Multilingual practices from antiquity to the present day

April 29–30, 2019, MultiLing, University of Oslo

The purpose of the round-table is to bring together sociolinguists, classicists and historians who study multilingualism in antiquity and medieval times (Day 1) and in imperial, colonial and postcolonial times (Day 2) and to engage in a dialog about continuities and discontinuities in multilingual practices shaped by conquests, migrations and globalizations.

Multilingual practices from antiquity to the present day

Day 1 Multilingual practices in the ancient and medieval world

Rachel Mairs, University of Reading, UK
>*Multilingual administrations in the Hellenistic world*

Anastasia Maravela, University of Oslo, Norway
>*Contexts of multilingualism in Egypt from the Hellenistic to the early Arabic period*

Alex Mullen, University of Nottingham, UK
>*Language shift in the multilingual Roman west*

Yasmine Beale-Rivaya, Texas State University, USA
>*Shuffling between languages in medieval Iberia: The Mozarabs as an exemplary case study*

Jonathan Rubin, Bar-Ilan University, Israel
>*Contact between languages in the Kingdom of Jerusalem*

Laura Wright, University of Cambridge, UK
>*On medieval mixed-language business writing in Britain: Evidence from the archive of London Bridge*

Elise Kleivane, University of Oslo, Norway
>*Multilingualism in medieval Scandinavia*

Discussant: Alastair Pennycook, MultiLing/University of Oslo, Norway

Day 2 Multilingual empires, colonies and nation-states

Aneta Pavlenko, MultiLing/University of Oslo, Norway
The hosts who learned immigrants' tongues: Multilingualism in tsarist and imperial Russia

Roland Willemyns, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
Why colonial Dutch failed to become a global lingua franca

Pieter Judson, European University Institute, Florence, Italy
The Habsburg Monarchy Legal, Administrative, and Practical Management of Multilingualism

Jan Fellerer, University of Oxford, UK
Language policies and practices in the Habsburg Empire

Benjamin Fortna, University of Arizona, USA
Multilingualism in the Ottoman Empire

Li Wei, University College London, UK
Han-Manchu Language Contact and Shift during the Qing Dynasty (1636-1912) China and beyond

Pia Lane, MultiLing/University of Oslo, Norway
Paradoxes of language revitalisation

Alexandre Duchene, University of Fribourg, Switzerland
Late capitalist multilingualism

Discussant: Susan Gal, University of Chicago, USA

Abstracts and bios

Day 1 Multilingual practices in the ancient and medieval world

Multilingual administrations in the Hellenistic world

Rachel Mairs, University of Reading

How were multilingual empires administered in the ancient world? How did conquerors such as Alexander the Great deal with the linguistic challenges of administering conquered territories? This paper presents two case studies - Hellenistic (c. 323-30BC) Egypt and Bactria - to show how complex bureaucracies functioned using multiple languages, to manage populations who spoke an even wider range of languages. The papyrological record from Egypt allows us to explore how both Demotic Egyptian and Greek were used on a local and national level to conduct complex projects such as the census. While Bactria lacks the rich documentary record of Egypt, recent discoveries of documents in Aramaic and Greek provide evidence of how an existing Achaemenid Persian bureaucracy in Aramaic was taken over after the conquest of Alexander. For both Egypt and Bactria, I also explore how language shift occurred within the administration, and how this related to processes of language change and shift in the population as a whole.

Bio
Rachel Mairs is Associate Professor of Classical and Near Eastern Studies at the University of Reading. She got her PhD from the University of Cambridge, and has previously held positions at New York University, the University of Oxford and Brown University. Her publications include *The Hellenistic Far East: Archaeology, Language and Identity in Greek Central Asia* (2014), *Archaeologists, Tourists, Interpreters* (with Maya Muratov, 2015) and *From Khartoum to Jerusalem: The Dragoman Solomon Negima and his Clients* (2016). She works on multilingualism and ethnicity in the Hellenistic world (primarily Egypt and Central Asia) and currently has a British Academy-funded project on foreigners learning Arabic c. 1850-1945.

