CHAPTER 36

Diglossia

Johannes Kabatek

36.1 Introduction

With traditional roots as a concept referring to the specific language situations of Greek and Arabic (see Fernández 2005), the term 'diglossia' in modern linguistics is generally attributed to Charles Ferguson, who discussed it in a landmark paper (Ferguson 1959). It is traditionally used for the description of sociolinguistic situations in which two varieties of one language or two different languages are used in the same territory for different purposes. Generally, though not necessarily, one of the varieties or languages is used in supra-regional communication and writing (traditionally also called H(igh)-variety), and the other, the local variety (or L(ow)-variety), is dominant in oral, informal communication The concept of diglossia as a term describing social aspects of multilingualism and multidialectalism is thus related to the general question of sociolinguistic variation (Ch. 35), as well as to the issue of standardization (Ch. 37). From a historical point of view, several phases in the evolution of the Romance languages are marked by diglossic situations, such as the Latin-Romance diglossia in the Middle Ages (Ch. 2). This chapter will briefly introduce the historical evolution of the concept of diglossia in linguistics, especially Romance linguistics, showing that the term can be understood in either a wider or a narrower sense. I will then establish some general aspects according to which diglossic situations in the Romània might be classified (§36.2). The main part of the chapter is dedicated to the description of certain types of historical (§36.3) as well as present-day diglossic situations in different Romance-speaking areas (§36.4). In the final section (§36.5), I will offer a brief outlook on methodological and empirical issues for future research.

36.2 The evolution of the concept of diglossia

Even if there is a long tradition of the term being used for the description of linguistic situations (Kremnitz 1996:209), the reference point for the use of the term 'diglossia' in modern sociolinguistics is the already mentioned paper by Charles Ferguson, 'Diglossia', in which he offers the following classic definition:

> DIGLOSSIA is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any section of the community for ordinary conversation. (Ferguson 1959:336)

Ferguson's definition was based on the description of four prototypical cases, including one case in the Romance area, the diglossia between creole and French in Haiti. His aim was not to offer an overall description of any imaginable situation of coexisting language varieties, but rather to illustrate one particular type of coexistence, in which two clearly differentiated varieties of one language are used for different communicative uses, as in the case of Swiss German and standard German in Switzerland. In Fergusonian diglossia, the situation is stable; the two varieties are historically related (they are varieties of one language); and the H-variety, used for writing and formal purposes, is more elaborated than the L-variety, which is restricted to informal communication.

Following Ferguson's conception, other authors criticized his definition above all because of claims that, due to its restrictions, it was not suitable as a general conception for the description of the coexistence of languages and varieties. In current research, some scholars distinguish between a 'narrow' conception of diglossia in a Fergusonian sense and add new terms for the description of other situations (Berruto 2007), while others have preferred to maintain the term but widen it for the description of virtually any situation of coexistence of languages and varieties.

Among other points, the aspects that were criticized or further differentiated in subsequent discussions of the Fergusonian conception were the idea of diglossia being stable, the restriction to varieties of one and the same language, the restriction to two and only two varieties, and the idea of diglossia also being a matter of grammatical complexity. One of the canonical modifications is that of Joshua Fishman, who, adopting a criticism formulated by Gumperz (1962), proposed to give up the restriction that the two varieties implied in a diglossic situation should be kin varieties of the same language. According to Fishman, diglossia could comprise a wide range of possibilities between genetically related varieties and different languages. His main contribution, however, consisted in a distinction and combination of two dimensions—the social function of the varieties/languages on the one hand, and the degree of competence people have in the respective community (bilingualism, with broad knowledge of both varieties, vs group-specific usage of both varieties) on the other. The term 'bilingualism', originally the Latin equivalent for the Greek term 'diglossia', is thus used to introduce a distinction between social bilingualism and situations where two different groups in one territory use two different languages or varieties (i.e. 'diglossia without bilingualism'). Whereas diglossia is used for situations where a high-prestige H-language or variety coexists with a low-prestige L-language or variety, bilingualism is also suitable for situations in which two equivalent forms of a language are employed. Discussing the different types of combination of diglossia and bilingualism, Fishman also mentions the case of completely monolingual and monovarietal situations without the existence of either bilingualism or diglossia. He states, however, that such situations will be difficult to find in reality, and that '[a]ll communities seem to have certain ceremonies or pursuits to which access is limited, if only on an age basis' (Fishman 1967:87).

In the following years, several attempts were made to give more general definitions of diglossia: while some authors, like Martinet (1982), rejected the notion in general, others tried to offer comprehensive theories able to account for virtually any kind of multilingual or multivariational setting, introducing terminological distinctions between diglossia with and without kinship of the contact languages, or adding further terms like polyglossia (with more than two varieties), dilalia (Berruto 1989, see below) or diaglossia (Auer 2005, see below). Within Romance linguistics, several authors related the term to specific Romance situations, often combining it with the Romance terminological and conceptual tradition of dialectology and variational linguistics in the sense of Flydal (1951) and Coseriu (1980).

An enormous number of publications on the issue of diglossia are now available (see Fernández 1993, an exhaustive bibliography covering only the publications 1960-90). It will obviously not be possible to give a comprehensive review here. Instead, it will be more convenient to depart from the phenomena themselves and ask which theoretical conceptions might be useful for the description of diglossia or polyglossia in the Romance area.

Diglossia in a narrow sense is a particular historical constellation of language variation. Language variation in general can be considered under a universal, genetic view or under an empirical view describing historical or current situations.

Universally, language variation can be accounted for by two major tendencies of human speech: on the one hand, apart from the obvious function of language to communicate with others about something, there is the universal tendency to mark social identity. Social identity means identification with a particular group and distinction from other groups. On the other hand, even within the same social group, communication is organized along a line between everyday informal communication and formal communication. Variation thus seems to be not accidental but genetically necessary (Labov 2011). The two universal necessities of linguistic differentiation are the ones Halliday et al. (1964) called 'variation according to user' and 'variation according to usage'.

Variation 'according to user' leads to group-specific differentiation. From the beginning of human settlement, the local or spatial dimension is the most important one, and within the Romance languages, locally identifiable dialects present by far the most differentiated range of varieties. Other group-specific phenomena not necessarily linked to space are generational, sexual, religious, or other differences. In Romance philology, the spatial dimension of variation is traditionally referred to as 'diatopic' variation, and the group-specific variation is called 'diastratic' variation.

