic community,” with a slightly anti-English undertone, as one of the main tasks is how to *avoid* the increasing use of English in inter-Nordic communication.¹⁸ The original goal of LP inside each country is to make each titular language the “society-bearing”¹⁹ language and avoid “domain loss” – to avoid there being domains of public life in which English would be used more than the titular languages.²⁰ One could say the regions represent three models of regional interaction: isolated (Baltic), separational (ex-Yugoslav) and cooperative (Scandinavian).

¹⁵ Dyvik H. Offisiell og ikke-offisiell språknormering–nyttig eller skadelig motsetning? In *Krefter og motkrefter i språknormeringa. Om språknormer i teori og praksis*. Høyskoleforlaget, 2003, 25–40; Sandøy H. Language Culture in Norway: A Tradition of Questioning Standard Language Norms. In *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus Press, 2011, 119–126.

¹⁶ Greenberg R. D. *Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and Its Disintegration: Serbo-Croatian and Its Disintegration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; Sotirović V. B. *Sociolingvistički aspekt raspada Jugoslavije i srpsko nacionalno pitanje*. Novi Sad: DobricaKnjiga, 2007.

¹⁷ Radovanović M. *Planiranje jezika i drugi spisi*. Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, 2004; Bugarski R. *Govorite li zajednički?* Belgrade: XX vek, 2018.

¹⁸ Kristinsson A. P., Hilmarsson-Dunn A. Unequal language rights in the Nordic language community. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 2012, nr. 36, 222–236.

¹⁹ Da. *samfunnsberende*, no. nynorsk *samfunnsberande*, sv. *samhällsbärande*.

²⁰ Salö L. Domänförlustsomspråkideologiskrepresentation. *Språkvårdens diskurser om engelska i Sverige. Nordand Nordisk tidskrift för andrespråksforskning*, 2012, nr. 7, 21–59.

COMPARING THE POWER OF LPS

LEGAL STATUS OF TITULAR LANGUAGES

All of the countries in the study have one majority language, whose name is derived from the name of the titular ethnic group.

In the Baltic region and Serbia, the status of the titular language is defined both in the **constitution** and **the laws**. The Baltic countries define “state language” (or “official language”) in their constitutions.²¹ The “language acts” in the Baltic countries focus only on the state language (not minority languages), defining both the status and corpus (see below). In this group is also Serbia, but there is a clear difference: the constitution defines only the “official language” (*службени језик*)²² and the “official script,” namely the Cyrillic one. The language act is called “Law on the Official Language and Script” and it also defines the use of language within the state apparatus and public signs of state institutions, but the largest part of the law focuses on use of minority languages in local municipalities.

Constitutional status is found in Croatia and Montenegro where the “official language” is defined (Croatian and Montenegrin languages, respectively), but no language acts/laws have been passed. In BiH, a federation of the two ethnicity-based republics (the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, predominantly Bosnian, and the Republic of Srpska, predominantly Serbian), official language is defined in the constitutions of the two republics, but not in the Federal. The former defines *Bosnian* and Croatian as the official languages, while the latter defines *Bosniak*, Croatian, and Serbian as the official languages.²³

Legal status is found only Sweden. It has a Language Act that defines Swedish as the “principal language in Sweden” (*sv. huvudspråk*).

²¹ The phrasings: *riigkeel* (ee.), *valstsvaloda* (la.), *valstybinė kalba* (lt.) could be translated as “state language” or “official language” (both ee. *riik*, la. *valsts* and lt. *valstybė* mean „state/country“). It can, therefore, be interpreted as the language within the state apparatus, or as the language of all thensation (within the whole state), which would mean obligatory use of the languages in all spheres of life.

²² Derived from the word archaic work *служба/ služba* meaning “service”. This is the phrasing used in all ex-Yugoslav countries.

²³ The controversy behind the name *Bosnian* and *Bosniak* is described by Robert Greenberg. It should be noted that *Bosnian* is used by the ISO, while in the region, individual laws and standards vary between *Bosnian* and *Bosniak*, sometimes employing both. The Serbian government in Srpska holds the position that *Bosnian* is unacceptable, arguing that it would refer to the entire population of BiH (of all ethnicities), so only *Bosniak*, which would denote the language of the Bosnian Muslim population, is acceptable. This opinion is seconded by the LP institutions in Serbia (see Brborić B., Vuksonović J., Gačević R. *Srpski jezik u normativnom ogledalu: 50 odluka Odbora za standardizaciju srpskog jezika* [The Serbian language in normative mirror: 50 decisions of the Commission for the Standardization of Serbian Language]. Belgrade: Beogradska knjiga, 2006, 61, 206).

No status / Other regulation: The constitutions and laws of Norway and Denmark do not explicitly define the majority language.²⁴ Other regulations do exist. Denmark has a law on orthography (defining the Danish written language), Norway has a law on the official use of the two written standards (Bokmål and Nynorsk). The LP goals are defined only in the *language policy documents*, not in laws. All three Scandinavian countries have similar language policy documents, that define that the goal of LP will be that Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish shall be *principal* and *society-bearing* languages in the three countries.²⁵

One could say that the differences are the result of historical circumstances: the coerced policy of Russification / Serbo-Croatian created the need for constitutional and “legal protection” of languages, which did not happen in Scandinavia. As the further analysis will show, the legal ground is used for much more than “protection.”

LP GOALS

In this section, I will show the **state-sponsored LP goals and the level of their “officialization.”** The most officialized are (1) in the Baltics, where the LP goals are set out in the laws, then (2) in Scandinavia, where LP goals are presented in LP papers / white papers, and (3) there are no clearly defined LP goals in ex-Yugoslav countries, but the state only symbolically supports the non-official LP efforts of the ‘language academies’.