Contexts of multilingualism in Egypt from the Hellenistic to the early Arabic period

Anastasia Maravela, University of Oslo

From the introduction of Greek with the Macedonian conquest in the last quarter of the 4th century BCE until well into the Arabic period (10th-12th century CE), multilingualism was a

prevalent feature of Egyptian life and society. Helpfully, Egyptian society during this extensive period is amply documented by the heaps of papyri preserved in the country's dry soil. They give insight into the diverse contexts in which the native language co-existed first with Greek – the language of the administration, the cultural elite and a portion of the population – and later with Arabic. The same sources shed light on the areas in which during the first six-seven centuries CE the language of Egypt's new conquerors, Latin, negotiated its position with the established language of power, Greek. This paper will survey some representative contexts of multilingualism in Egypt from the Hellenistic to the early Arab period. Particular attention will be paid to linguistic interactions in religious and related frames, from the courts of the Hellenistic temples to monastic enclosures through linguistic interactions gleaned from the magical papyri.

Bio
Anastasia Maravela (PhD University of Oslo, 2006) is Professor of Ancient Greek at the Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas, University of Oslo. Her research output consists in editions of unpublished papyri from Egypt (in Greek, Latin and Coptic) and studies on the contribution of the papyri to Greek linguistics and the social context of papyrus texts, see https://www.hf.uio.no/ifikk/english/people/aca/classics/tenured/anastasm/

Language shift in the multilingual Roman west

Alex Mullen, University of Nottingham

Dramatic changes occurred linguistically in the western Roman world: a patchwork of local languages which existed in the Iron Age came under increasing pressure from Latin and by the end of the imperial period the linguistic landscape had been radically reconfigured. Despite a significant linguistic shift under a government with the capacity for interference, most commentators agree that there was no official Roman linguistic policy. In this talk we attempt to reconstruct aspects of multilingual practices and Latinization in the Roman West 'on the ground' using a range of patchy and problematic evidence from multiple sources. Through these we consider the social factors which encouraged, or not, the uptake of Latin and the nature of, and reasons for, 'differential Latinization'. In turn this may tell us about the relationships between ancient languages, identities and cultures, and why even the concept of 'linguistic policy' itself may not be appropriate for the Roman west.

Bio
Alex Mullen is Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Nottingham and a Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. She is co-editor (with Patrick James) of Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds (Cambridge, 2012) and author of Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean (Cambridge, 2013), which won the American Historical Association's James Henry Breasted Prize. She is Principal Investigator of the ERC project LatinNow (The Latinization of the North-western Roman Provinces: sociolinguistics, epigraphy and archaeology) and a Philip Leverhulme Prize recipient. Dr. Mullen's research interests lie in the application of contemporary sociolinguistics to the ancient world and the integration of sociolinguistics, epigraphy and

archaeology to write socio-cultural history. Her primary area of expertise is the cultural and linguistic histories of Iron Age and Roman Britain and Gaul.

Shuffling between languages in medieval Iberia:
The Mozarabs as an exemplary case study

Yasmine Beale-Rivaya, Texas State University

From Américo Castro and María Rosa Menocal to Brian Catlos and García Sanjuán, scholars have endlessly debated the idea of medieval Iberia as a sort of utopic land where people of multiple faiths and backgrounds seamlessly interacted using a handful of different languages. Among the key preoccupations of this scholarly debate are Arabic influences and categorization of the lasting remnants of the Arabic language in Castilian-Spanish today. To this end, the Mozarabs (Arabized-Christians residing in Spain and Portugal) are often credited with incorporating words of Arabic origin into the Spanish language. The approach that associates language borrowing with the Mozarabs (1) perpetuates the idea of Arabic *influence* rather than an Andalusí culture born from the symbioses of the different communities; and 2) suggests that as communities changed political hands, their language shifted from Andalusí-Arabic to Romance or different Romances, to reflect the language of the dominant power and that the only community that retained multilingual abilities were the Mozarabs. Through examples of inter-textuality, I tease out some of the main issues related to the writing of the Mozarabs and writing about the Mozarabs and show how the Mozarabs and other liminal communities used languages for specific purposes, including to protect their communities from ever-changing political shifts.