Variation 'according to usage' is, following a term coined by Eugenio Coseriu (1980), traditionally called 'diaphasic' variation. Since the 1980s, attempts have been made to relate 'variation according to usage' to a universal dimension Koch and Oesterreicher (1985) called 'immediacy' (Ger. 'Nähe') and 'distance' ('Distanz'). The crucial importance of this dimension for the differentiation of text traditions or genres has also been demonstrated empirically in corpus linguistics (Biber 1993; Biber et al. 2006). Koch and Oesterreicher show that the continuum of different text traditions ('discourse traditions' in Koch's terminology: see Koch 1997a) between immediacy and distance is closely related to a medium differentiation between spoken and written language in societies with literacy. They also hold, following Coseriu, that there is a relationship between this universal dimension and the whole configuration of varieties in the 'architecture' (Flydal 1951) of a historical language: a diatopic variety (a dialect) can function as a diastratic variety (e.g. the frequent connotation of French spoken varieties or *patois* as indicators of lower classes), and a diastratic variety may function as a register or style (e.g. when French *argot*

The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages. Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds)
This chapter © Johannes Kabatek 2016. Published 2016 by Oxford University Press.

'slang' is associated with colloquial or informal speech). In Koch and Oesterreicher's model (2011), there is a general relationship between variational markedness and the dimension of immediacy and distance: a strong dialectally or sociolectally marked variety and low registers are associated with immediacy; a high register variety not dialectally or socially marked (generally the 'roof language' or 'standard language' in a community, see Ch. 37) is generally associated with distance.

Diglossia in a narrow sense is the historical result of a rather particular evolution of these general principles in a particular community. Diglossia in a wider sense—understood as the linguistic organization of immediacy and distance in virtually any linguistic community—is a general phenomenon whose description in the area of Romance will not be limited to some particular Fergusonian situations, but must be extended to the Romance-speaking world as a whole. Considered in this more general sense, there is no reason to establish a fundamental difference between diglossia with related or even closely related varieties ('in-diglossia', Kloss 1976, also called 'endoglossia') and diglossia implying different languages ('out-diglossia', or 'exoglossia'). In fact there is a continuum between both, and mere 'distance' is not a criterion for establishing a clear limit between a dialect and a language. Some strongly differentiated regional varieties in Italy are generally considered to be dialects, whereas in a case like Galician and Spanish the status of two different languages is generally not doubted. Thus, other historical reasons than distance must be responsible for the distinction, and I will use the term 'variety' as a general notion without distinguishing its status unless necessary. I will also refer both to cases with two clearly distinguishable varieties and to cases in which more than two varieties can be identified (polyglossia).

Within the vast Romance-speaking world, diglossia and polyglossia might be associated with a series of types that are the results of historical evolutions and constellations in part parallel in the whole area. As Auer (2005) claims, sociolinguistic situations in Europe (and, we may add, in the whole world where European languages are spoken) roughly derive from some general historical constellations that I will consider in the following section.

36.3 Diglossia in the history of the Romance languages

36.3.1 The history of Romance languages and varieties in Europe

Due to its widespread extension and its detailed historical documentation, the Romance language family is probably the most privileged for the study of different constellations of diglossia. In this section, rather than offering an exhaustive insight into the history of diglossic situations in the Romance area, a short overview of some of the most important periods in the history of Romance diglossias will be combined with an attempt to show that they might be systematically ordered alongside a scheme of historical emergence (Auer 2005). This does not mean that there is only one panchronic line on which the different situations are situated on a more or less advanced position; rather, it means that there were some crucial historical and cultural moments in the history of the last millennium that have had considerable impact on Romance (and other) languages and varieties in Europe and beyond, such as the emergence of written vernaculars in the Middle Ages, book printing, colonization, the creation of national states, the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, Romanticism, or globalization.

I will leave aside the diglossic situations that gave rise to the different Romance languages when Latin entered into contact with a whole range of languages. Nevertheless, we should keep in mind that the traditional terms 'substratum', 'superstratum', and 'adstratum' used to describe the different influences on Latin are but generalizations for different configurations of language contact. They imply long-term or short-term diglossic coexistence of languages. Latin was most often the H-language with a prestigious pressure that in many regions sooner or later (leaving aside some exceptional cases like Basque) led to the extinction of the L-language.

The result of the Romanization of vast regions in Europe (and originally also in north Africa) is the emergence of a spoken continuum of varieties that would be the origin of the Romance languages. After the decline of the Roman Empire, these 'primary dialects' in the sense of Coseriu (1980) evolve in the different Romance speaking areas under the roof of written Latin.

The Romance languages thus emerged in a diglossic environment. Ferguson's narrow conception of diglossia as a stable situation already referred to this occurrence when he mentions 'Latin and the emergent Romance languages during a period of some centuries in various parts of Europe' (Ferguson 1959:337). Latin was used as a relatively stable written language while its spoken varieties became more and more distinct among themselves (see Ch. 2). The emergence of the Romance languages illustrates two factors. First, a long-lasting and rather stable Fergusonian diglossia may come to an end. And, second, such changes of stable coexistences might be (or tend to be) indirect, paradoxical consequences of other evolutions. The latter can be seen in the arrival of a new spelling ideal after the Carolingian Renaissance (§2.9) and the unification of Latin pronunciation opening the gap between the local vernacular and Latin. This indirectly stirs a new diglossic consciousness reflected in the creation of the first written texts in which a Romance variety is clearly differentiated from Latin. Examples are the old French Strasbourg Oaths or the old Spanish *Glosas emilianenses*. Before, the diglossia had lasted for several centuries without significant changes, but the intervention of a centralized institution—the Carolingian Empire and the Catholic Church—and its modification of the H-variety led to the side-effect of the emergence of writings in the L-variety. Similar kinds of indirect effects can be observed in several subsequent moments in the history of Romance.

However, the emergence of written Romance does not, at the beginning, substantially alter the diglossic situation between Latin and Romance; rather, it renders it conscious and explains the appearance of some of the first Romance documents. It should be noted that this does not occur simultaneously in all regions; instead the new consciousness arrives noticeably later in some areas than in others (see §§2.9, 3.1). Its effects are immediately present in France after the Council of Tours (813), whereas in Spain, this is the case more than two centuries later, only after the Council of Burgos (1080), in which the Roman Rite for the Mass supersedes the former Mozarabic Rite.

In a general European historical-typological perspective, the Latin-Romance diglossia corresponds to Auer's 'Type Zero Repertoire' (Auer 2005:5), a situation in which an exoglossic standard language (Latin) coexists with spoken varieties (see also Koch 2003 for a Romance perspective). However, the fact that the spoken Romance varieties are considered exoglossic with regard to Latin is only the case after the Carolingian reform: before, spoken Romance and written Latin seem to have been considered just as two different medial instances of the same language. This is another example that shows that the distinction between language and dialect is a matter rather of consciousness than of objective distance.