The Baltic states have many similarities in their language laws. Each obliges the use of the three state languages to comply with standard language norms.²⁶ The *spheres of obligatory state language use* are somewhat similar: the state system is obliged to communicate in the state language, including internal communication and communication with citizens, it is also obliged to use the state language for names and place names (foreign names are to be transcribed) in internal and personal documents. In other aspects, it differs: in Lithuania and Estonia, public advertisements and translations on commodities in non-titular languages are obliged to

²⁴ Article 114 of the Norwegian constitution from 1814 only mentions that public servants can be citizens who speak the “country’s language” (no. original *Landets Sprog*, modernized *språket i landet*). See NO-01. *Lov om målbruk i offentligteneste* [Law on language use in public services], 1980, §114. <<https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1980-04-11-5>> [retrieved 12 September 2018].

²⁵ SC-01. The declaration on a Nordic language policy. In *Språk i Norden*, 2006. <<http://norden.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:700895/FULLTEXT01.pdf>> [retrieved 12 May 2018].

²⁶ EE-03. Language Act, 2011, §4-1. <<https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/506112013016/>> [retrieved 28 June 2016]. <https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/eestikeelearengukavainglise.indd_.pdf> [retrieved 01 December 2018]; LA-01. *Official Language Law*, 1999, §2-17. <http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/docs/LRTA/Likumis/Official_Language_Law.doc> [retrieved 20 February 2019]; LT-01. *Valstybinės kalbos įstatymas* [Law on the State Language], 1995, §19. <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.0B0253BB424C/TAIS_170492> [retrieved 20 December 2018].

be translated into the titular ones, with the font at least as big as the foreign inscription.²⁷ In Latvia, translations and dubbing of films and public events are obligatory too.²⁸ The Latvian law also applies also to communication inside *private* companies when it comes to record-keeping and when dealing with information of “legitimate public interests,”²⁹ a phrase that could be subject to interpretations. Lithuania is the only country in which all public media, both spoken and written, and all books are subject to control of language use. Up until 31 January 2019, compliance with the norm set by the official language expert body was subject to surveillance and financial fines³⁰; now, only state documents and non-fiction publications can be controlled, and warnings can be issued to media outlets. The laws also require a certain level of expertise from various types of workers in these countries. In Estonia and Latvia, all employees at state institutions, as well as employees of public and private institutions, have to be proficient in state languages to different levels in order to serve the “public interest.”³¹ In Lithuania all employees working for companies that receive money from the budget of “the state, the municipality, or the monetary funds of foreign countries”³² are obliged to attain a certain level of proficiency in Lithuanian. The demand for a monolingual state sector (and public space in Lithuania) can be seen as a measure against the Russian (and, in Lithuania, Polish-speaking) minorities, as a number of Baltic scholars who look favorably upon such policies explain that these used to be a privileged “majorized minority” under Soviet rule (despite their class-based, religious, and ethnic heterogeneity).³³

Much of the legislative basis in Scandinavian state-sponsored LP comes from their international cooperation. Around the turn of the millennia, an initiative of the Nordic Council of Ministers urged the LP institutions to create a common “Nordic” language policy. Reports on the status of languages in the Nordic countries started to appear, defining the main LP priorities. Three goals were put

²⁷ EE-03. *Ibid.*, 2011, §16-2; LT-05. *Dėl viešosios informacijos ne valstybine kalba pateikimo* [On public information in non-state language], 2012. <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.437442> [retrieved 10 May 2018].

²⁸ LA-01. *Ibid.*, 1999, §17.

²⁹ LA-04. *Ibid.*, 1999, §6-2.

³⁰ LT-06. *Lietuvos Respublikos administracinių teisės pažeidimų kodeksas* [Code of administrative violations the Republic of Lithuania], 2015, §489. <<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/4ebeb66c0262311e5bf92d6af3f6a2e8b>> [retrieved 14 April 2019].

³¹ EE-02. *Ibid.*, 2011, §23-2; LA-01, *Ibid.*, 1999, §6-1.

³² LT-03. *Nutarimas dėl valstybinės kalbos mokėjimo kategorijų ir jų taikymo tvarkos aprašo patvirtinimo* [Agreement on the state language proficiency categories and their application], 2003, §4. <<https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalActPrint/lt?jfwid=-lqwel9ehm&actualEditionId=AmBdgdCkuC&documentId=TAIS.224296&category=TAD>> [retrieved 13 April 2019].

³³ Vershik A. The Language Situation in Estonia. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 2005, nr. 36, 283–316.; Ozolins U. The Impact of European Accession Upon Language Policy in the Baltic States. *Language Policy*, nr. 2, 2003, 217–238.

forward. The first goal, ‘inter-Scandinavian communication’, is a continuation of the above-described goal to increase mutual intelligibility amongst the Nordic countries, avoiding the use of English and translation.³⁴ The second goal, ‘plain language’, encompasses codification of a new, simplified administrative language and its dissemination: publication of guidelines, language trainings with municipalities, etc. The third goal is the most complex and most discussed – ‘parallellingualism’. The central idea behind the term was to increase the status of the national languages in the fields where they felt English was dominant. Two such fields were prioritized – higher education and international business. The current status of these policies is difficult to assess, as they are still ongoing at the time I am writing the text, but the reports have been turned into white papers in Denmark and Norway, and into a Language Act in Sweden.³⁵ The ‘plain language project’ is still ongoing. Of all the Scandinavian countries, Sweden³⁶ has invested the most into it; it is intensifying in Norway, as a new BA study programme in plain language was recently started at the University of Oslo. The goal to apply ‘parallellingualism’ in international business attracted the attention of major corporations in Norway, but ultimately failed (based on an interview with an employee in the Norwegian Language Council). But at universities, LP is developed on the principles of the Declaration. The most recent development at the time I am writing this was that the Nordic Council of Ministers issued 11 *recommendations* for how to achieve better parallellingualism at universities. The first recommendation clearly states that “All universities should have a language policy”³⁷ and then goes on to define it. Four recommendations define the language(s) of the classroom, administration, digital resources, and dissemination of research. Three recommendations are about language courses that should be offered at universities; and another three are about the practical side of implementing language policy: establishment of a language translation center, forming a language policy committee, and observing and documenting the use of languages. In the coming years, the implementation and practice of these university-based LP institutions should be observed by LP scholars.