References
Castro, A. (1948) *España En Su Historia: Cristianos, moros y judíos*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada.
Castro, A. (1965) *Los españoles: Cómo llegaron a serlo*. Madrid: Taurus/
Catlos, B. (2004) *The Victors and the Vanquished: Christians and Muslims of Catalonia and Aragon, 1050-1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Menocal, M. (2002) *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain*. Boston: Little Brown.
Soifer, M. (2009) Beyond Convivencia: Critical Reflections on the Historiography of Interfaith Relations in Christian Spain. *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies,* 1, 1, 19–35.

Bio
Yasmine Beale-Rivaya received her PhD in Hispanic Linguistics from the University of California Los Angeles in 2006 and holds the rank of Associate professor at Texas State. Her research centers on language contact, change, and borrowing in borderland communities in Medieval Iberia. She examines contact between Romance and Semitic languages among Mozarabic (Arabized-Christians) and Mudéjar (Muslims living in Christian lands) communities, living between the Andalusí and Christian frontier from the ninth to the early fourteenth century. Her work appeared in a variety of journals, including *e-humanista*, *La Corónica* y *American Speech*.

In 2012, she received the John K. Walsh award for "Best Article of the Year" for her article in La Corónica. She has also published an edited book co-authored with Dr. Jason Busic *Compendium to Medieval Toledo: Reconsidering the Canons* (Brill, 2018). At present, she is working on a special issue for e-humanista on *Places of Encounter: Language Culture and Religious Identity in Medieval Iberia* and on another edited book with Dr. Ainoa Castro, titled *From Visigothic to Caroline to Gothic: Studies in the Cultural History of Iberian Scripts*. Dr. Beale-Rivaya is also part of the team of researchers working on a Digital Humanities project on the General Estoria. In June 2019, Dr. Beale-Rivaya is hosting a conference on Medieval Toledo as a 'borderland' at the University of Castilla La Mancha, in Toledo.

Contact between languages in the Kingdom of Jerusalem: Background, source material and preliminary conclusions

Jonathan Rubin, Bar-Ilan University

On 15 July 1099 the armies of the first crusade, which left the Latin West about three years earlier, broke into Jerusalem. The bloody conquest of the city marked the establishment of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, a political entity dominated by a Catholic population, which survived, in changing borders, for almost two hundred years until the fall of the city of Acre to the Mamluks in May 1291. During this period, the Holy Land was home to a variety of cultural groups. The Latin element was composed of people originating in a wide variety of regions in Western and Central Europe, and included both Crusaders and settlers who immigrated to the Levant for a range of material considerations (e.g. farmers trying to improve their social status, or merchants seeking to benefit from the potential of ports such as those of Acre and Tyre), and often founded families which would continue to reside there for several generations. But the Latin component never made the majority of people residing in the kingdom. Large Muslim and Eastern Christian communities continued to live in the Holy Land under Latin rule. Consequently, there developed in the Kingdom of Jerusalem a complex web of intercultural relations which included, on the one hand, hostility and at times even violence, but, on the other, a considerable degree of exchange and even cooperation. In my paper I will explore some consequences which this state of affairs had in the field of language. Among the phenomena discussed will be the use of words from one language by the speakers of another; translations; the production of glossaries; curiosity toward other languages; and, finally, the impact of the western meeting with eastern linguistic systems on the Latins' self-perception of their own system.

Bio
Jonathan Rubin teaches in the Department of Land of Israel Studies and Archaeology at the Bar Ilan University, Israel. His research focuses on the cultural history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and he recently published a book titled *Learning in a Crusader City: Intellectual Activity and Intercultural Exchanges in Acre, 1191-1291* (Cambridge University Press, 2018). He is also working on medieval geographical descriptions of the Holy Land and the Eastern Mediterranean, and is currently running a project focusing on the manuscript tradition and

reception of Burchard of Mount Sion's *Descriptio Terre Sancte*. The most recent result of this project is a paper titled "A Missing Link in European Travel Literature: Burchard of Mount Sion's Description of Egypt," published in *Mediterranea: International Journal on the Transfer of Knowledge*.