The places and the text types where written Romance emerges (monastic centres, chancelleries) are not without significance. Clearly differentiated Romance appears in oaths, in religious texts, in glosses, and it frequently appears in a Latin surrounding, which shows a clearly functional markedness of Romance texts showing immediacy or testimony of orality. The first texts are clearly marked by dialectalism. They show, however, tendencies towards koineization. Only a few local Romance varieties appear in written texts, and in the first local scriptae, supraregional criteria linked to power and prestige centres already prepare a selection of particular norms (Kabatek 2013, and Ch. 37).

From the late twelfth century onwards, in different European regions, a new diglossia is added to the diglossia between Latin and Romance. Local Romance languages are not only sporadically written but become part of an *Ausbau* process ('process of elaboration': Kloss 1967) which leads to the creation of series of texts in several domains: charters, chronicles, juridical and administrative as well as literary texts begin to appear first in southern France, followed by the Iberian Peninsula, northern France, and Italy as a consequence of the transformational processes linked to the so-called Renaissance of the twelfth century (Haskins 1927; cf. also §§3.2.2-3). The creation of elaborated Romance written languages is a complex process where not only does the formerly spoken language undergo a transformation of the medium ('Verschriftung' in the sense of Oesterreicher 1994; cf. §3.2), but new text genres are created in Romance, and models from the contact language are adopted (generally from Latin but also, in the case of Spanish, from Arabic: see Corriente Córdoba 2004; García González 2008). This elaboration process (or *Verschriftlichung* in the sense of Oesterreicher 1994), through which the spoken vernaculars are used for purposes of communicative distance, establishes a new diaphasic differentiation within the vernacular and creates an inner diglossia, a 'Type-A repertoire' in the sense of Auer (2005:9). As Auer points out, this type of diglossia is close to Ferguson's narrow original conception, with functional differentiation within the same language giving rise to one written and another spoken variety. However, during the first centuries of emergence of Romance written languages, this 'Type-A repertoire' still coexists with the Latin–Romance diglossia, allowing the possibility of a triglossia with Latin and written Romance as H-varieties and spoken Romance (or, in some areas, another vernacular, Greek, Basque, Breton, etc.) as an L-variety. Furthermore, the use of Latin and Romance in writing is not parallel but clearly stratified. As Gumbrecht (1990:54) stated, a 'didactic gap' (*didaktisches Gefälle*) between Latin and Romance writing is installed: after the establishment of universities and the 'Bolognese Renaissance' (Kabatek 2005b), some communicative functions of writing are delegated to the new Romance languages, while a newly established, more classical Latin increasingly becomes the language of higher education, science, and academic writing.

In several Romance areas, a parallel process to the medieval emergence of written Romance can be observed in the nineteenth century. Several primary dialects had begun their way towards written elaboration, but this path was altered due to competition with other supraregional languages, as in the case of Occitan (Martel 2003), where French became the H-language in the late Middle Ages and was officially superposed on the regional language from the sixteenth century onwards. Other examples are languages like Galician (Mariño Paz 2008), Asturian (Kabatek 2003), or Sardinian (Blasco Ferrer 1984a), which, after flourishing as written languages, lost prestige and were only used as

spoken vernaculars with restricted written usage from the Late Middle Ages onwards. When in the nineteenth century national languages such as French, Spanish, or Italian initiated a process of further generalization throughout the national territory affecting those regions where another language or regional variety was still alive at the spoken level, these local languages or varieties emerged as written languages (with more or less historical tradition) and started establishing alternative written H-varieties that were added to the existing national standards. In some cases, such as Asturian, this romantic revival hardly created stable traditions, but in others, such as Occitan or Galician, written traditions persisted and even led, as in the case of Galician or Catalan, to official status in recent times (see §36.4.3).

From the two cases of the medieval and the 'late' emergence of Romance written varieties, three general principles can be derived. First, counter to the Fergusonian assumption of stability, changes in diglossic situations may occur quite quickly. The almost immediate effect of the Carolingian spelling reform on the emergence of the first sporadic instances of Romance is a striking example of this. Second, the possibility of rapid change does not contradict the fact that the spread of this kind of historical impact to other areas can be a long-lasting process, as in the case of the late arrival of the Carolingian reform in areas of the Romània such as the Iberian Peninsula (§2.9). Third, the dynamics are somehow cyclic: the Romance languages are originally the L-varieties of a diglossia between written Latin and spoken Latin (later, Romance). When in later centuries the Romance languages become standardized (see Ch. 37), a new diglossia emerges between standard Romance (e.g. standard Italian) and the vernacular varieties (Clivio et al. 2011:157). In the case of 'late standardization' of so-called Romance minority languages (minority in relationship to the earlier established national standards), this cyclicity leads to the establishment of new regional standard languages, with the side-effect of the creation of new inner diaphasic differences within the minority language and a diglossic gap between its standard and the local spoken varieties (Kabatek and Pusch 2009; Pusch and Kabatek 2011). This kind of cyclic movement is, however, by no means a necessity. In most Romance areas, there is no emancipation of spoken vernaculars as written varieties, and while the written language adopts features from the spoken language, the latter shows convergence with the standard language and tends to lose dialect features.

Referring back to the Middle Ages, the triglossic situation between spoken Romance, written Romance, and written Latin is more or less stable until the Renaissance. However, thanks to the printing press and the resulting increased diffusion of written texts, beginning in the second half of the fifteenth century, the Latin–Romance diglossia disappears as the Romance languages become established as dominant written languages. For instance, in 1539 French is declared the official language of juridical documents in France. In the first half of the sixteenth century, the relationship between Latin and French books printed in the French-speaking area is almost inverted, and from the second half of the century onwards, French becomes the clearly dominant language in printing. Religion is an important factor in the diffusion of the vernacular, and within one century, Latin is abandoned or becomes minoritarian in almost all possible discourse traditions (Rey et al. 2007:468–86). In other Romance areas, similar evolutions can be observed.

Following the increase of book printing in Romance languages and the first wave of colonial expansion, conscious debates on the role of the written language spread from Italy to France and the Iberian Peninsula. A central question of these debates is the relationship between the spoken and the written language; and an opposition can be observed between those who defend a written language more or less oriented in oral speech and those who uphold an etymological, Latinizing writing. Thus, a visible gap between the spoken and the written language and a consciously created inner diglossia is established. The latter situation was more successful in France than in Spain or Italy, underlying a stronger inner differentiation between written and oral language in France, and further reinforced by the phonetic and morphosyntactic evolution of French in comparison to the other Romance languages (see Chs 5, 17). This conscious establishment of an inner diglossia, following the desire for a differentiation between immediacy and distance, is accompanied by institutional rules with the aim of stabilizing the written language. The Spanish grammarian Nebrija claims in 1492 that he writes his Castilian Grammar with the purpose that, from that moment onwards, everything in the Spanish language should remain 'in the same tenor', believing that the language had reached an evolutionary peak and that stabilization would be necessary in order to avoid decay.

