

УДК 81'26: 811.134.2, 811.161.2

*Іванова О.Ю.
(Ivanova, O.Y.)
(Salamanca, Spain)*

**BILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE POLICY:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE LEVELLING IN UKRAINE
AND SPAIN**

Стаття присвячена порівняльному розгляду мовного розширення у двомовних суспільствах: українському та іспанському. Аналіз мовного функціонування проводиться з перспективи мовної політики та ставлень мовців до вживання мов у контакті в різних комунікативних ситуаціях.

Ключові слова: *соціальний білінгвізм, мовне розширення, мовна політика, мовні ставлення, комунікативна ситуація, Україна, Іспанія.*

Статья посвящена сравнительному рассмотрению языкового расслоения в двуязычных обществах: украинском и испанском. Оценка языкового функционирования проводится ввиду языковой политики и отношений носителей к употреблению языков в различных коммуникативных ситуациях.

Ключевые слова: *социальный билингвизм, языковое расслоение, языковая политика, языковые отношения, коммуникативная ситуация, Украина, Испания.*

The article deals with a comparative overview of language levelling in two bilingual societies: Ukrainian and Spanish ones. The analysis of language functionality is carried out from the perspective of language policy and speakers' attitudes to language practices in different communicative situations.

Key words: *social bilingualism, language levelling, language policy, attitudes to language, communicative situation, Ukraine, Spain.*

Theoretical approach to societal bilingualism

As a widespread influential phenomenon, bilingualism has recently aroused a singular interest in sociolinguistic studies all over the World. Being considered, from the scientific point of view, as a double-nature phenomenon that involves not only personally psychological but also societal modality of language coexistence, bilingualism has become one of the central targets of linguistic studies in the modern World so complex. Language contacts from the rigorously linguistic outlook, opposed to *trivial language contacts* that do not imply interactional links among coexisting languages [1], connote social meaning [2], which determines a socially dependent evolving of language phenomena. Commonly, such social dependency will deter-

mine a diglossic nature of bilingualism viewed as a most recurrent macro-effect of language coexistence [3; 4], or as a “paradigm sociolinguistic situation of language contact [...] where one of the languages involved is pragmatically dominant” [5: 100]. From there on, bilingualism would be considered throughout this paper as a contact language phenomenon derived from a direct sociocultural interaction of at least two language groups producing a single speech community.

Within linguistics, bilingualism has been treated in as many ways as many inner linguistic approaches have been applied to it [6: 207; 7: 8; 8: 1; 9: 116]. Most of them have differentiated between *individual* and *collective*, or societal, fractions of bilingualism, although as far as sociolinguistic studies may be concerned this differentiation resembles inaccurate. Sociolinguists [10: 11; 12] have repeatedly considered bilingualism as a double-nature occurrence, which should be treated in terms of both personal and societal components as interdependent and correlating constituent of the same phenomenon. Individual bilingualism is viewed, in this way, as a consequence of a social language contact, while societal bilingualism is considered to be a direct result of individual language behaviour. Following this trend, Hamers and Blanc define bilingualism as “a global phenomenon, which involves simultaneously a psychological state of the individual and a situation of languages in contact at the interpersonal and the collective level” [13: 49]. Bilingual speakers, hence, are to be estimated as referential units within a bilingual community, in the sense that their individual language behaviour reflects socially induced attitudes to languages, which represent identity symbols within one and the same social space [10: 24; 14: 146-147]. Therefore, from a sociolinguistic point of view, bilingualism implies a continuous and usually stratified employment of the languages in contact inside a linguistic community where a bilingual individual as a component of the sociocultural group domain settles his language practices according to the personal, though socially motivated, attitudes to the language space.

Such theoretical approach to bilingualism has been regularly an object of *macrosociolinguistic level of analysis*, frequently equated with the general field of the sociology of language [3; 15; 16; 17]. Unlike microsociolinguistic studies, focused on concrete language phenomena within a definite context, macrosociolinguistic studies are attentive to global phenomena related to the social structure, such as multilingualism, standardization, language policy and planning, diglossia or attitudes to language. Macrosociolinguistics frequently operates with some of the mentioned phenomena at the same time with the aim to obtain a general multilateral perspective on the correlation of language/s and social parameters. In bilingualism studies, a polyvalent macrosociolinguistic approach has proved to be one of the most comprehensive ways of analysis of language levelling in a speech community, since contrastive perspectives trace both external and internal factors, participant of the sociolinguistic reality examined. On account of this, we will follow such a polyvalent macrosociolinguistic approach in our comparative analysis of language levelling in two bilingual countries, Ukraine and Spain. Our contrastive overview of language functionality in both states will be carried out from a correlative estimation of the principles of the language policies applied, as well as from the point of view of the speakers' attitudes to multicontextual language practices.