Legislation in the individual Scandinavian countries is more diverse, as Sweden has a language act, Denmark a law on orthography, and Norway a law on the use of Bokmål and Nynorsk (two written languages) in public services. The Danish law

³⁴ SC-01. *Ibid.*, 2006.

³⁵ In Denmark, a governmental commission produced a report in 2009 called “Sprog til tiden”, in Norway a white paper called “Mål og mening” and in Sweden a Language Act was adopted in 2009. Their main LP documents reflect the three main points of the Nordic declaration.

³⁶ Josephson O. Tankarna bakom Deklaration om nordisk språkpolitik. *Sprog i Norden*, 2015, 85–96.

³⁷ Gregersen, F. et al. *More parallel, please!: 11 anbefalinger til mønsterpraksis for parallelsproglighed på nordiske universiteter*. [11 recommendations for models of practice of parallellingualism at Nordic university]. Nordisk Ministerråd. DOI: 10.6027/TN2018-510, 2018, 27.

is pretty narrow and only authorizes the Danish Language Council to decide on the spellings that are obligatory to use in Danish state institutions (excluding the Faroe Islands and Greenland) and to be taught in schools.³⁸ The Norwegian law states that both forms should be practiced in the public services and also obliges the civil servant to provide written answers to citizens in the same written standard the citizen used to communicate with the service.³⁹ Only Sweden has a language act, which obliges the state administration and bodies in the public sector to use Swedish (unspecified whether internally or also externally), as well as courts, with the use of interpreters. Minority and other Nordic language use is also allowed in these areas, defined in other laws.⁴⁰

In the ex-Yugoslav countries, the only country with some legislation is Serbia. The part of the law focusing on majority language is short and defines the obligatory spheres of use: the state, road signs, and documents of public institutions. Four articles are dedicated to the use of script: it obliges official institutions and road signs to have a Cyrillic name, with the possibility to use the Latin as well, while private enterprises can choose to have their inscriptions only in Latin. The largest part of the law is focused on the official use of minority languages, beyond the scope of this article. The law foresees control of language use (but without stating which institution is responsible for it) with fines from 200 to 1000 euros for not abiding by the law.⁴¹ I have not found any report that this is done in practice. In all the other countries (Bosnia, Croatia, and Montenegro), LP is developed and implemented through non-official initiatives of language academies that are – due to their authoritative status – expected to be supported, at least symbolically, if not financially, by the government. Strictly speaking, the LP is not state-sponsored, but rather, state-supported.

LP INSTITUTIONS, THEIR ACTIVITIES AND MECHANISMS OF INFLUENCE

There are two types of LP institutions – expert bodies and surveillance institutions. Expert bodies function as the authority on language that the state relies on, and they are by format either professional state-financed agencies or self-governed bodies within language academies. Surveillance institutions oversee the implementation of laws, provisions or policies. Table 1. presents the status and the main goals of these LP institutions in the 10 countries.

³⁸ DA-01. *Lov om dansk retskrivning* [Law on Danish orthography], 1997. <<https://www.retsinformation.dk/forms/r0710.aspx?id=84769>> [retrieved 02 April 2018].

³⁹ NO-01. *Ibid.*, 1980, §6.

⁴⁰ SE-02. *Språklag* [Language Act], 2009. <https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svenskforfattningssamling/spraklag-2009600_sfs-2009-600> [retrieved 17 February 2019].

⁴¹ SR-01. *O službenoj upotrebi jezika i pisama* [Law on the official use of language and script], 1991, §24. <https://www.paragraf.rs/propisi/zakon_o_sluzbenoj_upotrebi_jezika_i_pisama.html> [retrieved 14 April 2019].

Table 1. Status and main function of the LP institutions⁴²

	Country:	Expert body: State-financed (+), self-financed (-)		Language surveillance institution		Main language planning goals:
			Under:		Under:	
Baltic region	Estonia	+	Ministry of Education and Research (2011–2017)	+	Ministry of Education and Research	Status (Spread) and Acquisition (of the state language)
	Latvia	+	Ministry of Justice	+	Ministry of Justice	Status (Spread)
		-	The office of the President			
Lithuania	+	The Parliament	+	Ministry of Culture	Corpus (Purification)	
Scandinavian region	Denmark	+	Ministry of Culture	-	-	Corpus (Orthography)
	Norway	+	Ministry of Culture	-	-	Prestige and corpus (reform, simplification)
	Sweden	+	Ministry of Culture	-	-	Prestige and corpus (simplification)
-		Swedish Academy				
Ex- Yugoslav region	Bosnia	-	Academy of Science and Arts	-	-	Corpus (Re-Standardization)
	Croatia	+	Ministry of Education and Sport (2005-2012)	-	-	Corpus (purification, reform)
		-	Academy of Science and Arts			
	Monte-negro	-	Academy of Science and Arts	-	-	Corpus (Re-Standardization)
Serbia	-	Academy of Science and Arts	-	-	Corpus	

The institutions in the Baltic have the most decisive and coercive power. The expert bodies in all three countries⁴³ are legally empowered to decide on the *corpus* of the language. In Lithuania, the expert body can also decide on the status only in the area of “[in transport, hotels, banks, tourist agencies as well as advertising]”⁴⁴,

⁴² The first institution was opened in 1992 with permanent financing. The second institution, the State Language Commission, is a part of the Office of the President; it is a body that is legally supposed to set out directions for language policy in the future regarding the status of Latvian language, but their initiatives seem to be more about development of general linguistic resources, such as corpora.