This idea of stability gains importance during the following centuries, and the conscious establishment of a *bon usage* ('correct usage') in France in the seventeenth century in addition to the foundation of academies with the declared task of codifying the language (Italy 1583, France 1635, Spain 1713) stabilizes, to a certain degree, the written language and apparently unties it from the evolution of the spoken language. The historiography of the Romance languages tends to interpret this 'fixing point' of the language evolution as the moment when the fundamental structures of the modern languages are firmly established, polymorphism is greatly reduced, and further changes are basically limited to lexical innovation (Cano Aguilar 1988:255). However, one of the tasks of recent linguistic historiography is to separate the metalinguistic discourse on language evolution from the facts. And even if a certain stability of written traditions in several Romance languages can be traced back to their 'classical' periods until the seventeenth century, changes are not only occurring on all levels until the present but can also be identified even within the written traditions, in particular if the view on history includes everyday informal written texts (Hafner and Oesterreicher 2007).

The inner diglossia within the Romance languages is basically limited to a traditional Fergusonian difference between the spoken and the written language. The divergence between these varieties is enhanced by the aforementioned establishment of distance starting in the Renaissance. Additionally, since the written languages are based on the dialects of certain geographical regions—Paris, Tuscany, Madrid, or Lisbon, for example—they sometimes contrast starkly with the peripheral dialects and regional languages. This is why the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century, with its ideal of equality and education, alleges the unjust existence of a linguistic gap between different languages, postulating two ways of resolving it: education in the vernacular is proposed as a possible solution in some regions, while in others, the 'abolition' of language variation is the target. The most extreme case in European history is the Jacobin language policy during the French Revolution. This policy associates the ideal of liberty, equality, and national unity with complete unification of diversity within the society in order to combat injustice; this process includes linguistic unification and the abolition of diatopic, diastratic, and diaphasic varieties (Schlieben-Lange 1996). Of course, this project was completely unrealistic, but it helped to connect the idea of a modern democratic state with the necessity of a unified standard language taught to everyone as a written and spoken language. Even in France, this ideal was far from reality at the moment of its conscious formulation (only with the introduction of a general education starting in 1882 does it become an increasing reality). Nevertheless, it remains until the present the dominant linguistic model for a modern state, and it establishes the inner diglossia not only as a diglossia between speaking and writing but also as a diglossia between the written standard and the spoken standard (or close to standard) variety in relation to spoken local varieties.

This is what Auer (2005) describes as another common European constellation of diglossia, 'type B' diglossia in his terminology. In Romance linguistics, the term 'dilalia' was proposed for this kind of situation (Berruto 1989) and described in the case of Italian in particular. In this case, a common written standard language coexists with spoken local dialects and with a more and more extended spoken standard language.

Parallel to the expansion of a spoken standard-oriented language, two further evolutions can be observed in different regions during the last two centuries. First, the emergence of intermediate spoken regional varieties or 'regiolects' between the primary dialects and the standard language; second, the possibility of the loss of the primary dialects with the survival of only regional accents. The first of these situations is referred to as 'diaglossia' and 'type C' by Auer 2005 (following Bellmann 1998). 'Diaglossia' and 'dilalia' may also coexist in the same territory. According to territorial, social, and individual criteria, there can be a continuum of possible intermediate realizations between the primary dialect and the standard. This continuum of realizations does not exclude a discrete separation between standard and dialect among the speakers. In some situations, within the continuum there are clear differentiations or 'zones of density', according to Berruto (1989), or 'grades' (Stehl 2012; see also Kabatek 1996:31–7). The more the inner differentiation is stratified, the more the speakers might switch between the different varieties (Berruto 2005:89; 2007).

Levelling of local dialects and even dialect loss seem to be the latest stage of the general European evolution. The result is a new inner diglossia, where the difference between the spoken and the written variety is more a supraregional distinction between immediacy and distance, between colloquial spontaneous speech and the standard in its written as well as in its spoken realization. The conservative character of the written language and the retraction of dialects has led to a situation of particularly marked inner diaphasic diglossia. In the case of France, for example, a series of linguistic features appear only in writing or in highly elaborated spoken registers, while others are typical of informal spoken registers. Several authors have discussed this diglossia between immediacy and distance (see Koch 1997b; Gadet 2007; Massot 2010; Koch and Oesterreicher 2011; Zribi-Hertz 2011).

Dialect loss seems to be stronger in France or Portugal than in Italy, though, there are even counter-movements that can be observed, as in Spain (see §36.4). However, the observation of dialect loss must always be carefully analysed; sometimes, it is only the observer's paradox that leads to an apparent inexistence of dialects. In some cases dialects are preserved not as varieties of active first-language acquisition but, rather, as passively acquired dialects activated later in life.

36.3.2 The history of Romance languages and varieties beyond Europe

It is not possible to simply extend the general typology of historically determined European language situations to the

România noua; but we can to a certain degree distinguish certain colonial and postcolonial scenarios that roughly correspond to more general types (see also Schon 2013).

The first stage of colonization, beginning with the arrival of the Spaniards in America in 1492, leads to an immediate diglossia between the languages of the colonizers and the different indigenous local languages. This diglossia is mainly a diglossia without bilingualism, with the conquerors speaking Spanish and the indigenous population continuing to speak their respective languages, only maintaining reduced contact through translators like the famous Malinche, a translator between Spanish and Nahuatl after the Mexican conquest.

This first stage, a trade colony, can be taken as an instance of a type of colony that may last only for a short period, but it can also become an established, stable situation. The Spanish conquest is immediately followed by a second stage, the 'domination colony', with the aim of full territorial control and the overall expansion of the Christian religion. In the sixteenth century, missionaries from several orders, especially Jesuits, chose a few so-called *lenguas generales* (general languages) based on indigenous languages for the teaching of the Christian doctrine. While many of the other indigenous languages disappear, some of the *lenguas generales* are expanded beyond their original territories, and the diglossia between the Spanish and the indigenous language is stabilized and maintained, in some areas, until the present.

