Language Policy and Planning in the Mediterranean World

Language Policy and Planning in the Mediterranean World

Edited by

Marilena Karyolemou and Pavlos Pavlou

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

Language Policy and Planning in the Mediterranean World,
Edited by Marilena Karyolemou and Pavlos Pavlou

This book first published 2013

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4234-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4234-1

In memoriam

This volume is dedicated to the memory
of my friend and colleague Pavlos Pavlou
who this project was initially conceived with

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE PLANNING IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

MARILENA KARYOLEMOU

Language Policy and Language Planning in the Mediterranean was initially the theme of a Conference held at the University of Cyprus in October 2009. Some of the papers in this volume are expanded versions of papers presented at the conference; others are invited contributions that were included with the view to broaden the linguistic scope and geographical covering of the issue.

MedLPLP2009 was the first in, what we hope to be, a series of conferences dealing with issues of language policy and language planning in Mediterranean countries. Since the end of the twentieth century, the Mediterranean has emerged as an area of scientific interest and as a research topic from a variety of points of view. The Mediterranean has been at the centre of efforts to promote economic development, democratic reform and scientific and cultural cooperation among EU and other Mediterranean countries, through such programs as *Euromed* (Union for the Mediterranean), *EuropeAid* or *Euromed Heritage*. The use of the term *Euro-neighborhood* since the early twenty first century seeks to foster a feeling of common concern, if not belonging, among all those Southern European, Northern African and Middle Eastern countries which are not (or not yet) members of the European Union and still share common elements of history and culture.

The linguistic equivalent of this trend can be found in the emergence of the term *Eurolinguistics* proposed by Norbert Reiter in 1991 (*Eurolinguistik*), and such projects as *EuroLSJ*, *EuroLinguistiX* or the *Atlas Linguarum Europae*. It is quite interesting to note in this respect that the MedLPLP conference was not an isolated event; a variety of scientific encounters in the areas of sociolinguistics and the sociology of language took place at approximately the same time. Let me mention just two: the International Conference *Politiques linguistiques en Méditerranée* held at the University

of Tel Aviv in November 2008–*Proceedings* published in 2010 by Michel Bozdemir and Louis-Jean Calvet at Honoré Champion, Paris–and the Conference *Identitat, Europa, Mediterrània: Dinàmiques identitàries a la Mediterrània* held at the Institute of Catalan Studies in Barcelona in October 2009–*Proceedings* published in 2012 by Joan Argenter, at Cathedra UNESCO de Llengües i Educació/Institut d'Estudis Calalans in Barcelona. It is also, I believe, *un signe des temps* that these events were organized and took place at the two geographical extremes of the Mediterranean basin. Whether seen as a *dialogic* or an *ecological* space, Mediterranean can foster cooperation and understanding. I hope that this volume will also contribute to promote scientific exchange between Mediterranean people.

***

The volume is divided into four parts: the first part comprises five articles where authors give general overviews of language policy and language planning in the Mediterranean or in some parts of it, from a synchronic or a diachronic point of view. The second part comprises three articles on the issue of language feminization in several European languages. In the third part, three articles deal with language teaching policy in three different countries from three different perspectives: first language teaching in Malta, foreign language teaching in Greece, endangered language teaching in Cyprus and, finally, three articles deal with issues of language policy and language policy and identity in Cyprus.

In the first paper of the volume, Bernard Spolsky examines Mediterranean as a sociolinguistic ecosystem and goes back to early medieval times to seek evidence that, despite the variability of political and economic patterns, there existed shared varieties that enabled communication throughout the Mediterranean world. He concludes that historical events and conquests lead to periods of monolingual domination in the Mediterranean alternating with periods of linguistic co-existence and tolerance. Louis-Jean Calvet examines the linguistic responses given since antiquity *in vivo* to cope with linguistic diversity and the need to communicate in an area of intense contact between peoples. He goes on to consider the idea that each language has a specific *linguistic weight* determined by a set of twelve factors and examines the linguistic weight of Mediterranean languages. Finally, he turns more specifically to one of the factors considered, namely translation, and examines how the number of translations from and towards a language can be used as a predictor of language vitality and, subsequently, how a low rate or a lack of translation