⁴³ A temporary body called Estonian Language Commission empowered the Estonian Mother Tongue Society to decide on the corpus. In the other two countries expert bodies are permanent: the Latvian Language Expert Commission under the State Language Centre, and the Lithuanian State Language Commission.

⁴⁴ LT-02. *Dėl Lietuvos Respublikos valstybinės kalbos įstatymo įgyvendinimo* [On the implementation of the State Language Act], 1995. <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.3C497B1D3C54/TAIS_404335> [retrieved 10 May 2018].

where it ‘allowed’ to use foreign languages, if followed by a translation of equal physical size / voice message not shorter than the original.⁴⁵

The Estonian (Language Inspectorate) and Latvian (Language Control Department at the State Language Centre) institutions perform a functions of the control of expertise in state language of civil servants; both can issue warnings, demand they obtain a higher level of state language proficiency, impose re-taking of exams for those that already hold a certificate, or even suggest them be fired.⁴⁶ The corpus defined in the law is not enforced by either of these institutions, at least according to the reports available to me.⁴⁷ Additionally, the acquisition of the Estonian language by the non-Estonian speaking population is a central part of LP, occupying a central place in the government’s integration programmes, both for the period of 2008–2013 and 2014–2020. The latter document mentions language camps for children, abolition of Russian language at secondary schools, and discounted Estonian language courses for adults as means of achieving this result.⁴⁸

In Lithuania, both the status and the corpus are being implemented by the surveillance institution (the State Language Inspectorate, independent from the expert body), in a much broader area than in the first two countries. Public use of non-state languages can be penalized, and – until 31 January 2019 – the use of Lithuanian language that does not match the norms set by the expert body could also be penalized (in the areas described in the previous chapter, including both written and spoken language). The instruments of regulation are both warnings and financial penalties, up to 400 euros.⁴⁹ The last fine was administered in 2018, according to the website of the Inspectorate. The Inspectorate also fines and warns advertisers. Even international events were required to translate the slogans into the state language, as was the case with English-speaking “Login Festival”, which caused some debate in the media.⁵⁰ Similar practices have not been reported in Estonia and Latvia, even though there are legal grounds for such practice. Additionally, in Lithuania all municipalities are obliged by law to employ a ‘language

⁴⁵ LT-05. *Ibid.*, 2012.

⁴⁶ EE-01. *Commissioner for Human rights of the Council of Europe’s Memorandum to the Estonian Government*, 2004, 5. <<https://rm.coe.int/16806db6be>> [retrieved 07 March 2019].

⁴⁷ EE-02. *Development Plan of the Estonian Language 2011–2017*, 2011, 69–70. <https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/eestikeelearengukavainglise.indd_.pdf> [retrieved 01 December 2018].

⁴⁸ EE-04. *The Strategy of Integration and Social Cohesion in Estonia “Integrating Estonia 2020”*, 2014, 6. <<https://www.kul.ee/en/integrating-estonia-2020>> [retrieved 11 Dec 2018].

⁴⁹ LT-06. *Ibid.*, 2015, § 489.

⁵⁰ Žuolytė J. Pakluso reikalavimui išversti reklamą – išėjo absurdas. *Delfi.lt*, 2018. <<https://www.delfi.lt/m360/naujaisi-straipsniai/pakluso-reikalavimui-isversti-reklama-isejo-absurdas.d?id=77613931>> [retrieved 20 March 2019].

manager', who assists in the writing and revision of documents as well as monitoring of public signs. They can penalize the use of non-state language at the municipality level.⁵¹

Table 2. LP models: The power of LP institutions to decide and control the corpus and status of language. Abbreviations: Cor: corpus, St: status, Orth: orthography, Maj.: majority, Min.: minority

		Define			Control			Area of control		Instruments of implementation
		Cor	St	Orth	Cor	Maj. lang	Min. lang	Cor	Status	
Baltic region	Lithuania	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	State institutions, spoken and written media, publishing, films, advertising, names of companies.		Warnings, fines
	Latvia	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	State institutions, public events, films	Warnings, dismissals
	Estonia	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	State institutions, local governments	Warnings, dismissals
Scandinavian region	Denmark	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	Recommendations
	Norway	+/-	-	+/-	+	-	+	School dictionaries	Use of written Norwegian languages and minority languages in municipalities	Recommendations
	Sweden	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	Use of Swedish and minority languages in municipalities	Recommendations
All Ex-Yugoslav		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Standard language publications

The Scandinavian institutions (all called Language Councils) have the status of an expert body and – as their name suggests – have an advisory role. The only institution in Scandinavia that can legally decide on language is the Danish Language Council, but only on the standard language orthography.⁵²

⁵¹ LT-04. *Dėl kalbos tvarkytojų bendrųjų kvalifikacinių reikalavimų aprašo patvirtinimo* [Agreement on the general qualifications on language managers], 2004, § 3–4. <<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.11F7993285DA>> [retrieved 19 April 2018].

⁵² DA-01. *Ibid.*, 1997.