The Spanish colonization almost immediately establishes urban centres, universities, and book printing in the New World, creating an urban culture in the capitals of the newly established vice-kingdoms in close contact with Spanish cities. By contrast, the Portuguese colonization of Brazil was more like the Greek colonization of the Mediterranean coasts in the ancient world; the Portuguese concentrated on trade, and established their centres mainly in the Atlantic harbours, maintaining a long-term trade colony. While in Brazil this creates a rather long-lasting diglossia without bilingualism (Portuguese or Dutch of the colonizers in the centres on the coast, indigenous languages and *línguas gerais* ('general languages') in other areas and in the interior), in the Spanish colonies, the urban centres of the interior, in addition to a more 'Roman' organization of society, allow for a more intensive Hispanization. It seems, however, that Hispanization, in spite of several royal decrees postulating the extinction of the indigenous languages mainly in the eighteenth century, is not very efficient. This follows, most notably, the independence of the American countries in the early nineteenth century with the adoption of the ideas of a modern nation with one national language framed during the French revolution; furthermore, Spanish as well as Portuguese expand in their respective countries. In the nineteenth century, this adoption of the language of the colonizers as national languages of independent states is already being discussed as problematic, and first attempts at showing or establishing differences can be observed. However, both in the former Spanish colonies and in Brazil, with the foundation of national academies at the end of the century, a clear orientation towards the standards of the European motherlands still can be seen. This changes during the twentieth century, when the diglossia between the written European standard and the obviously diverging spoken language is increasingly considered to be an obstacle for education in Brazil (Mattos e Silva 2004); recent descriptions of Brazilian Portuguese are based on an autochthonous Brazilian written standard. In a similar way, but with fewer differences between the European and the American standards in the Spanish-speaking countries, the diglossia between a European standard and the local reality has been replaced by a commonly accepted view that considers Spanish as a 'pluricentric' language, with several regional standards that coexist in a horizontal equality (Oesterreicher 2002; Lebsanft et al. 2012).

A completely different constellation was the result of the second phase of colonization, with the French expansion to North America and Africa (we will leave aside, for reasons of space, other colonizations such as the Spanish and Portuguese expansions in Africa and Asia). In North America, French colonization is a 'New England type colonization' (Osterhammel 1995; Schon 2013), a type of 'settlement colony' marked by the transposition of locally marked French varieties to a new territory and a diglossia between these varieties and the European French written standard. More recently, the written standard introduced some Canadianisms; but a strong unity with the European standard is still maintained, and a diglossia exists between the written standard and the spoken varieties. At the same time, Canada has currently become an interesting case with two officially monolingual regions in one country (besides the officially bilingual region of New Brunswick), established in order to avoid diglossia and language mixture. This is, however, more a political ideal than a descriptive truth throughout the country, where diglossic situations occur with both of the national languages in both possible positions and mixed forms exist such as so-called Joual in Quebec or Chiac in New Brunswick, colloquial French varieties marked by Anglicisms (Pöll 2011:112).

In Africa, French colonization has led to different types of diglossia and polyglossia: the first period of French conquests is marked by trade colonialism, but there are also aspects of territorial dominance. The diglossia in many so-called francophone African countries used to be between standard French as a written language, French as a spoken language of the colonizers and the upper class, and local languages (Biloa 2004). In northern Africa, French used to be employed as a prestige language in the Maghreb states; however, Maghrebine Arabic has recently become more prestigious in Morocco and Tunisia, while French has increasingly become marginal or only a second language in a situation marked by an inner-Arabic diglossia. In recent times, the presence of French as trade language or as supranational prestige language in several African countries has been threatened by an increasing presence of English.

A completely different type of colonization must also be mentioned: the planter society, with a massive presence of slaves that often led to the emergence of creole languages (see Ch. 24). Romance-based creoles can be found in the Caribbean, North and South America, Africa, the Atlantic Ocean, the Indian Ocean, and in several parts of Asia. The result of the original polyglossic situation between African languages, indigenous languages, and the languages of the European colonizers were rapidly emerging creole continua between the European 'acrolect' as H-variety and the local creole as L-variety. Current creole situations are still generally marked by this constellation. However, depending on the presence and status of the European acrolect, in some regions, creoles are official languages and the acrolect is reduced to the language of a minority (e.g. Cape Verde, Haiti), while in others, almost the whole population is bilingual (e.g. Martinique, Klingler 2003a; see also §§24.2.1, 24.3.1).

36.4 Current dynamics in Romance variation and diglossia

36.4.1 The impact of globalization: universalism and particularism

For the current description of diglossic sociolinguistic settings, it is preferable not to depart from discrete categories but rather to establish a series of continuous parameters that allow for the description of the whole range of possible situations. Lüdi (1990), in an influential attempt within Romance linguistics developed in the 1980s, proposes such a set of parameters. Lüdi's dimensions allow for unlimited combinations in every individual situation as well as for the description of dynamic evolutions of such situations. He distinguishes (p. 321) six different continua:

- linguistic distance between the varieties or languages in contact;
- types of communities;
- functional complementarity;
- standardization;
- type of acquisition;
- prestige.

Several of these continua are further subdivided. Lüdi (1990) offers an application to current diglossic and polyglossic situations in France. It would be an interesting task to extend this application across the Romance languages.

Since any situation of coexisting varieties is determined by history, the following section is somehow a continuation of the previous one; but instead of distinguishing historical phases, I will concentrate briefly on some tendencies observable in current situations. Probably the most important evolution of the last decades concerns the effects of globalization and the increase of communication following several technological innovations. It is commonly argued that the consequences of this tendency are, above all, massive language death and dialect levelling. On the other hand, the other side of the coin of this tendency towards universalization is particularization, the stress on local identities, and the emergence of new languages and varieties or the increase of the status of former L-languages or varieties. The massive political changes in the former 'second world' and the breakdown of apparent unity has caused local varieties to emerge in the Baltic states and the former Yugoslavia, for example, as well as in Romance-speaking areas such as the Republic of Moldova, where the former diglossic situation between dominant Russian and the local, majoritarian Romanian (artificially considered as a separate language under the name of *limba moldovenească* 'Moldavian language') was almost inverted after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and Romanian is now the official language.

36.4.2 Levelling

As already mentioned, dialect levelling and the reduction of dialect diversity can be observed all over Europe to different degrees since the creation of national states and linguistic unifications (Auer et al. 2005a:11). In recent decades, the presence of standard languages in all strata of society and the reduction of dialect diversity have been increased by modern communication (Loporcaro 2009:176-82). This is not uniform in all countries, but wherever Romance languages are spoken, it has become difficult to find speakers who ignore the standard language. Furthermore, the increasing use of the standard leads to the reduction of dialect features and to a general tendency towards levelling, noteworthy in France, remarkable in Italy, and present in other countries as well.