indexes the poor situation of certain Mediterranean countries both from an ideological and from a political point of view. In his paper, Fernand de Varennes underlines that although the relation between international law and language policies is not immediately apparent, it is essential and necessary if we want to maintain linguistic diversity. International law is not yet offering a coherent system of direct legislation protecting languages or forbidding language abuses. However, recent initiatives by supra national or international organizations make it difficult for states to ignore international practices in the name of the protection of e.g. national languages. Angel Angelov offers an overview of the historical facts that led to the emergence of standard languages in the Balkans and discusses the role and place of standard language in the formation of the modern Balkan nation-states: Greece, Romania, Serbia, Bulgaria and Albania. The emergence of standard languages in each of these states has been a conscious act of self determination sanctioned by specific language policies which aimed at settling issues of power and representation between the new and the old elites. Angelov argues that nationalism in the Balkans bares three unique characteristics compared to Western nationalism: it is influenced by the romanticism of the late nineteenth century rather than by civic ideals of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century; it is oriented towards the past; it has a religious character and, often, motivation. Finally, Matthias Kappler examines the language attitudes and beliefs towards Ottoman Turkish of the Greek elite living in the Ottoman Empire in the second half of the nineteenth century. His data, taken from introductions to grammars and dictionaries or from opinions expressed in the written press, lead him to the conclusion that Ottoman Greeks were, quite strangely, more conservative than Muslim Turkish speaking Ottomans as far as language preservation and renewal are concerned, a fact that, he deems, needs to be further investigated.

In the second part of the volume, three articles deal with the linguistic representation of gender in various Mediterranean languages, the policy of feminization in various languages/countries and its implications for parity and social justice. After briefly examining the three fundamental concepts of « feminization », « desexization » and « parity », Edwidge Kaznadar advocates, in her article, the use of the term « parity » to designate gender representation because of its capacity to move away from purely linguistic considerations to reflect on the socio-cognitive processes that underlie gender discrimination. She then considers the policy of parity in some European countries–France, Belgium, Switzerland and Poland–and in Canada. She emphasizes that the degree of linguistic feminization is not always indicative of the degree of social parity: for instance, minimal

gender distinction as in English–where, however, neutral nouns are represented by masculine pronouns–, or maximal gender distinction as in Polish–where all feminine nouns are marked with a diminutive–, pose the same kind of problems as languages like French or German where, despite the fact that morphological resources allow gender distinction, a generic use of the masculine is being made. She concludes that despite the fact that parity is a fundamental principle of European institutions, in reality, the analysis of institutional texts reveals that gender representation remains binary, discriminating for women and thus, highly primitive. Elmar Schafroth presents the situation that prevails in three European languages: French, Spanish and Italian, by studying official recommendations and actual use, including both electronic and conventional written media use. He underlines that the attitudes towards feminization have been quite negative in the three countries for common or similar sociolinguistic or psycholinguistic reasons. He notes, however, that the sociolinguistic context, actual usage as well as the model promoted to overcome sexist language are quite different. France and, especially, Spain have progressed a lot on the way towards feminization–despite France being, generally speaking, the most reluctant country to accept linguistic innovations–but not Italy, where the use of the masculine as generic is still prominent. Schafroth attributes this difference to political disparities between the three countries–and, more specifically, to the sensibility of the socialist parties in power which promoted sex equity in the former and the persistence of a conservative political environment in the latter–but also to the progressive nature of the French and Spanish societies compared to the more patriarchal Italian society. Finally, questioning the effects of linguistic feminization on social parity, he points to the fact that, according to several studies, the frequency and extend of linguistic feminization does not necessarily guaranty social parity: inequality is not only lexically expressed, but also insidiously investing various discursive levels. In the last article of this section, after briefly discussing the causes of the poor success of feminization in Greece, Baider and Karyolemou examine the impact of diglossia for gender distinction by looking into feminization in Cyprus. They compare lexicographic practices and grammatical prescriptions in standard Greek and the systemic norm of the Cypriot vernacular with the actual use of professional nouns in a corpus of Cypriot newspapers. They further investigate epilinguistic arguments used by Greek lexicographers, philologists or, sometimes, linguists, to promote or legitimize a specific model of feminization and in particular the imprecise and fictional concept of “linguistic feeling”. The results of their analysis confirm that, generally speaking, there is an important restriction of

systemic possibilities in written media practice; although still very much used orally, systemic norms of the low (Cypriot) variety are absent from written texts; and, as in Greece, there is an overall tendency towards minimal feminization. Baider and Karyolemou conclude that the quantitative and qualitative discrepancy in the presence of the two genders in the press point to the perception of women as non authoritative and contrasts sharply with their social contribution within the Cypriot society, where they represent more than two fifths of the working force.

In the third part, six articles deal with language policy and planning in education and language teaching as well as with the interaction between language policy and identity. Lydia Sciriha examines the current state of bilingual education in public and private schools in Malta, where the distribution of the two official languages, Maltese and English, for the teaching of particular subjects (for instance, English for Mathematics, Science and Technology, Maltese for all other subjects) is regulated by successive Education Acts and especially the National Minimum Curriculum guidelines of 1988 that sets bilingualism as the base model for all schools and even advises for the use of code-switching. However, reports from previous quantitative research in primary education have shown that the two languages are overall less used in state schools than in private ones, in other words bilingual practices are less present in public schools. The public or private character of the school does not seem to be the most relevant factor as regards the amount and quality of English which is used as a medium of instruction. It is rather the overall policy of each school and how it is implemented as well as teachers' competence in each language that seem to be important for the quality and frequency of use of the English language. Such a conclusion highlights the need for primary teachers' further and better training in English. The second article by Androniki Gakoudi, Eleni Griva and Foteini Karanikola examines the English language teaching policy in higher education in Greece and, more specifically, in four universities of Northern Greece. Their research conducted by questionnaire shows that English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is not a well appreciated discipline among Greek students, who are more willing to improve their skills in general English than to develop discipline related linguistic competences. Therefore, it is important not just to present students with EAP courses but to get them to realize how important it is to be able to communicate in English in academic contexts related to their discipline. EAP teachers should be able to negotiate the content and goals of EAP in order to adapt them to the specific local conditions and students' needs. Brian Bielenberg, in his paper on Cypriot Arabic, investigates the role of youth in the process of language