It does surveillance of language change over time⁵³ but has no mechanisms to directly implement the orthography. The Norwegian Language Council can initiate reforms of the two written standards, but it has to do so in close cooperation with the major stakeholders – the linguistic societies with long traditions (as mentioned in the introduction). Due to the long period of ‘language struggles’ between supporters of Bokmål on the one hand, Nynorsk on the other, and government-led efforts to join the two standards in the middle of the 20th century,⁵⁴ there are many such organizations. These informal institutions have had traditional allies in political parties, newspapers, publishers, etc.⁵⁵ One reform of Nynorsk failed because linguistic societies and language experts were not consulted.⁵⁶ In terms of power to enforce on the actual linguistic practices, the Norwegian LP institution has a single mechanism – they can approve the written language glossaries for use in school.⁵⁷ In Sweden, the task of defining the corpus of Swedish has traditionally been entrusted to the Swedish Academy (although no law explicitly entitles it to that position), which abandoned its purist ideal to improve “the purity, strength, and sublimity of the Swedish language,” visible in its orientation towards new loanwords, where the original English spellings are preferred to the Swedish-ized ones.⁵⁸ On the other hand, the tasks of the official Swedish LP institution (Swedish Language Council) include surveillance of the use of Swedish and national minority languages in local municipalities as well as the implementation of Nordic language projects.⁵⁹

The ex-Yugoslav countries rely on “language academies” for both the development and implementation of LP, but do not provide any stable financing. These are not necessarily a single isolated language academy like the *Académie française*, but a system of institutions (usually research institutes and certain bodies within Academies of Science). The only financing that is available is for dictionaries and

⁵³ DA-02. *Lov om Dansk Sprovnæv* [Law on the Danish Language Council], 2015. <<https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=167989>> [retrieved 20 April 2018],

⁵⁴ Sandøy, H. *Ibid.*, 2011.

⁵⁵ Ims I. I. “*Det er vi som bestemmer åssen folk snakker og skriver*”: *En undersøkelse av norske avisers språknormative prinsipp og praksis*. Master’s thesis, University of Oslo, 2007. <https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/26801/III_hovedoppgave.pdf;sequence=2> [retrieved 08 June 2018].

⁵⁶ Røyneland U. *Ibid.*, 2013.

⁵⁷ Most glossaries are checked because they not always include all the possible optional spellings that the official norm includes.

⁵⁸ Malmgren S. G. Svenska Akademiens ordlista genom 140 år: mot fjortonde upplagan. *Lexico Nordica*, 2014, nr. 21, 81–98.

⁵⁹ SE-01. *Förordning med instruction för Institutet för språk och folkminnen* [Decree with the instruction for the Institute for language and folklore], 2007, §2. <https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/forordning-20071181-med-instruktion-for_sfs-2007-1181> [retrieved 12 May 2018].

grammar-books,⁶⁰ but not for positions and infrastructure, like in the other two regions. LPs in BiH and Montenegro are similar, their main goals are to establish a new standard (re-standardization), as the titular languages were proclaimed official quite recently (in 1995 and 2006 respectively). The governments have left it in the hands of the institutions themselves to decide on the appropriate level of re-standardization. In Bosnian, words of Turkish and Arabic origin were introduced to highlight the *oriental* features of Bosnian,⁶¹ clearly because of the dominant Muslim religion. In Montenegro, there were ambitious plans of changing the dialectal basis of the language, but as those failed, the linguists had to settle for symbolic change – two new letters in the alphabet.⁶²

The Croatian example illustrates a failed institutionalization of LP well. The linguists involved in LP were divided along ideological lines, as one group saw the other as too ideologically close to the previous Serbo-Croatian language project.⁶³ One of the two groups, with the support of a major right-wing political party, managed to institute an expert body under the Ministry of Education and Sports, but with the change in cabinet, the new minister (from the opposing party) immediately disassembled the expert body.⁶⁴ In the aftermath of the failed institutionalization, another institution proclaimed itself the expert body on national-level LP, namely the Institute of the Croatian language and Linguistics. This institute is as a research center,⁶⁵ not an LP institution, but it added to its statute the goal of “[providing advisory services, making studies and expertise <...> especially concerning the status and the place of Croatian language and its standard language norms].”⁶⁶ As they recently published a new Glossary, it is possible they will continue to be considered the main authority on national-level LP, even without the official recognition by the state.

The Serbian state has not invested much financial means in LP since the break-up of Yugoslavia. One self-proclaimed authority was created in 1997, under the Serbian Academy of Science and Arts, gathering academics from the many

⁶⁰ In the ex-Yugoslav area, it is generally considered that standard languages rest on three “pillars”: the grammar, the dictionary, the glossary (for correct orthography).

⁶¹ Mešanović-Meša E. Rječnici bosanskoga jezika. In *Zbornik radova Bosanskohercegovački slavistički kongres I*. Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet, 2012, 36.

⁶² Dzankic J. Cutting the Mists of the Black Mountain: Cleavages in Montenegro’s Divide over Statehood and Identity. *Nationalities Papers*, 2013, nr. 41, 412–430.

⁶³ Greenberg R. *Ibid.*, 2004.

⁶⁴ Bašić N. U povodu objave Hrvatskoga pravopisa Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje: Politika ili struka? *Jezik: Časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, 2014, nr. 61, 67–74.

⁶⁵ CR-01. *Uredba o Podjeli Hrvatskoga Filološkoga Instituta, Zagreb* [Decree on the division of the Croatian Philological Institute, Zagreb], 1996, §3. <https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/1996_12_103_1996.html> [retrieved 20 April 2018].

⁶⁶ CR-02. *Statut Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*. [Statute of the Institute of the Croatian Language and Linguistics], 2014 <<http://ihjj.hr/uploads/3671f5ae7acf8b94eb20df97cade634e.pdf>> [retrieved 20 April 2018].

universities, who worked voluntarily on updating the old Serbo-Croatian norm. The analysis of their decisions reveals a very low focus on both status and corpus planning, but a great accent on the Cyrillic script, which they saw as the main distinguishing feature of Serbian standard language.⁶⁷ The first institution that might receive permanent financial support will be the Board for the Serbian Language under the Ministry of Culture, foreseen to be opened between the years 2017 and 2027, whose primary goals will be to implement the policy, determine the norms of correct language, and “care for the Cyrillic script.”⁶⁸

SUMMARY: SCOPE AND POWER OF STATE-SPONSORED LP

The aim of this paper was to compare the power of LP mechanisms and their sphere of influence in 10 countries of the Baltic, Scandinavian, and ex-Yugoslav regions. They are presented from most to least powerful.