On medieval mixed-language business writing in Britain:
Evidence from the archive of London Bridge

Laura Wright, University of Cambridge

When English began to standardise in the late fifteenth-century, it was against a multilingual background. Late fourteenth and earlier fifteenth-century British administrative/business scribes switched back and forth between Anglo-Norman French, Medieval Latin and Middle English, so a run of English entries in an archive for several years might then be followed by further decades of Anglo-Norman and Medieval Latin, and oaths and ordinances, for example, would be translated in all three languages. The timespan between first use of English and the switch to sustained monolingual English in a given archive could be more than a hundred years, but in reporting written English, historians and historical linguists have rarely taken systematic notice of surrounding proportions of Medieval Latin and Anglo-Norman. As a rough rule of thumb, from the thirteenth century to the last quarter of the fourteenth, most writing in Britain was in Medieval Latin, Anglo-Norman French and mixed-language (by which I mean a system of codeswitched Medieval Latin/Anglo-Norman/Middle English as evolved for use in accounts, inventories, wills and deeds). From 1375 to 1440 most writing switched between Medieval Latin, Anglo-Norman, Middle English, and mixed-language. From 1440 to 1500 most writing switched between Medieval Latin, Middle English and mixed-language (that is, Anglo-Norman was used less); and from 1500 onwards most writing was in Neo-Latin and Early Modern English (with a shift away from both the mixed-language system and Medieval Latin and towards monolingualism). From the late fourteenth century to the late fifteenth century, London archives show that use of all four systems (Medieval Latin, Anglo-Norman, Middle English, and mixed-language) was the norm. Monolingual writing was the exception during this century, with switching occurring within the word, the phrase, the clause, the paragraph; from paragraph to paragraph; from text to text; between text-body, margin, heading, gloss and annotation; and with different text-types following different conventions. The switchover can be characterised as a movement from Medieval Latin, Anglo-Norman and mixed-language, to a transition period of intense switching back and forth (roughly 1380-1480), to an eventual outcome of monolingual English and monolingual Neo-Latin. It is not until the eighteenth century that monolingual English settled down as a written norm for numerous purposes, and even then, Neo-Latin remained the language of scholarship. In this presentation I shall focus on the mixed-language system and show some grammatical developments over time within it.

Bio
Laura Wright has worked on medieval mixed-language business writing for three decades. In 2011 she and co-editor Herbert Schendl published *Code-switching in Early English* (Berlin:

Mouton de Gruyter). From 2012-2016 she was part of an Academy of Finland funded project 'Multilingual Practices in the History of Written English', resulting in Päivi Pahta, Janne Skaffari, Laura Wright (eds) *Multilingual Practices in Language History: English and Beyond* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2017). She is currently editing *The Multilingual Origins of Standard English* with 24 contributors, which is due at the end of 2019 or early 2020. Her monograph *Sunnyside: A Sociolinguistic History of British House Names* (British Academy/OUP) is in press. The historical languages involved are Middle English, Medieval Latin, Anglo-Norman French and Scottish Gaelic, with an underlying Old Norse syntactic stratum in historic Scottish house names of the 'Sunnyside of Auchenmade', 'Sunnyside Of Auchmunziel', 'Sunnyside of Tillyreach' type.

Multilingualism in medieval Scandinavia

Elise Kleivane, University of Oslo

The Vikings brought home treasure, foreigners, new ideologies, and paved the way for Christianization. As a result medieval Scandinavia became a multilingual society. In the High and Late Middle Ages (c. 1250 onwards) there were three languages in use: The vernaculars (Old Norse, Old Swedish and Old Danish), Latin and Middle Low German. The Saami languages are not considered here, but they too were vernaculars used within what is now the Scandinavian mainland. The three languages I will discuss are the ones that made any structural impact on the Scandinavian society: The vernaculars being the mother tongue of the majority of the population, Latin as the language of religion, book learning, and foreign affairs, and Middle Low German as language of the Hanse trade and with a noticeable linguistic impact on the Scandinavian vernaculars. In addition to this linguistic diversity, two written modes were in use: manuscript writing and epigraphy. Two script systems – runes and Roman script – were in use in epigraphy, and here we have access to valuable information balancing the manuscript sources.