revitalization by analyzing and commenting on a series of interviews with Cypriot Maronite youth in which they discuss issues of identity, belongingness and cultural continuity. He identifies five components of the Cypriot Maronite Arabic identity–religion, community/geography, a shared history, openness, and language–but notes also the readiness of youth to adopt a flexible identity in order to ensure personal safety and security. Bielenberg draws on these interviews to elucidate the attitudes of the youth toward speaking and learning the community language, and discusses how planners can encourage and motivate young people to be active agents in the process of revitalization and renewal in an effort to promote and develop a strong Cypriot Maronite language, culture, and identity.

In the last part of the volume, Popi Theophanous discusses the shift from a macrolinguistic to a microlinguistic perspective in studies of language policy and language planning and presents the various acceptions of the terms micro-, meso- and macro-. Drawing on language policy and planning issues in Cyprus, Theophanous presents several examples of how the various levels interact and supports the view that many language problems can be solved by taking joint actions at both the micro and the macro level. Dimitra Karoulla-Vrikki discusses, in her paper, language use in public signs (advertisements, road signs, etc.) in Cyprus and examines the unsuccessful efforts to legislate language use in this specific area. She thoroughly analyzes the arguments in favor or against the proposed legislation expressed during the parliamentary discussions which took place in the nineties and reframes them within the overall tendency to protect the Greek language and restrict the use of English in the public domain. Karoulla-Vrikki highlights the fact that the debate on language use in the public sphere can only be understood if it is seen as a disagreement over identity and within the wider context of the antagonism between ethnic nationalism and civic nationalism which has been a constant characteristic of the modern history of Cyprus. These two forms of nationalism underlie two different aspects of language: the first one–ethnic nationalism–highlights the symbolic value of language as an identity marker, whereas the second one–civic nationalism–emphasizes its pragmatic and instrumental value. Karoulla-Vrikki concludes her paper by presenting the linguistic landscape in Cyprus today and argues that the dominance of English in public signs has had little if any effect on the formation of Cypriot identity. Finally, in the last paper of the fourth part, Maria Koumarianou presents the situation of the Cypriot Maronite Arabic community of Cyprus where she has carried field research intermittently from November 2002 to May 2003 and from November 2007 to June

2008. After briefly presenting the history of the community and discussing the affiliations of its language to the Syrian and Mesopotamian Arabic varieties, Koumarianou presents the current sociolinguistic situation as well as recent developments concerning the community and its language. She analyses the efforts of the community to revitalize its language as part of a wider political claim and goes on to discuss who will benefit from the recognition of the community as an ethnic minority rather than a religious group.

***

The publication of *Language Policy and Planning in the Mediterranean World* has been a long process–more than three years have elapsed since the MedLPLP conference–not only because the volume was enriched with new contributions that were not initially part of the conference but mainly because it has also been a story of sorrow: it was marked by the death of my friend and colleague Pavlos Pavlou, with whom we had organized the conference and who was initially responsible for the publication. Pavlos passed away less than a year after the conference, in August 2010.

Although Pavlos was an academic acquaintance for me–we first met during the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics held at the University of Reading in 1993–we soon became friends not only because we were, then, two young Cypriot linguists just finishing our studies abroad but also because we had thereafter followed parallel paths, both in our academic and in our personal lives. Pavlos had his first degree in German and French from the University of Vienna, then decided to move on to the University of Southern Illinois, to continue with an MA in Applied Linguistics and Literature focusing on German, and finally went on to Georgetown University for his PhD, which he obtained in 1995. So when we met in 1993, Pavlos was about to return to Cyprus, which he actually did in April 1994. I came back from Paris in the summer of that same year.

At first, we both served in private colleges and we officially entered the University of Cyprus together in January 1997, Pavlos as a lecturer in the Department of English Studies and myself as a lecturer in the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies. We had since then worked together on several occasions: as research partners, as members on several committees, as co-organisers in joined conferences etc.

The first image I recall of him from Reading is that of a joyful guy who went for a drink after the conference dragging behind him a whole bunch of people who willingly followed. This first image reveals for me

an important aspect of Pavlos' personality, his ability to bring people together. This sociable and outgoing trait of character was carried over into his academic life, where he was constantly inciting people to work together, encouraging them to undertake common actions to achieve common goals, thus strengthening personal and academic bonds at the same time.