Lithuania's expert body has the most stable status, operating under the national Parliament (the highest authority in a Parliamentary democracy). It has the legal right to decide on the entire corpus of the Lithuanian standard language, including morphosyntax, codification of new words, the lexicon, spelling, and even *correct prosody*. Along with the separate surveillance institution and municipal language inspectors, they have the broadest sphere of control – including large parts of the public language use. Both warnings and financial penalties are employed (up to 400 euros). The use of non-state languages can be penalized, and, until 31 January 2019, Lithuanian language use that does not match the norm set by the expert body could be penalized too. It is uncertain how the Inspectorate will continue to function, most the revision of state documents for correctness will continue, as well as warnings to media outlets. The successful institutionalization can be explained by the absence of status-related issues (unlike Latvia and Estonia),⁶⁹ and the general ideological unity of those engaged in LP (unlike in Croatia).

Latvia has two language institutions, but only one – the State Language Center under the Ministry of Justice – is legally recognized and financed as a LP institution. Its primary function is the surveillance of whether Latvian language is being

⁶⁷ Brborić B., Vuksonović J., Gačević, R. *Ibid.*, 2006, 141, 158, 262.

⁶⁸ SR-02. *Стратегија развоја културе Републике Србије од 2017. до 2027.* 2017, 77. [Strategy for the development of culture in the Republic of Serbia from 2017 to 2027]. <<http://www.kultura.gov.rs/docs/dokumenti/nacrt-strategije-razvoja-kulture-republike-srbije-od-2017--do-2027--/nacrt-strategije-razvoja-kulture-republike-srbije-od-2017--do-2027-.pdf>> [retrieved 14 October 2018].

⁶⁹ These results are drawn from the comparative study, a much more detailed institutional / discursive explanation of the Lithuanian case is provided in *Lietuvių kalbos ideologija: norminimo idėjų ir galios istorija*. Eds. L. Vaicekauskienė, N. Šepetytė. Vilnius: Naujasis Židinys-Aidai, 2016.

used in state institutions as well as public events and films. It can issue warnings for the use of non-state language, as well as propose dismissals of employees who have low Latvian language proficiency. When it comes to corpus planning, just like in Lithuania, an expert body has the monopoly on the corpus, but there is no coercive enforcement of the language norm.

Estonian LP goals and the language planning legislation are almost the same as in Latvia, but there are fewer institutions. The Language Inspectorate is the only permanent LP institution; it is primarily a surveillance institution; it can penalize the non-use (and low competence in) Estonian language amongst employees in state and public institutions. A non-profit organization was entitled to decide on the corpus, according to the state-commissioned language development strategy.

Denmark has one legally authorised expert body that decides on spellings of words and orthography (but not other aspects of corpus planning). This research institution cannot control or penalize language use; it has a surveillance function, but only for the purpose of following the development of language and documenting new words.

Sweden's Language Council main task is to provide *recommendations* for the correct use of Swedish, use of 'plain Swedish', and the status of Swedish in the education system. As in Estonia, the written norm is decided by a non-governmental institution (the Swedish Academy). The Language Council can monitor whether the state and all the minority languages are being used in municipalities (without coercive mechanisms).

Norway's Language Council is based on the same model as the Swedish one, dealing with both written forms of Norwegian and the official minority languages. When it comes to corpus planning, the Norwegian Language Council can decide on the written norm *de jure*, but *de facto* it can only do so through common work with linguistic societies, representatives of different language-related professions. The supervisory duties include approving Norwegian (Bokmål and Nynorsk) glossaries for use in schools and monitoring the use of Bokmål and Nynorsk in municipalities (without coercive mechanisms).

Croatia is the only country in the Balkans where a state-sponsored LP institution existed (although for only 8 years). No institution has the legally recognised authority of either status or corpus planning, but a research institute has successfully (for now) overtaken the role of a state-recognized LP institution.

Bosnia, Montenegro and Serbia have had purely academy-based LP practice. The government does not provide financial support to these institutions but accepts their authority. They do not officially decide on the norm, but they are the only ones with ties in large publishing houses that issue normative linguistic publications, which gives them "soft power."

CONCLUSIONS

This paper presents the beneficial side of applying a comparative-qualitative approach in the field of state-sponsored LP. In particular, I was interested in the *power* of the state apparatus and centered the comparison around that notion. The results reveal differences in power that have not been presented in LP research so far. Power is practiced from almost none and the power to enforce language use through fines, as exemplified in the comparison of the legislation and institutional mechanisms. What this approach could offer LP scholarship is a more realistic view of various aspects of LP, instead of the classical focus on the legislative aspect and the impact of LPs on the schooling system.

The pitfall of the approach is – as in any comparative research – a limited number of phenomena that can be compared. Also, knowledge of languages is a prerequisite in most cases, so research would need to be done in larger teams. Furthermore, the dependant variable would need to be precisely defined, which, in the case of a complex notion (such as power) would lead to a necessary simplification. On the other hand, my main argument was that even the simplest notions are not properly addressed in LP research, such as pure, *coercive* power – no clear picture of the scope of state-sponsored LP's influence exists in present-day scholarship, which is offered here in the case of the LP of 10 countries.

Further research could be extended to non-European countries and include an even larger number of countries state-sponsored LP into account.