In this presentation I will focus on Latin in relation to the vernacular(s), with an emphasis on the situation in medieval Norway. I will however have a side glance to Sweden and Denmark for comparison of the respective status and functions Latin and the vernaculars had. Medieval strategies for Bible translations will serve as the point of departure for an overview of what the preserved material can reveal about language use in this multilinguistic culture. An important question to be addressed is to what extent we can talk about multilingual individuals in this multilingual culture.

Bio
Elise Kleivane has a doctoral degree in Old Norse philology and is currently employed as a researcher at the Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo. She leads a research project funded by the Norwegian Research Council about epigraphy in medieval Norway. The project is the first in Norway to document Roman-alphabet inscriptions and analyse their impact on medieval literacy and script culture in relation to runic inscriptions and manuscript culture.

Day 1 Discussant

Alastair Pennycook, MultiLing, University of Oslo and University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Bio
Alastair Pennycook is Professor of Language Studies at UTS and Professor II at MultiLing. He has been involved in language education for over 30 years in France, Germany, Japan, China, Canada, Hong Kong and Australia. He is well known for his work on the global spread of English, particularly in his classic text *The cultural politics of English as an international language* (Longman, 1994). Also well known his is work on critical approaches to language education and applied linguistics, outlined in *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction* (Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001).

Day 2 Multilingual empires, colonies and nation-states

The hosts who learned immigrants' tongues:
Multilingualism in tsarist and imperial Russia

Aneta Pavlenko, Center for Multilingualism/University of Oslo

Even those who had never finished, or even started, *War and Peace*, know that the *beau monde* of Russia conversed in French, so what else is there to say? The first hint that there is more to the story is the name of the empire's capital – it is Sankt-Peter-burg, after all, not la Ville-de-St. Pierre. The map of the city and its environs sports more German-sounding names – Kronstadt, Oranienbaum, Schlisselburg, Peterhof. The irrefutable German of 18th and 19th century signs preserved *in situ* on St Petersburg's streets boosts misgivings about the city's second language: was it really French or have we been misled by Tolstoy? Yet identifying the languages of Russian capital and elite is only our first step. Lurking below the surface are more intriguing questions: Why did Russians give their capital a foreign name? What compelled them to learn the languages of their immigrants and prisoners of war? Is it true that the Russian elite spoke French as its mother tongue? What were the consequences of such upbringing for Russian? And how did people enamored of French (or was it German?) manage to russify everyone else in their vast empire? Did they, in fact, russify everyone? The answers to these questions are all the more important because linguistic consequences of imperial conquests reverberate in today's politics, be it in Latvia and Estonia, first annexed by Peter the Great, or in Ukraine, where modern-day linguistic divides are still blamed on Catherine the Great.

Bio
Dr. Aneta Pavlenko received her Ph.D. in General Linguistics from Cornell University. Currently, she is Research Professor of Applied Linguistics at the Center for Multilingualism in Society

across the Lifespan at the University of Oslo, Norway. Her research examines the relationship between multilingualism, cognition, and emotions, including in forensic settings. She has also published studies of immigrant autobiographies and multilingualism in historic contexts in Russia and the USA. Dr. Pavlenko has lectured widely in North America, Europe and Asia and has authored more than a hundred articles and ten books, the most recent of which is *The bilingual mind and what it tells us about language and thought* (Cambridge University Press, 2014). She is Past President of the American Association for Applied Linguistics and winner of the 2006 BAAL Book of the Year award and the 2009 TESOL Award for Distinguished Research. At present, her time is divided between a book on the history of multilingual societies and an empirical project at Multiling that examines communication of rights to native and non-native speakers in police investigative interviews in the USA and Norway (https://www.hf.uio.no/multiling/english/projects/flagship-projects/forensic/index.html).