Despite the fact that he was a prominent researcher in his field, he always remained simple, warmhearted and generous. His students all praised his quality as a teacher and as a human being, his reliability, his constancy, his eagerness to help them, to find solutions to their problems, to ease their anxiety, to calm down their worries, resentment or fear. He used to protect and guide them and remained very close to them, courageously refusing to abandon his courses, even in the worst days of his illness.

Pavlos was an endless source of ideas. He had this kind of intellectual restlessness that made him constantly move a step forward: he always had a brand new collaboration in view, a new project under way, an excellent idea in mind. He would never keep anything to himself, though. He would always share his ideas and his projects with his friends, his colleagues, his students. Although a member of the academia for more than fifteen years, he had always kept in touch with educational reality and was well aware of the fact that the teaching of foreign languages was all about practice, not theories. He used to be a member of the Executive committee of CyTEA (Cyprus Teachers' of English Association) for many years and in January 2010 he assumed the position of Deputy Chair. One of his main concerns was how to provide foreign language teachers with the necessary skills and tools to help them be good teachers. Many of his conferences organized at the University of Cyprus or elsewhere aimed to make excellence and good practice in foreign language teaching accessible to educators. He was, among other things, the coordinator of PRO-CLIL, a project that provided guidelines for the implementation of CLIL in Pre-Primary and Primary Education. His innovative work on language testing and assessment of young learners, an area where not much has been done, has gained him wide recognition: in 2005 the book "Assessing Young Learners", which he wrote with Sophie Ioannou-Georgiou published at Oxford University Press[1], was awarded the "Elton" prize for innovation and excellence by the British Council and was also shortlisted for the Ben Warren Prize.

His approach to teaching and testing EFL was not limited to strictly didactic or technical considerations. Pavlos had a broader view of the social and cultural components vested in language teaching and invited

teachers to ask themselves what language learning implied for the learners, especially for young learners, in terms of cultural intake. He also highlighted the role of parents in raising awareness about cultural diversity and in helping young learners develop positive language attitudes which could enhance motivation and achievement [in foreign language learning]. Moreover he stressed the need to involve parents in the language learning and assessment process. At the same time, Pavlos espoused totally Elana Shohamy's call to view testing and assessment as democratic processes (2001, 2004)[2] and, in line with Cohen and White (2007)[3], he emphasized the status of language learners as consumers that needed to be fully informed about their options and rights. In other words, he advocated a synergetic and collaborative language teaching process.

His work has also had a wider impact on foreign language policy in national education, as shows his early collaboration with the Ministry of Education and the Pedagogical Institute of Cyprus in the area of teachers training and curricula design. His latest contribution in this area was his participation in the design of the new national curricula for foreign language teaching not only of English but of other languages as well for primary and secondary education, which is currently under way. Although in the universe of foreign language teaching, it is Pavlos' work in the area of language testing and assessment which is more widely known and acknowledged, there is another aspect of his work less known but equally important and valued by him: his work on the sociolinguistics of the Cypriot dialect and the impact that the use of a local variety might have on language policy issues in education in general. Although it may look as a distinct area of research, it is much relevant to foreign language teaching as well, since embedding foreign language testing and assessment in a specific sociolinguistic context inevitably brings us to take into consideration non dominant local varieties of standard or pluricentric languages and rejoins the issue of fairness, equality and democracy in the process of foreign language policy decision making and the management of global and local linguistic resources.

Pavlos was quite conscious of the limits we have as humans. Although he was constantly redesigning and re-adjusting his limits in order to embrace new challenges, he told me on several occasions: "I know who I am and how far I can go". He was fully aware of the possibilities we have and the limitations of our efforts, but still confident in our ability to give the best of ourselves. Sometimes, he was almost amazed by his own achievements: when in 2008 Cyprus was elected Vice-Chair of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Unesco, where his role as an expert for Cyprus had been decisive, he told

me: “It is impressive how small you can be and how much impact you can have”.

This publication comes as a meager tribute to his life and work and as a gift of memory to his wife and children.

***

I wouldn’t want to conclude this introduction without addressing my many thanks to the people who helped this publication become a reality. My special thanks go to Cathy Stephanides for her tremendous good work in proof reading the papers in English, Stephan Schlaefli for helping with the translation of passages from Spanish, and Marta Januszek for her initial work in putting together the first draft of the papers. Last but not least, I also thank the authors for their trust, patience and spirit of collaboration throughout the editing process.

Notes

[1.] Ioannou-Georgiou, S., and Pavlou, P. 2003. *Assesing young learners.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[2.] Shohamy, E. 2001. “Democratic assessment as an alternative.” *Language Testing* 18(4): 373-391; Shohamy, E. 2004. “Assessment in multicultural societies: Applying democratic principles and practices to language testing.” In *Critical pedagogies and language learning*, edited by B. Norton, and K. Toohey, 72-92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[3.] Cohen, A. D., and C. White. 2007. “Language learners as informed consumers of language instruction.” In *Studies in language and language education: Essays in honor of Elite Olshtain*, edited by A. Stavans, and I. Kupferberg, 185-205. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press.