Bilingualisms in Ukraine and Spain: an overview of language policy

Though in terms of geopolitics and intralinguistic organization bilingualisms in Ukraine and Spain do not coincide, they do share several historical, social and sociolinguistic attributes

that allow a scientific comparison of linguistic elements from Ukrainian and Spanish language contexts.

As far as differences between bilingualisms in Ukraine and Spain are concerned, they refer to a complex intralinguistic and geographical ordering of both.

In case of Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism, two major fellow Slavic languages have been coexisting on a large geographic territory since modern Slavic language divergence. Their coexistence has participated in the formation of a triple-identified Ukrainian society, where monolingual speakers, in either Ukrainian or Russian, and bilingual speakers constitute one and the same linguistic, though not speech, community. Multinational essence of Russian language and its pluricentricity in formation [18] contribute to a continuous maintenance of Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism, which correlates notably with diatopic axe as well as with such social variables as sex, age group and education level [9; 19].

Language situation in Spain is outlined by the concurrence of three bilingualisms: Spanish-Catalan, Spanish-Galician and Spanish-Basque. Unlike in Ukraine, these bilingualisms hold regional distributions and constitute, together with a considerable Spanish monolingual sub-community, to a complex sociolinguistic reality, in which Spanish as multinational and pluricentric language [20: 2-3] establishes tangential relations with the *own* regional languages. Historically, Catalan, Galician and Basque have achieved different prestige grades relative to Spanish from inside bilingual communities, what currently determines diversified language attitudes and identities in each of the regions of Spain [21: 290-291].

Despite distributional and aspectual differences, bilingualisms in Ukraine and Spain share certain features, like social historicity reflected in a complex evolution of identities and practices through diachronic regulation till the present day. In both cases, the widespread languages, Russian and Spanish correspondingly, turned to dominate during some centuries, and during the XXth century in particular, as the prestige and functionally prevailing codes in Ukraine and Spain under political systems of the Soviet Union and Franco's dictatorship. Since the second half of the XXth century, democratic processes in both countries have initiated new phases in their linguistic situations: new *Spanish Constitution* (1978) has set off the period of regional languages recognition and functional reconstruction [21: 290; 22: 235], while new *Ukrainian Constitution* (1996) has launched an influx for Ukrainian language ideological and functional recovery [19; 14].

Though in either national case the language policy applied has been focused on the *principle of claim* of the practical and doctrinal values of the historically subordinated languages, their practical approaches have varied notably from Spain to Ukraine. In Spain, the 3rd article of the *Constitution* (1978) has stated that the regional languages are, together with the Spanish language, official in their Autonomous Communities and are legally subordinated to the local policy and planning processes. Since then, each Community has been implementing its own language policy through specific legal documents aimed at an administrative regulation of the regional bilingualisms [23: 354]. All of them recognize their regional languages as the *own languages* of the Autonomies (Statutes from 1979 in Catalonia and Basque country, and from 1981 in Galicia), which obtain co-official or official status, function in all the communicative contexts and are object of autonomous promotion. Further regional laws, usually dealing with linguistic *normalization*, have focused on the protection, promotion and development of the regional languages inside and outside of the Autonomies. Regional languages have undergone

standardization processes and have been introduced into the most relevant public domains, like administration, education or mass media, under a continuous regarding for the own languages' practical and attitudinal improvement.

In Ukraine, since its independence in 1991, the language policy has been structured in two absolute intervals, different according to the intentions towards language regulation. Though Ukrainian language has been straightaway recognized as the only state and official language of the country, till later 2000-s the language policy has been fixed in terms of a mixed indirect approach to language regulation, which didn't specify clearly the rights of the non-official languages, Russian among them. Only since 2008 on, the Ukrainian language policy has introduced a sector regulation within the open promotion principles, or centrist perspective on the Ukrainian public monolingualism [14; 24]. From July 2012, the *Law on the guides for the state language policy* brings in new nuances in the theoretical definition of the Ukrainian language policy, which may be defined in its whole as a generally perceptive legal action towards the Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism. Though Russian is not considered as co-official language and is decidedly removed from the education and administrative sectors, it keeps on functioning as a highly distributed language in mass media, culture and everyday communication.

Although intensity degree has been different in the language policy of the bilingual Autonomous Communities of Spain and Ukraine, either of them has been lined up towards the *own language recovery*, opposite to the dominant contact Spanish and Russian. Spanish regional policies and Ukrainian policy have continuously stimulated the reinforcement of the positive attitudes towards the own languages, which during the last two decades have determined different perspectives on new language levelling in the communities in question.