36.4.3 The revival of languages

The tendency towards the revival of languages is a global one; it is linked to local political evolutions like the end of Franco's dictatorship in Spain, as well as to a general countermovement against globalizing unification. The cases of Quebec French and Catalan in Spain are striking. Quebec French as the only official language of Quebec served as a model for Catalan sociolinguists in the 1970s, and the evolution in Catalonia served as a model for many other regions in Europe and abroad. Catalan, after a short period of co-official status in the 1930s, had lost this status during the Franco regime. Only from the end of the 1970s onward did an emancipation process take place that made the former L-language Catalan become equally accepted as Spanish, achieving even the status of a dominant language in some areas and sectors of the society. This rapid emergence was also due to the high prestige of Catalan in dominant social groups. There is currently a debate on Catalan independence, and there is no doubt that Catalan would be the dominant language of a new Catalan state, with a clear inversion of the traditional diglossia. This inversion is also possible because Catalan, even in times of clear Spanish domination, had high 'covert prestige' (Trudgill 1974), which means that it was highly esteemed within its domains even without having the overt prestige of an official language. However, even if a certain Catalan dominance is gradually replacing the traditional diglossia, the future status of Spanish—the language of half the population in the Catalan-speaking area of Spain—is by no means clear, and due to its international prestige it will probably remain an H-language.

The Catalan situation served as a model for other Spanish bilingual regions such as the Basque Country and Galicia, but it has also strongly influenced debates on minority languages in other regions (Coluzzi 2007). In Sardinia, for instance the Catalan model is presented as the ideal example of emancipation of a local language, and in several Latin American states, recent language policies establishing rights for indigenous languages show influences from the Catalan model. But there is a considerable difference between those regions where the local language movement is accompanied by economic power (as in Catalonia or in the German-Italian bilingual situation in South Tyrol/Alto Adige) and those where dominant sectors of society prefer to continue using the traditional dominant language (as in Galicia, Sardinia, or the bilingual regions of Mexico).

The emancipation of languages is a complex process that cannot be reduced to simply changing the roles of languages in a society (Blauth-Henke and Heinz 2011). The rise of languages also leads to creation processes of a new inner diglossia. The entry of formerly spoken varieties into the whole range of prestige discourse traditions (including official usage, administration, mass media) is also accompanied by the massive creation of new linguistic means. New elements can be direct adoptions from the contact language or as well, in an identity-creating process, proper elements that show a tendency of avoiding adoptions.

An interesting phenomenon linked to this diaphasic differentiation is the fact that in emancipation processes L1 speakers of the former dominant language participate and change their usage (generally or temporarily) to the emergent or emancipating language. These 'new speakers' might be marginal in some cases, but in others they are dominant in the creation of standard models, such as the new speakers of Basque in the Basque country; the *neofalantes* ('neo-speakers') in Galicia, with Spanish background; the new speakers of Breton, with French background; or the new speakers of Raeto-Romance, with Swiss German background. Generally, these speakers are phonetically marked by their L1, but they have fewer problems in adopting a newly created standard language, as they do not feel any conflict with a dialect form of the same language.

Another phenomenon paradoxically linked to the emancipation of regional languages is dialect levelling; and diversification of linguistic situations implies also, on another level, unification processes. In the Catalan-speaking area, for instance, levelling and convergence with the standard can be observed in western Catalan areas since the emancipation and acquisition of official status of Catalan (Kabatek and Pusch 2009).

36.4.4 Creating bilingualism

In some regions, contact with adjacent bilingual regions has led to the adoption of a bilingual discourse, even if the local language situation is only a slightly differentiated spoken dialect closely related to the standard language. This is the case of Aragonese, a dialect spoken in some valleys of the Pyrenees, where the local varieties are preserved without any unity, but urban groups outside these territories, generally 'new speakers', defend an 'Aragonese language' in an attempt to create a bilingual situation. Similar tendencies can be observed in Asturias, where an 'Asturian language' is defended on the basis of a rather lively dialect diversity, or in Upper Brittany, where the local spoken French entered into writing as the 'Gallo' language (Radatz 1997). In Spain, the general tendency to foster regional diversity has led to higher acceptance of the spoken dialects also in regions without an open bilingualism. Thus, younger speakers are using varieties close to the spoken dialect in Andalusia (Narbona 2009) and the Canary Islands in formal situations, and local accents are even consciously employed in the mass media. The marking of identity seems to be the basic target of these phenomena.

36.4.5 Hybrids and their function

In other cases, identity marking does not feature at the beginning of the creation of varieties, but is instead a consequence of existing divergence. This seems to be particularly the case when language mixture occurs in situations of recent migration or in certain postcolonial settings. Examples can be found in very different areas in the Romance-speaking world, like the English–Spanish mixture in the US (Torres 2011; Otheguy and Zentella, 2012), the mixture between Guaraní and Spanish in Paraguay termed Jopará (Gynan 2011), the hybrid English–Spanish Yanito in Gibraltar (Levey 2008), or the mixture between French and Wolof in Senegal, Francolof or Wolof urbain. Even if they can be named (frequently with 'hybrid' names), these mixtures of languages are not necessarily stable entities and might consist of an actual blend of two languages that presupposes knowledge of both of them; however, these hybrids might also function as expressions of a double identity and the creation of a postcolonial 'third space' (Bhabha 2004). They are sometimes part of complex polyglossic settings, as in the city of Dakar, where different African languages—spoken local French, spoken standard French, and Francolof—coexist with written varieties of French and Wolof. Hybrid mixtures are typical for territorial coexistences of languages or for frontier situations. Hybrid mixtures can also be frequently found where there is urban language contact (Bombi and Fusco 2004), where the coexistence of different languages (local, colonial, migration languages) leads to sometimes complex polyglot 'glossotopes' (Krefeld 2004).

36.5 The future of research on diglossia in Romance

As we have seen, diglossia, especially in its wider sense, is a crucial term for the historical as well as the present-day description of Romance languages and varieties. A central empirical task for present research is to observe the dynamics of linguistic diversity between levelling and differentiation. It is impossible to predict future evolution, but current tendencies can be observed and can allow resulting inferences. An interesting emerging field of research is mathematical modelling of language contact situations, including the evolution of diglossia; but close collaboration between sociolinguists and model-builders is necessary in order to avoid naïve simplifications (see Kabatek 2012; Kabatek and Loureiro-Porto 2013). Another recent field of research is the study of so-called 'linguistic landscapes', in which the visibility of languages and varieties in a community is described. Even if some of the numerous recent publications do not reach beyond pure descriptions of the public presence of written languages, there are fortunate exceptions that shed light on the whole linguistic reality behind the surface of the visible 'landscape' (see e.g. Pons Rodríguez 2012, on Seville).

References (Chapter 35, *Diglossia*, Author: Johannes Kabatek)

Auer, P. (2005). 'Europe's Sociolinguistic Unity, or: A Typology of European Dialect/Standard Constellations', in N. Delbecque, J. van der Auwera, and D. Geeraerts (eds.): *Perspectives on Variation: Sociolinguistic, Historical, Comparative*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 7–42.

Auer, P., Hinskens, F., and Kerswill, P. (eds.) (2005). *Dialect Change. Convergence and Divergence in European Languages*, Cambridge: CUP.