PART I

CHAPTER ONE

THE MEDITERRANEAN AS SOCIOLINGUISTIC ECOSYSTEM

BERNARD SPOLSKY

When I started working in sociolinguistics many years ago, one of the concepts I found most puzzling was "speech community." My students would regularly ask, "How big is a speech community?" For John Gumperz (one of the first to use the term), it could be a village (Gumperz 1958) or a coffee shop; for William Labov, it could be an island (Labov 1972) or a city (Labov 1966); many recent studies have looked at the family (Spolsky 2008) as a speech community, while others regularly study a polity (Kaplan & Baldauf 2000) or region (Barbour & Carmichael 2000). The concept perhaps became clearer (but still undefined for size) when Fishman (1972) introduced into sociolinguistics the notion of "domain," ranging from home and family to national government, and defined by common social roles (father, mother, children in the family; legislators, bureaucrats and citizens in the nation-state), location and topics. Another revealing approach was Milroy's 1980 proposal of social networks, particularly valuable for comparing dense lower class networks and sparse middle-class networks in a study of Belfast. I have finally been persuaded of the usefulness of the ecological model proposed originally by Haugen (1971, 1972) in which Fishman's domains form niches, to conceive of varieties functioning in a sociolinguistic ecosystem, a dynamic and constantly changing pattern. In this paper, then, I will explore the Mediterranean not as a "dialogic space", a Bakhtinian notion moved from psychotherapy to classrooms but difficult to apply to complex multivariety situations, but as a sociolinguistic ecosystem, asking what evidence there has been at various historical junctures of shared varieties in the changing political and economic patterns.

Economic patterns provide a useful first view, for the most fundamental notion of a lingua franca as a trade language, making possible communication and commerce between social groups speaking different

languages. Thus, some Amazon Indian tribes were reported to have special varieties for communication and trade; Aramaic spread through the Middle East and into the Mediterranean as a trading language and as a language for commercial documents; Tok Pisin and Police Motu (Wurm 1968) permitted communication among the speakers of the seven hundred or so languages of Papua New Guinea; and Sabir, the classic lingua franca of the Mediterranean, was a nautical mercantile variety, filling that specific niche in the sociolinguistic pattern of the nations trading by sea (Kahane 1951; Kahane & Tietze 1958). There are interesting counter-examples to the lingua franca: Cooper and Carpenter (1976) looking at language in Ethiopia; Werner (1963) looking at Trader Navajo; and Spolsky and Cooper (1991) who, in the Old City of Jerusalem, found evidence of a tendency for sellers to learn the language of prospective buyers, producing interlanguages (Corder 1981; Selinker 1972) rather than pidgins or creoles. Be that as it may, there appears to exist a common variety in a commercial or communicative niche shared by speakers of a number of different varieties–at least until stronger sociolinguistic pressures like nationally enforced language management policy or the "Q" or communication value (de Swaan 2001) of a more central variety lead to the diffusion or spread of that variety and its replacement of a less central language that it endangers. The best examples of such a process in the Mediterranean were the military conquests of the Romans, spreading Latin in the West and Greek in the East, and the Islamic conquest starting in the nineth century spreading Arabic of southern and eastern margins blocked only at the Pyrenees in the twelfth century and at Vienna in the seventeeth century.

During the period of Roman rule, the future linguistic history of the Romance countries was determined, with local versions of Vulgar Latin being carried by Roman armies and military veterans along the European littoral, developing after the loss of central political power into the many Romance varieties that were later standardized into major European languages; only the mountain areas where Basque held out were spared. Similarly, Arabic was carried by conquering Islamic armies across an area previously united by Aramaic; in each country, a distinct local variety influenced by an earlier and submerged language developed as the vernacular, held together at the top by a strictly guarded Classical Arabic defined by its use in the Qur'an.[1] Maltese, with its Semitic base and half of its lexicon from Italian, thus celebrates the border between these two conquering languages, and it is historically and symbolically appropriate that it has recently been added to the list of recognized European Union languages, in spite of the difficulty of finding qualified speakers to carry out all the necessary translation of EU documents.