LITERATURE

- A'Beckett L., du Plessis T. Shall we compare 'apples' and 'oranges'? Measuring the scope of the language legislation in Ukraine and South Africa. In *Pursuit of Societal Harmony: Reviewing the Experiences and Approaches in Officially Monolingual and Officially Multilingual Countries*, 2017, 2–29.
- Bašić N. U povodu objave Hrvatskoga pravopisa Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje: Politika ili struka? *Jezik: Časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, 2014, nr. 61, 67–74.
- Bugarški R. *Govorite li zajednički?* Belgrade: XX vek, 2018.
- Dzankic J. Cutting the Mists of the Black Mountain: Cleavages in Montenegro's Divide over Statehood and Identity. *Nationalities Papers*, 2013, nr. 41, 412–430.
- Dyvik H. Offisiell og ikke-offisiell språknormering – nyttig eller skadelig motsetning? In *Krefter og motkrefter i språknormeringa. Om språknormer i teori og praksis*. Høyskoleforlaget, 2003, 25–40.
- Greenberg R. D. *Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and Its Disintegration: Serbo-Croatian and Its Disintegration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hogan-Brun G. Language-in-education across the Baltic: policies, practices and challenges. *Comparative Education*, 2007, nr. 43, 553–570.
- Ims I. I. "Det er vi som bestemmer åssen folk snakker og skriver": En undersøkelse av norske avisers språknormative prinsipp og praksis. Master's thesis, University of Oslo, 2007. <https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/26801/III_hovedoppgave.pdf?sequence=2>.
- Josephson O. Tankarna bakom Deklaration om nordisk språkpolitik. *Sprog i Norden 2015*, 85–96.

Kaplan R. B., Baldauf R. B. *Language planning from practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997.

Kordić S. *Jezik i nacionalizam*. Zagreb: Durieux, 2010.

Kristinsson A. P., Hilmarsson-Dunn A. Unequal language rights in the Nordic language commu-

nity. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 2012, nr. 36, 222–236.

Liddicoat A. J., Baldauf R. B. Language Planning in Local Contexts: Agents, Contexts and Interactions. In *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters, 2008.

SOURCES

Brborić B., Vuksonović J., Gačević R. *Srpski jezik u normativnom ogledalu: 50 odluka Odbora za standardizaciju srpskog jezika* [The Serbian language in normative mirror: 50 decisions of the Commission for the Standardization of Serbian Language]. Belgrade: Beogradska knjiga, 2006.

CR-01. *Uredba o Podjeli Hrvatskoga Filološkoga Instituta, Zagreb* [Decree on the division of the Croatian Philological Institute, Zagreb], 1996 <https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/1996_12_103_1996.html>, 1996 [retrieved 20 April 2018].

CR-02. *Statut Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*. [Statute of the Institute of the Croatian Language and Linguistics], 2014. <<http://ihjj.hr/uploads/3671f5ae7acf8b94eb20df97cade634e.pdf>> [retrieved 20 April 2018].

DA-01. *Lov om dansk retskrivning* [Law on Danish orthography], 1997. <<https://www.retsinformation.dk/forms/r0710.aspx?id=84769>> [retrieved 02 April 2018].

DA-02. *Lov om Dansk Sprovnævnet* [Law on the Danish Language Council], 2015. <<https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=167989>> [retrieved 20 April 2018].

EE-01. *Commissioner for Human rights of the Council of Europe's Memorandum to the Estonian Government*, 2004 <<https://rm.coe.int/16806db6be>> [retrieved 07 March 2019].

EE-02. *Development Plan of the Estonian Language 2011–2017*, 2011 <https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/eestikeelearengukavainglise.indd_.pdf> [retrieved 01 December 2018].

EE-03. *Language Act*, 2011. <<https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/506112013016/>> [retrieved 28 June 2016].

EE-04. *The Strategy of Integration and Social Cohesion in Estonia "Integrating Estonia 2020"*, 2014. <<https://www.kul.ee/en/integrating-estonia-2020>> [retrieved 11 Dec 2018].

Gregersen, F. et al. *More parallel, please!: 11 anbefalinger til mønsterpraksis for parallelsproglighed på*

nordiske universiteter. [11 recommendations for models of practice of parallelism at Nordic university]. Nordisk Ministerråd. DOI: 10.6027/TN2018-510, 2018.

LA-01. *Official Language Law*, 1999. <http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/docs/LRTA/Likumi/Official_Language_Law.doc> [retrieved 20 February 2019].

LT-01. *Valstybinės kalbos įstatymas* [Law on the State Language], 1995. <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.0B0253BB424C/TAIS_170492> [retrieved 20 December 2018].

LT-02. *Dėl Lietuvos Respublikos valstybinės kalbos įstatymo įgyvendinimo* [On the implementation of the State Language Act], 1995. <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.3C497B1D3C54/TAIS_404335> [retrieved 10 May 2018].

LT-03. *Nutarimas dėl valstybinės kalbos mokėjimo kategorijų ir jų taikymo tvarkos aprašo patvirtinimo* [Agreement on the state language proficiency categories and their application], 2003. <<https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalActPrint/lt?fwid=-lqwel9ehm&actualEditionId=AmBdgdCkuC&docum entId=TAIS.224296&category=TAD>> [retrieved 13 April 2019].

LT-04. *Dėl kalbos tvarkytojų bendrųjų kvalifikacinių reikalavimų aprašo patvirtinimo* [Agreement on the general qualifications on language managers], 2004. <<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.11F7993285DA>> [retrieved 19 April 2018].

LT-05. *Dėl viešosios informacijos ne valstybine kalba pateikimo* [On public information in non-state language], 2012. <<https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.437442>> [retrieved 10 May 2018].