Perspectives on bilingualism and language attitudes in Ukrainian and Spanish contexts

In spite of the similarity of the efforts of the language policy in Ukraine and Spain, practical results of language revival seem to be quite different from one community to another. Historical perspective on the sociolinguistic valorization of the languages in contact lets observe that value judgement systems of the speakers with unlike sociolinguistic portrait determine a direct correlation with the language levelling as a consequent phenomenon of the language policy. As data from Tables 1 and 2 illustrate [data sources: 9; 19; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30], three language levelling prototype groups may be singled out from the first language, family language and everyday use language comparison.

The *first prototype group* of language levelling is represented by bilingual regiones, both Spanish and Ukrainian, where the historically dominant language – Spanish and Russian, correspondingly, - keeps on being the assertive linguistic code through identity and spontaneous use practices. These are the cases of Basque country in Spain and of three of the six sociolinguistic zones of Ukraine, delimited by Ivanova [9], where Russian language has prevailed during centuries: capital city of Kyiv, Southern Ukraine and Eastern Ukraine. But for the language policy efforts, own languages use in these regiones defines a minority speech group. Through a contrastive analysis, a higher predisposition for bilingual practices is observed in Ukrainian regions, what might be explained by the close fellow relationship and mutual comprehension of Ukrainian and Russian languages, versus a non-fellow relationship of Romance Spanish and non-Indoeuropean Basque language.

The *second prototype group* unites Catalonia and Northern Ukraine, where the own languages practices are subordinate but percentually close to the dominant use of Spanish and Russian. In both cases, bilingual regiones with positive attitudes towards the own language are concerned, though higher rates of bilingual practices in Northern Ukraine might be interpreted as a consequence of a lower estimation of Ukrainian in this region in comparison with a higher estimation of Catalan in Catalonia.

Table 1.

Language practices in Spain

		Both l.	Own l.	Spanish
Basque c.	first l.	4,2%	19,3%	76,5%
	family l.	8,4%	13%	78,5%
	everyday l.	6,1%	12,5%	70,4%
Catalonia	first l.	3,8%	31,6%	55%
	family l.	4,3%	33,2%	48,5%
	everyday l.	11,9%	35,6%	45,9%
Galicia	first l.	16,5%	52,6%	30,8%
	family l.	21,9%	57,8%	20,2%
	everyday l.	49,3%	29,9%	20,1%

Table 2.

Language practices in Ukraine

		Both l.	Own l.	Russian
Western Ukr.	first l.	20,8%	70,7%	8,5%
	family l.	9,8%	76,8%	13,4%
	everyday l.	26,8%	68,3%	4,9%
Central Ukr.	first l.	25%	43,8%	31,2%
	family l.	28,1%	46,9%	25%
	everyday l.	50%	21,8%	28,2%
Northern Ukr.	first l.	20,9%	23,3%	55,8%
	family l.	34,9%	34,9%	30,2%
	everyday l.	31,8%	29,6%	38,6%
Kyiv	first l.	21,4%	7,1%	71,4%
	family l.	27,2%	5,7%	67,1%
	everyday l.	50%	6,9%	43,1%
Southern Ukr.	first l.	0%	6,7%	93,3%
	family l.	3,3%	0%	96,7%
	everyday l.	16,7%	3,3%	80%
Eastern Ukr.	first l.	11,2%	2,7%	86,1%
	family l.	25%	11,1%	63,9%
	everyday l.	22,2%	0%	77,8%

Finally, the *third prototype group* relates Spanish Galicia to the Western and Central Ukraine, where divergent language preferences are observed from the identity field to the external presentation of the speakers. In the three regions the own languages, Galician and Ukrainian, dominate as first and family languages, though external exposition of the speakers through their everyday language practices determines them to turn to the usage of the dominant Spanish and Russian through bilingual practices. On the western Spanish and Ukrainian territories historical development has determined specific attitudes, which superpose the dominant language status to that of the own one.