Sabir, the original lingua franca, was also a mixture of Arabic and Romance, based on Italian dialects and with a lexicon extensively drawn from Arabic, Persian, Greek and French. It was defined by the Arabs as the language of the Franks, a term they used for Europeans in general. Diaz (2007) describes the situation in which the Mediterranean lingua franca developed: the spread of the power of Romance-speaking commercial cities such as Venice to Levantine and North African areas starting in the fifteenth century, with emigrants moving and establishing enclaves; as the Latin languages were mutually intelligible, *colingualism* was produced, and the resulting varieties were learned by local speakers of eastern or Levantine languages, producing a pidgin originally based on Italian but later (especially in Algeria and Tunisia) on Spanish. It became the language of wider communication for trade and in the mixed baths of the area, used especially to communicate with Christians (Franks). Kahane (1951) and Kahane and Tietze (1958) noted especially the nautical core of Sabir. There was a theory, no longer supported, that Sabir formed the basis of the creoles that developed with the slave trade in West Africa and was transported to the West Indies (Taylor 1977). The origin and special nature of creole continues to be widely debated (Mühlhäusler 1986).

There were then periods of monolingual domination of the Mediterranean region by conquering languages and empires, and also periods of co-existence and tolerance. One period of co-existence was the so-called Golden Age of Spain, the medieval Iberian culture between the eighth and fifteenth century when there was acceptance of Christians and Jews within an Islamic world; the pattern of *convivencia*–living together–outlasted Moslem rule, but started to break down in the late fourteenth century and was replaced by an intolerant Christian rule in the late fifteenth century that expelled Jews and forcibly converted Muslims (Moriscos) (for recent studies, see Dodds, Menocal & Balbale 2008; Schwartz 2009). Linguistically, one of the effects was to move Spanish-speaking Jews to the eastern Mediterranean, where for some centuries Ladino (Judezmo) flourished as a Sephardic counterpart to Yiddish.

Starting in the thirteenth century, the dominant Mediterranean power was the Ottoman Empire, which conquered much of the region. While its governing language was Turkish, there was acceptance of other languages: obviously, Qur'anic Arabic maintained its religious status, and Greek was commonly used as a bureaucratic language. The maintenance of the Ottoman Millet system, where each religion was able to use its own language and keep up its own culture, also was pluralistic. It was in this period that lingua franca was widespread (Clogg 1982; Karpat 1982). Wansbrough (1996) traces lingua francas in the Mediterranean area over

three millennia, starting in the Late Bronze age and going up to the Ottoman period.

Two of the main opponents of the expansion of Ottoman rule were the French and the English, each setting up naval bases in various ports, and asserting the importance of their own national language. It was the French in fact who established the basic connection between nation and language; Richelieu used language as a method of building central rule (Cooper 1989), a notion taken over by the Jacobins who interpreted "égalité" as meaning that everyone should be required to speak Parisian French. The Jacobins during the French Revolution opposed peripheral varieties, whether different languages like Basque and Breton or varieties like Gascon and Occitan, and Napoleon confirmed their centralizing policies (Ager 1999). It took over fifty years to enforce the French-only policy in schools–there just weren't enough teachers who controlled the standard language. The policy was also applied to all French territories so that not just the borderlands conquered by the Republic but the colonies established in Africa and Asia were required to use French as the language of instruction in schools as well as to insist on its usage in government. Thus, Algeria and later Lebanon and Syria became part of francophonie; equally important, the notion of linguistic pluralism was abandoned, and Mediterranean nations, under French influence, started to proclaim the importance of their national languages, so that earlier plurilingual tolerance was replaced by monolingual hegemony.

This happened not just with French, but was also a foundational principle for the Turkification campaign of Kemal Atatürk (Lewis 1999); the Arabicization programs in North Africa (Grandguillaume 1990) after independence; and the linguistic changes accompanying Balkanization. Interestingly, the conservatism of independent Arab states and the involvement of Christian Arabists in the early days of Arab nationalism encouraged pan-Arabism rather than Islam as rallying cries, and led to decisions in the 1920s to recognize only the Classical and not the regional national varieties (Suleiman 1996, 2006), preserving the diglossia (Ferguson 1959; Fernández 1993) that has contributed to the weakness of modern Arab societies (Maamouri 1998; United Nations Development Programme 2009). It is nationalism that was at the core of the Balkanization that followed the collapse of the Ottoman Empire; while Tito held Yugoslavia together and helped establish the role of Serbo-Croatian as a unifying variety, the more recent political divisions have been accompanied by the encouragement of new varieties like Slovenian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Kosovan (Friedman 1985; Paternost 1985; Poulton 1998; Pranjkovic 2001).