LT-06. *Lietuvos Respublikos administracinių teisės pažeidimų kodeksas* [Code of administrative violations of the Republic of Lithuania], 2015. <<https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/4ebe66c0262311e5bf92d6af3f6a2e8b>> [retrieved 14 April 2019].

NO-01. *Lov om målbruk i offentlegteneste* [Law on language use in public services], 1980. <<https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1980-04-11-5>> [retrieved 12 September 2018].

- SC-01. *The declaration on a Nordic language policy. Språk i Norden*, 2006. <<http://norden.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:700895/FULLTEXT01.pdf>> [retrieved 12 May 2018].
- SE-01. *Förordning med instruktion för Institutet för språk och folkminnen* [Decree with the instruction for the Institute for language and folklore], 2007. <https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/forordning-20071181-med-instruktion-for_sfs-2007-1181> [retrieved 12 May 2018].
- SE-02. *Språklag* [Language Act], 2009. <https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/spraklag-2009600_sfs-2009-600> [retrieved 17 February 2019].
- SR-01. *O službenoj upotrebi jezika i pisama*. [Law on the official use of language and script], 1991. <https://www.paragraf.rs/propisi/zakon_o_sluzbenoj_upotrebi_jezika_i_pisama.html> [retrieved 14 April 2019].
- SR-02. *Стратегија развоја културе Републике Србије од 2017. до 2027.* [Strategy for the development of culture in the Republic of Serbia from 2017 to 2027], 2017. <<http://www.kultura.gov.rs/docs/dokumenti/nacrt-strategije-razvoja-kulture-republike-srbije-od-2017--do-2027-/nacrt-strategije-razvoja-kulture-republike-srbije-od-2017--do-2027-.pdf>> [retrieved 14 October 2018].
- Žuolytė J. Pakluso reikalavimui išversti reklamą – išėjo absurdas. *Delfi.lt*, 2018. <<https://www.delfi.lt/m360/naujausi-straipsniai/pakluso-reikalavimui-isversti-reklama-isejo-absurdas.d?id=77613931>> [retrieved 20 March 2019].
- Lietuvių kalbos ideologija: norminimo idėjų ir galios istorija*. Eds. L. Vaicekauskienė, N. Šepetytė. Vilnius: Naujasis Židinys-Aidai, 2016.
- Malmgren S. G. Svenska Akademiens ordlista genom 140 år: mot fjortonde upplagan. *Lexico Nordica*, 2014, nr. 21, 81–98.
- Mešanović-Meša E. Rječnici bosanskoga jezika. In *Zbornik radova Bosanskohercegovački slavistički kongres I*. Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet, 2012, 35–44.
- Nekvapil J. Language Management Theory as One Approach in Language Policy and Planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 2016, nr. 17, 11–22.
- Ozolins U. The Impact of European Accession Upon Language Policy in the Baltic States. *Language Policy*, nr. 2, 2003, 217–238.
- Pavlenko A. Multilingualism in Post-Soviet Countries: Language Revival, Language Removal, and Sociolinguistic Theory. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 2008, nr. 11, 275–314.
- Radovanović M. *Planiranje jezika i drugi spisi*. Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, 2004.
- Røyneland U. The Voice from Felow. Norwegian Language Reforms in the 21st Century. In *In Search of Universal Grammar: From Old Norse to Zoque*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2013, 53–76.
- Salö L. Domänförlost som språkideologisk representation. Språkvårdens diskursrom engelska i Sverige. *Nordand Nordisk tidskrift för andrespråksforskning*, 2012, nr. 7, 21–59.
- Sandøy H. Language Culture in Norway: A Tradition of Questioning Standard Language Norms. In *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus Press, 2011, 119–126.
- Shohamy E. G. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Sotirović V. B. *Sociolingvistički aspekti raspada Jugoslavije i srpsko nacionalno pitanje*. Novi Sad: Dobrica Knjiga, 2007.
- Spolsky B. *Language Management*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Streļevica-Ošiņa D. Who loves prescriptivism and why? Some aspects of language correctness in Latvia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 2016, nr. 37, 253–262.
- Vaicekauskienė L., Šepetytė N. Lithuanian Language Planning: A Battle for Language and Power. In *Language Planning in the Post-Communist Era*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, 193–218.
- Verschik A. The Language Situation in Estonia. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 2005, nr. 36, 283–316.

Vuk Vukotić

KALBOS PLANAVIMO IŠ VIRŠAUS GALIA: TRIJŲ EUROPOS REGIONŲ LYGINAMASIS TYRIMAS

SANTRAUKA. Pastaraisiais metais pirmieji kalbos planavimo (KP) tyrimai, orientuoti į valstybės remiamą KP, sulaukė nemažai pagrįstos kritikos: dauguma jų iš anksto numato tiesioginį KP sprendimų poveikį ir taip supaprastina kompleksinį KP galios reiškinį. Dėl šios priežasties didelė dalis tyrimų nukreipti į mikrolygmens KP; juose tyrėjai stebi ir aiškina matomus kalbos vartotojų elgsenos pokyčius. Straipsnyje įrodinėjama, kad valstybės remiamas KP vis dar yra įdomus tyrimo objektas ir kad būtų aktualu taikyti lyginamąją perspektyvą. Autorius pateikia argumentų, kad, jeigu valstybės remiamas KP nebus reikšmingai papildytas lyginamaisiais tyrimais, neturėsime aiškaus vaizdo, kokia yra KP galia ir apimtys skirtingose šalyse. Straipsnis grindžiamas trijų Baltijos, trijų Skandinavijos ir keturių buvusios Jugoslavijos šalių KP lyginamąja analize.

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: kalbos planavimas, valstybės remiamas kalbos planavimas, kalbos planavimo institucijos, kalbos ideologijos.