Conclusions

Although each of the social bilingualisms gets formed as a consequence of particular historic and socioeconomic conditions and is undergone a specific governmental regulation, practical consequences to the language contact phenomena may concur from one linguistic community to another. As it has been demonstrated on a contrastive analysis of language levelling in Spain and Ukraine, two bi/multilingual states with their own language policy focused on the own languages claims, language behaviour tends to correspond to a prototypical frame highly dependent on the attitudes and value judgement systems of the speakers involved. Language levelling in the new democratic stage corresponds in both bilingual Spanish Autonomies and in Ukrainian zones to forebear sociolinguistic conventions, which favor the own language recovery as well as the dominant language maintenance.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Thomason S.G. Language contact: an introduction / Sarah Grey Thomason. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001. – 310 p.
2. Trudgill, P. Diccionario de sociolingüística / Peter Trudgill, Juan Manuel Hernández Campoy. – Madrid: Gredos, 2007. – 383 p.
3. Romaine S. El lenguaje de la sociedad. Una introducción a la sociolingüística / Suzanne Romaine. – Barcelona: Ariel, 1996. – 271 p.
4. Calvet L.J. A (Socio)lingüística / Louis-Jean Calvet. – Santiago de Compostela: Edicions Laiovento, S.L., 1998. – 108 p.
5. Heine B. Contact grammaticalization // The handbook of language contact / Bernd Heine, Tania Kuteva. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2010. – P. 86-105.
6. Moreno Fernández F. Principios de sociolingüística y sociología del lenguaje / Francisco Moreno Fernández. – Ariel: Barcelona, 2009. – 272 p.
7. Edwards J. Foundations of bilingualism // The handbook of bilingualism / John Edwards. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. – P. 7-31.
8. Sia J. Are you bilingual? / Jennifer Sia, Jean-Marc Dewaele // BISAL. – 2006. – N°1. – P. 1-19.
9. Ivanova O. Aproximación sociolingüística a la realidad idiomática de la Ucrania bilingüe / Olga Ivanova. – Salamanca: Trabajo de Grado inédito. – 560 p.
10. Siguán M. Bilingüismo y lenguas en contacto / Miquel Siguán. – Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2001. – 368 p.
11. Braunmüller K. Aspects of multilingualism in European language history / Kurt Braunmüller, Gisella Ferraresi. – Hamburg: University of Hamburg, 2003. – 289 p.

12. Romaine S. The bilingual and multilingual community // *The handbook of bilingualism / Suzanne Romaine.* – Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. – P. 385-405.
13. Hamers J. Bilinguality and bilingualism / Josiane Hamers, Michel H.A. Blanc. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 468 p.
14. Ivanova O. Sociolingüística urbana: estudio de usos y actitudes lingüísticas en la ciudad de Kiev / Olga Ivanova. – Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2011. – 1144 p.
15. Mesthrie R. Clearing the ground: basic issues, concepts and approaches // *Introducing sociolinguistics / Rajend Mesthrie.* – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. – P. 1-43.
16. Spolsky B. Language policy. Key topics in sociolinguistics / Bernard Spolsky. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. – 250 p.
17. Wardhaugh R. An introduction to sociolinguistics / Ronald Wardhaugh. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. – 464 p.
18. Ivanova O. El bilingüismo post-soviético y el pluricentrismo del ruso // *II Conferencia internacional sobre variedades no dominantes de lenguas pluricéntricas / Olga Ivanova.* – Salamanca, 2012.
19. Bartol J.A. Sociolingüística de la Ucrania bilingüe: actual cambio en la valoración diglósica de las lenguas en contacto // *Actas del IX Congreso internacional de lingüística general / José Antonio Bartol, Olga Ivanova.* – Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2011. – P. 298-316.
20. Clyne M. Pluricentric languages. Differing norms in different nations / Michael Clyne. – The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992. – 481 p.
21. Іванова О. Поняття престижу як визначального фактору мовної градації в лінгвістичній реальності Іспанії // *Наукові записки / Ольга Іванова.* – Кіровоград: КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2008. – С. 287-291.
22. Moreno Fernández F. Historia social de las lenguas de España / Francisco Moreno Fernández. – Barcelona: Ariel, 2005. – 287 p.
23. Mariño Paz R. Historia da lingua galega / Ramón Mariño Paz. – Santiago de Compostela: Sotelo Blanco Edicións, 1998. – 582 p.
24. Ivanova O. Cambio social e identidad lingüística: un ejemplo del caso post-soviético // *Actas del XLI Simposio de la SEL / Olga Ivanova.* – Valencia: Universitat de València, 2012.
25. IV Mapa sociolingüístico 2006. – Vitoria-Gasteiz: Servicio Central de Publicaciones del Gobierno Vasco, 2009. – 87 p.
26. Enquesta d'usos lingüístics de la població 2008. – Barcelona: Secretaria de Política Lingüística, Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, 2009. – 285 p.
27. Estadística d'usos lingüístics a Catalunya 2003. – Barcelona: Secretaria de Política Lingüística, Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, 2004. – 97 p.
28. Mapa sociolingüístico de Galicia 2004. Lingua inicial e competencia lingüística en Galicia. – A Coruña: Real Academia Galega, 2004. – 310 p.
29. Enquisa de condicións de vida das familias. Coñecemento e uso do galego 2003. – Santiago de Compostela: Instituto Galego de Estatística, 2004. – CD-Rom.
30. IV Encuesta Sociolingüística 2006. - Vitoria-Gasteiz: Servicio Central de Publicaciones del Gobierno Vasco, 2008. – 232 p.