The political and accompanying linguistic splintering of the Balkans clearly worked against any unifying Mediterranean trend; while weather and foodstuffs might be common, language became a divisive force. Cyprus itself provides evidence of this. Karoulla-Vrikki (2004) traces the efforts of the two ethnic groups under British rule to assert their identity by obtaining official status for their own language and resisting a shift from Greek to English by Greek Cypriots and from Turkish to Greek by Turkish Cypriots. Kizilyürek and Gautier-Kizilyürek (2004) suggest that Turkish Cypriots were influenced by the rise of Greek nationalism on the one hand and of Atatürk's secular reforms on the other to adopt Turkish identity and the reforms. However, since 1974, there has been increasing support for using Cypriot Turkish. Other varieties exist: Roth (2004) describes a Maronite Arabic variety spoken in the village of Kormakiti which has no connection with classical Arabic or other dialects and is influenced by Greek (Thomas 2000). The Council of Europe has expressed support for these minority varieties: in 2002, the Cypriot government was persuaded to recognize Armenian as an official language within the meaning of the *Charter*, but argued that Maronite Arabic was a dialect only spoken by a handful of old people and resisted recognition until 2008. Under the pressure exerted by the Council of Europe and the Cypriot Maronite community assisted by a group of experts, the government finally recognized Cypriot Arabic as a minority language within the meaning of the *Charter* in November 2008. There is also disagreement about the number and age of speakers of the variety and their location, and arguments that Maronite and Armenian groups be recognized as ethnic and not religious. Thus, the Council of Europe with its ideological commitment to diversity is calling for more effort to support endangered varieties.

McEntee-Atalianis (2004) notes that English is not officially recognized in Cyprus anymore, but is slowly spreading in areas of private activities such as commerce, tourism, bank services etc. In fact, one might argue that it is the growing role of English as a global lingua franca (Canagarajah 2007; Longman 2007) that is offering a basis for Mediterranean communication and even "dialogic space." To understand this, let me sketch the developing sociolinguistic ecology of the area that once was Ottoman Palestine, and now is uncomfortably but firmly divided between Israel and various Arab polities. In the nineteenth century under Ottoman rule, the language of government in what was a remote province was of course Turkish, but bureaucrats might also use Classical Arabic. There was a largely illiterate population speaking town, village or Bedouin varieties of Levantine Arabic. The longer established Sephardic Jewish

inhabitants were speakers of Judezmo but fluent in spoken Arabic and literate in Hebrew and often also Classical Arabic. The large numbers of Ashkenazim arriving in the second half of the century were mainly speakers of Yiddish and various East European languages and were also literate in Hebrew. Among them, by the turn of the century, were the early Zionists who were starting agricultural settlements and towns and revernacularizing and revitalizing Hebrew. By the time the British Army under General Allenby defeated the Turks and took over Palestine, the situation was such as to support a League of Nations suggested pattern of three official languages, English, Arabic and Hebrew.

Under the Mandate, Transjordan was sliced off as an independent Arab state, and the Mandatory government followed a kind of Millet policy in that it allowed (or required) Arab and Jewish communities to set up their own independent and self-funded educational and community organizations. In 1948, Gaza was taken over by Egypt and the West Bank by Jordan; each established (following the normal practice of Arab Islamic nations) a monolingual (but diglossic) ecology. Israel, too, modified the British policy, but only by dropping English from the official languages. Hebrew became dominant, but Arabic was, nominally at least, official (Saban & Amara 2002) and was the language of Arab elementary and secondary schools (Amara & Mar'i 2002). The multilingual immigration to Israel produced a vast range of languages filling usually private and sometimes selected community niches (Spolsky & Shohamy 1999). The schools, the army, and bureaucratic pressures worked strongly towards a Hebrew monolingual hegemony (Shohamy 2007), although there remain neighborhoods where other languages are commonly heard. The use of other languages is marked in Arab towns and villages (though Israeli Arabs are commonly bilingual), and where there are concentrations of former Soviet Russian speakers or Ethiopian Jews, and clusters of English French and Spanish speaking immigrants.

But in spite of the cancellation of its official status, English as a global language maintains a significant role, particularly in some legal domains (Rubinstein 1986), in higher education (Spolsky & Shohamy 2001), in the media, and in trade and tourism. Tourists can expect to find speakers of English in hotels, restaurants, souvenir stores, as guides and as taxi-drivers. And this is becoming true of much of the Mediterranean region, where global English is starting to serve as a lingua franca. Of course there is concern expressed by supporters of other languages, ranging from a romantic but somewhat naïve proposal to make Esperanto the language of the European Union to the common complaints expressed by language activists who wish to purify their national languages of English borrowings.

But it is not so much the result of an active diffusion policy–Fishman, Rubal-Lopez, and Conrad (1996) showed the exaggeration of Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (2001) position on this issue–as the value of English as a second language (de Swaan 2001) that has given it the status of a lingua franca, a role it can well serve in the Mediterranean as well.

United at times by military conquest and political power imposing a single language, the Mediterranean sociolinguistic ecology filled gaps in communication by developing or selecting lingua francas. National independence was accompanied by movements encouraging or enforcing national languages, so that the resulting linguistic mosaic has fostered the development of second language proficiency in English as a global lingua franca.

Notes

[1.] Again, there were geographical limits like Berber in the North African mountains and pockets of Aramaic preserved in the east, and cultural barriers that kept Turkish and Persian from being driven out.