Auer, P., Hinskens, F., and Kerswill, P. (2005). 'The Study of Dialect Convergence and Divergence: Conceptual and Methodological Considerations', in P. Auer. F. Hinskens, and P. Kerswill, (eds.) (2005), 1–48.

Berruto, G. (1989). 'On the Typology of Linguistic Repertoires', in U. Ammon, (ed.): *Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 552–69.

Berruto, G. (2005). 'Dialect/Standard Convergence, Mixing, and Models of Language Contact: the Case of Italy', in P. Auer, F. Hinskens, and P. Kerswill, (eds.) (2005), 81–95.

Berruto, G. (2007). *Prima lezione di sociolinguistica*, Rome: Laterza.

Bhabha, H. K. (2004). *The Location of Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Biber, D. (1993). 'Using Register-diversified Corpora for General Language Studies', *Computational Linguistics* 19, 2: 219–41.

Biber, D., Davies, M., Jones, J. K., and Tracy-Ventura, N. (2006). 'Spoken and Written Register Variation in Spanish: A Multi-dimensional Analysis', *Corpora* 1: 7–38.

Biloa, E. (2004). *La Langue française au Cameroun*, Berne: Lang.

Blasco Ferrer, E. (1984). *Storia linguistica della Sardegna*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Blauth-Henke, C., and Heinz, M. (2011). *Où en sont les Études des langues régionales en domaine roman? Données, méthodes, modèles de description*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Bombi, R., and Fusco, F. (2004). *Città plurilingui: lingue e culture a confronto in situazioni urbane*. Udine: Forum.

Cano Aguilar, Rafael (1992). *El español a través de los tiempos*. Madrid: Arco.

Clivio, G. Danesi, M. and Maida-Nicol, S. (2011). *An Introduction to Italian Dialectology*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Coluzzi, P. (2007). *Minority Language Planning and Micronationalism in Italy*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Corriente Córdoba, F. (2004). 'El elemento árabe en la historia lingüística peninsular: actuación directa e indirecta', in R. Cano Aguilar (ed.): *Historia de la lengua española*. Barcelona: Ariel, 185–206.

Coseriu, E. (1980). ''Historische Sprache' und 'Dialekt'', in J. Göschel, P. Ivić, and K. Kehr, (eds.), *Dialekt und Dialektologie*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 106–16.

D'Agostino, M. (2007). *Sociolinguistica dell'Italia contemporanea*. Bologna: il Mulino.

Díaz-Campos, M. (ed.) (2011). *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellena, S. (2011). *Die Rolle der norditalienischen Varietäten in der 'Questione della lingua': eine diachrone Untersuchung zu Sprachbewusstsein, Sprachwissen und Sprachbewertung*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Erfurt, J., and Amelina, M. (2011). *La Francophonie. Bibliographie analytique de la recherche internationale 1980-2005*, Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Ernst, G., Glessgen, M.-D., Schmitt, C., and Schweickard, W. (eds.) (2003-2008). *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen/ Histoire linguistique de la Romania. Manuel international*

d'histoire linguistique de la Romania. 3 vols III., vol. I: 2003; vol. II: 2006; vol. III: 2008, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Ferguson, C. (1959). 'Diglossia', *Word* 15: 325–340.

Fernández, M. (1993). *Diglossia: a Comprehensive Bibliography 1960 – 1990*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Fernández, M. (2005). 'Leyenda e historia del término 'diglosia'. Su invención y su primera expansión', in L. Santos Río (ed.), *Palabras, norma, discurso: en memoria de Fernando Lázaro Carreter*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 447–464.

Flydal, Leiv (1951). 'Remarques sur certains rapports entre le style et l'état de langue', *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 16: 240–57.

Fishman, J. (1967). 'Bilingualism with and without Diglossia; Diglossia with and without Bilingualism', *The Journal of Social Issues* 23, 2: 29–38; reprinted in L. Wei (ed.), *The Bilingualism Reader*, London/New York: Routledge, 81–88.

Gadet, F. (2007). *La Variation sociale en français*. Paris: Ophrys.

García González, J. (2008). 'Cuestiones pendientes en el estudio de los arabismos del español medieval. Una revisión crítica', in J. Elvira (ed.), *Lenguas, reinos y dialectos en la Edad Media Ibérica: Homenaje a Juan Ramón Lodares*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 257–86.

Gumbrecht, H. U. (1990). *E i n e Geschichte der spanischen Literatur*. 2 vols., Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Gumperz, J. J. (1962). 'Linguistic and Social Interaction in two Communities', *American Anthropologist* 66, 6/2: 137–54.

Gynan, S. N. (2011). 'Spanish in Contact with Guaraní', in M. Díaz-Campos (2011), 353–73.

Hafner, J., and Oesterreicher, W. (eds.) (2007). *Mit Clio im Gespräch. Romanische Sprachgeschichten und Sprachgeschichtsschreibung*. Tübingen: Narr.

Halliday, M. A. K., Mclntosh, A., and Strevens, P. (1964). *The Linguistic Sciences and Language. Teaching*. London: Longmans.

Haskins, C. H. (1927). *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*. Cambridge (Mass.)/London: Harvard University Press.

Holtus, G., Metzeltin, M., and Schmitt, C. (eds.) (1990). *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik. Vol. V: Französisch, Okzitanisch, Katalanisch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kabatek, J. (1996). *Die Sprecher als Linguisten. Interferenz- und Sprachwandelphänomene dargestellt am Galicischen der Gegenwart*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kabatek, J. (2003). ''Estamos dando principio ahora á la gramática asturiana' – Louis Lucien Bonaparte, Manuel Fernández de Castro y la elaboración del asturiano escrito', in *Actas del I Conceyu Internacional de Lliteratura Asturiana,* Uviéu [Oviedo]: Academia de la Llingua Asturiana, 23–51.

Kabatek, J. (2005). *Die Bolognesische Renaissance und der Ausbau romanischer Sprachen. Juristische Diskurstraditionen und Sprachentwicklung in Südfrankreich und Spanien im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kabatek, J. (2012). 'Modelos matemáticos e substitución lingüística', *Estudos de Lingüística Galega* 4: 27–43.

Kabatek, J. (2013). 'Koinés and Scriptae', in N. Vincent, J. C. Smith, and M. Maiden (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*. Vol. II. Cambridge/UK: CUP, 143–86.

Kabatek, J., and Loureiro-Porto, L. (2013). 'Mathematical Models Meet Linguistic Data and vice-versa', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 221: 1–10.

Kabatek, J., and Pusch, C. (2009). *Variació, poliglòssia i estàndard: Processos de convergència i divergència lingüístiques en català, occità i basc*. Aachen: Shaker.

Kabatek, J. and Pusch, C. (2011). 'Language Contact in Southwestern Europe', in J. van der Auwera and B. Kortmann (eds.): *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe. A Comprehensive Guide*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 393–408.

Kleinhenz, C., and Busby, K. (eds.) (2010). *Medieval Multilingualism. The Francophone World and its Neighbours*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Klingler, T. (2003). 'Histoire des langues créoles à base lexicale française: la Louisiane et les Antilles', in G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, and W. Schweickard, (eds.): *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen/ Histoire linguistique de la Romania. Manuel international d'histoire linguistique de la Romania.* vol. I., Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1105–20.

Kloss, H. (1967). ''Abstand Languages' and 'Ausbau Languages'', *Anthropological Linguistics* 9, 7:29–41.

Kloss, H. (1976). 'Über 'Diglossie'', *Deutsche Sprache* 4: 413–23.

Koch, P. (1997a). 'Diskurstraditionen: zu ihrem sprachtheoretischen Status und ihrer Dynamik', in B. Frank, T. Haye, and D. Tophinke, (eds.), *Gattungen mittelalterlicher Schriftlichkeit*. Tübingen: Narr, 43–79.

Koch, P. (1997b). 'Diglossie in Frankreich?', in: Engler, W. (ed.): *Frankreich an der Freien Universität, Geschichte und Aktualität*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 219–249.

Koch, P. (2003). 'Romanische Sprachgeschichte und Varietätenlinguistik', in G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, and W. Schweickard, (eds.): *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen/ Histoire linguistique de la Romania. Manuel international d'histoire linguistique de la Romania.* vol. I., Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 102–24.

Koch, P., and Oesterreicher, W. (1985). 'Sprache der Nähe – Sprache der Distanz. Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte', *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 36: 15–43.

Koch, P., and Oesterreicher, W. (2008). 'Comparaison historique de l'architecture des langues romanes/Die Architektur romanischer Sprachen im historischen Vergleich', in G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, and W. Schweickard, (eds.): *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen/ Histoire linguistique de la Romania. Manuel international d'histoire linguistique de la Romania.* vol. III., Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2575–610.

Koch, P., and Oesterreicher, W. (2011). *Gesprochene Sprache in der Romania: Französisch, Italienisch, Spanisch*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Krefeld, T. (2004). *Einführung in die Migrationslinguistik*, Tübingen: Narr.

Krefeld, T., and Pustka, E. (2010). 'Für eine perzeptive Varietätenlinguistik', in T. Krefeld and E. Pustka, (eds.): *Perzeptive Varietätenlinguistik*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 9–28.

Kremnitz, G. (1996). 'Diglossie/Polyglossie', in H. Goebl, P. Nelde, Z. Stary, and W. Wölck, (eds.): *Kontaktlinguistik, ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 208–18.

Labov, W. (2011). *Principles of Linguistic Change. Vol. 3: Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lebsanft, F., Mihatsch, W., and Polzin-Haumann, C. (eds.) (2012). *El español, ¿desde las variedades a la lengua pluricéntrica?*. Madrid: Iberoamericana.

Levey, David (2008). *Language Change and Variation in Gibraltar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Lodge, R. A. (1993). *French: From Dialect to Standard*. London: Routledge.

Loporcaro, M. (2009). *Profilo linguistico dei dialetti italiani*. Bari - Rome: Laterza.

Lüdi, G. (1990). 'Französisch: Diglossie und Polyglossie. Diglossie et polyglossie', in Holtus, Metzeltin, and Schmitt (eds.), V, 307–35.

Mariño, R. (2008). *Historia de la lengua gallega*. Munich: Lincom.

Martinet, A. (1982). ‘Bilinguisme et diglossie. Appel à une vision dynamique des faits’, *La Linguistique* 18, 1: 5–16.

Martel, P. (2003). ‘Histoire externe de l’occitan’, in G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, and W. Schweickard, (eds.): *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen/ Histoire linguistique de la Romania. Manuel international d’histoire linguistique de la Romania.* vol. I., Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 829–39.

Massot, Benjamin (2010). ‘Le patron diglossique de variation grammaticale en français’, in M. Barra Jover, (ed.): *Le(s) français : formaliser la variation*. *Langue Française* 168: 87-106.

Mattos e Silva, R. (2004). *‘O português são dois…’ Novas fronteiras, velhos problemas*. São Paulo: Parábola.

Narbona, A. (2009). *La identidad lingüística de Andalucía*. Seville: Centro de Estudios Andaluces.

Oesterreicher, W. (1994). ‘Verschriftung und Verschriftlichung im Kontext medialer und konzeptioneller Schriftlichkeit’, in U. Schaefer, (ed.): *Mündlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter*. Tübingen: Narr, 265–90.

Oesterreicher, W. (2002). ‘El español, lengua pluricéntrica: perspectivas y límites de una autoafirmación lingüística nacional en Hispanoamérica’, *Lexis* 26, 2: 275-304.

Osterhammel, J. (1995). *Kolonialismus. Geschichte, Formen, Folgen*. Munich: Beck.

Otheguy, R., and Zentella, A. C. (2012). *Spanish in New York*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pöll, B. (2011). *Francophonies périphériques: histoire, statut et profil des principales variétés du français hors de France*, Paris: L’Harmattan.

Pons Rodríguez, L. (2012). *El paisaje lingüístico de Sevilla. Lenguas y variedades en el escenario urbano hispalense*. Seville: Diputación de Sevilla.

Radatz, H.-I. (1997). ‘Französisch, Bretonisch und ... Gallo – Ist die Bretagne dreisprachig?’, in D. Kattenbusch, (ed.): *Kulturkontakt und Sprachkonflikt in der Romania*, Vienna: Braumüller, 163-189.

Rey, A., Duval, F., and Siouffi, G. (2007). *Mille Ans de langue française: histoire d’une passion*. Paris: Perrin.

Schlieben-Lange, B. (1996). *Idéologie, révolution et uniformité de la langue*. Sprimont: Mardaga.

Schon, D. (2013). *Eine soziohistorische Typologie von Sprachwandel und Sprachvariation in der außereuropäischen Romania*. PhD thesis, University of Tübingen.

Stehl, T. (2012). *Funktionale Variationslinguistik. Untersuchungen zur Dynamik von Sprachkontakten in der Galloromania und Italoromania*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Torres, L. (2011). ‘Spanish in the United States: Bilingual Discourse Markers’, in M. Díaz-Campos (2011), 493–502.

Zribi-Hertz, A. (2011). ‘Pour un modèle diglossique de description du français: quelques implications théoriques, didactiques et méthodologiques’, *Journal of French Language Studies*, 21, 02: 231–256.