Bibliography

Ager, D. E. 1999. *Identity, insecurity and image: France and language.* Clevendon, Philadelphia & Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Ammare, M. H., and A. A-R., Mar'i. 2002. *Language education policy: The Arab minority in Israel.* Dordrecht/Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Barbour, St., and C. Carmichael, eds. 2000. *Language and nationalism in Europe*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. 2007. "Lingua Franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition." *Modern Language Journal* 91 (supplement 1): 921-937.

Clogg, R. 1982. "The Greek millet in the Ottoman Empire." In *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The functioning of a plural society*, edited by B. Braude, and B., Lewis. Vol. 1. 185-207. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers Inc.

Cooper, R. L. 1989. *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, R. L., and, S. Carpenter. 1976. "Language in the market." In *Language in Ethiopia*, edited by M. L. Bender, J. D. Bowen, R. L.Cooper, and Ch. A. Ferguson. 244-255. London: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S. P. 1981. *Error analysis and interlanguage*. London: Oxford University Press.

de Swaan, A. 2001. *Words of the world: The global language system*. Cambridge UK and Malden MA: Polity Press and Blackwell Publishers.

Díaz, Martínez E. 2007. "An approach to the Lingua Franca of the Mediterranean." *Quaderns de la Mediterrània* 9: 223-227.

Dodds, J. D., M. R. Menocal, and, A. K. Balbale. 2008. *The arts of intimacy: Christians, Jews, and Muslims in the making of Castilian culture*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

Ferguson, Ch. A. 1959. "Diglossia." *Word* 15: 325-340.

Fernández, M. 1993. *Diglossia: A comprehensive bibliography 1960-1990*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fishman, J. A. 1972. "Domains and the relationship between micro- and macrosociolinguistics." *Directions in sociolinguistics,* edited by J. J. Gumperz, and D. Hymes, 435-453. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Fishman, J. A., A. Rubal-Lopez, and A. W. Conrad, eds. 1996. *Post-imperial English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Friedman, V. A. 1985. "The sociolinguistics of literary Macedonian." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 52: 31-57.

Grandguillaume, G. 1990. "Language and legitimacy in the Maghreb." In *Language policy and political development*, edited by Brian Weinstein, 150-166. Norwood NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Gumperz, J. 1958. "Dialect differences and social stratification in a North Indian village." *American Anthropologist* 60(4): 668-682.

Haugen, E. 1971. "The ecology of language." *The Linguistic Reporter* (supplement 25): 19-26.

—. 1972. *The ecology of language: Essays by Einar Haugen*, edited by A. S. Dil. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Kahane, H. R. 1951. "The sea as a medium of linguistic diffusion." *Italica* 28(4): 287-291.

Kahane, H. R., R. Kahane, and A. Tietze. 1958. *The Lingua Franca in the Levant: Turkish nautical terms of Italian and Greek origin*. Urbana IL: University of Illinois.

Kaplan, R. B., and R. B. Baldauf Jr. eds. 2000. *Language planning in Nepal, Taiwan and Sweden*. Clevedon UK & Philadelphia USA: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Karoulla-Vrikki, D. 2004. "Language and ethnicity in Cyprus under the British: a linkage of heightened salience." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 19-36.

Karpat, K. H. 1982. “Millets and nationality: The roots of the incongruity of nation and state in the post-Ottoman era.” In *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman empire: The functioning of a plural society*, edited by B. Braude, and B. Lewis. Vol. 1. 141-170. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers Inc.

Kizilyürek, N., and Gautier-Kizilyürek, S. 2004. “The politics of identity in the Turkish Cypriot community and the language question.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 37-54.

Labov, W. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

—. 1972. “The social motivation of a sound change.” In *Sociolinguistic patterns.* 1-42. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lewis, G. 1999. *The Turkish language reform: A catastrophic success*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Longman, Ch. 2007. “English as lingua franca: A challenge to the doctrine of multilingualism.” In *The language question in Europe and diverse societies: Political, legal and social perspectives*, edited by D. Castiglione, and Ch. Longman, 185-215. Oxford: Hart.

Maamouri, M. 1998. *Language education and human development: Arabic diglossia and its impact on the quality of education in the Arabic region.* Paper presented at the World Bank: The Mediterranean Development Forum, Marrakech.

McEntee-Atalianis, L. J. 2004. “The impact of English in postcolonial, postmodern Cyprus.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168: 77-90.

Milroy, L. 1980. *Languages and social networks*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Mühlhäusler, P. 1986. *Pidgin and Creole linguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Paternost, J. 1985. “A sociolinguistic tug of war between language value and language reality in contemporary Slovenian.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 52: 9-29.

Phillipson, R., and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. 2001. “Linguistic imperialism.” In *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics,* edited by R. Mesthrie. 570-574. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Poulton, H. 1998. “Linguistic minorities in the Balkans (Albania, Greece and the successor states of former Yugoslavia).” In *Linguistic minorities in Central and East Europe*, edited by Ch. Bratt Paulston, and D. Peckham, 37-80. Clevedon UK and Philadelphia USA: Multilingual Matters.