Why colonial Dutch failed to become a global lingua franca

Roland Willemyns, Vrije Universiteit Brussel

The Low Countries have a tradition of language contact and conflict and after a short overview of that situation the main focus of my presentation will be on Colonial Dutch, i.e. language planning and practice in some of the former colonies of The Netherlands. Concentrating on Indonesia, Suriname and the Caribbean islands, I will try to provide answers to the fascinating question why colonial Dutch failed to become a global lingua franca, as opposed to English, French, Spanish and Portuguese that did (partially) succeed in doing so. I will also try to find out in how far this is influenced by the past and present multilingual practices of the Low Countries.

Bio
Roland Willemyns is Emeritus Professor of Dutch Linguistics at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel. His research focuses on language contact and language variation in historical linguistics as well as dialectology and sociolinguistics, and he contributed to the study of the social stratification of dialect and standard in Flanders and the Netherlands, including work on dialect loss and changing attitudes to the standard and its norms. He is one of the pioneers of historical sociolinguistics in the Dutch language area, breaking away from traditional language historiography in favor of corpus-based historical sociolinguistics involving original documents from all layers of society. This is what characterizes his recent work on the historical sociolinguistics of 19th century Dutch. During the past decades he published several books on the history of the Dutch language, the most recent being *Dutch. Biography of a Language* (Oxford University Press, 2013). A special double issue of *Multilingua* ('*Changing standards in sociolinguistic research*' volume 29, 3-4) was published on the occasion of his 65th birthday.

The Habsburg Monarchy Legal, Administrative, and Practical Management of Multilingualism

Pieter Judson, European University Institute, Florence

In this presentation I analyze the distinctive ways in which the Habsburg Monarchy—later Austria-Hungary—approached the management its citizenry's multilingualism. I argue that the multilingual composition of the Habsburg Monarchy's population was not exceptional by European standards. Rather, the strategies developed over centuries for managing this phenomenon were indeed distinctive. The changing Habsburg approach to language use in public and official life transformed from a pragmatic and early-modern collection of regional policies into the assertion by 1848 of an individual's and group's constitutional right—or human right—to use its language in public life. This approach, I argue, differed substantially from the post- Versailles policies that granted particular rights to distinct linguistic minorities in self-styled nation states. At the same time, after 1867 the independent Hungarian and Austrian states diverged radically on this issue both in constitutional and political terms. Finally, I will discuss the ways in which local practice both followed and—especially in post-1867 Hungary—often diverged from the stated goals of state policy.

Bio
Since 2014 Pieter M. Judson holds a chair in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century History at the European University Institute in Florence. Before that he was Isaac H. Clothier Professor of History and International Relations at Swarthmore College. Most recently he authored The Habsburg Empire: A New History (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016), which is currently being translated into ten European and Asian languages. He is also the author of the prize-winning monographs Guardians of the Nation. Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria (2006) and Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848-1914 (1996), as well as of Wien brennt! Die Revolution von 1848 und ihr liberales Erbe (1998) and coeditor with Marsha Rozenblit of Constructing Nationalities in East Central Europe. Currently he is coediting the Cambridge History of the Habsburg Monarchy Vol. II, 1795-1918.

Language policies and practices in the Habsburg Empire

Jan Fellerer, University of Oxford

The focus of the talk will be on the late Habsburg Empire of the second half of the 19th century to WWI. In that period, the question of different language groups living side by side came to the forefront of the political and social life in Austria-Hungary. It has long attracted the attention of historians studying the growing antagonism between the Empire's ethno-linguistic groups during the rise of 19th-century nationalism. The imperial government and the provincial legislatures resorted to a growing number of language laws to manage the tensions, and to direct them for their own political purposes. These language policies increasingly gave priority to linguistic separation, rather than to multilingualism, as I shall argue in the first part of the talk.

Yet, multilingualism remained the reality on the ground in the many regions, towns and cities of the Empire where traditionally more than one language was in use. These multilingual practices have attracted much less scholarly attention. I shall argue that they took a variety of forms, depending on social factors, and on the prestige of the languages involved. Educated members of the middle class were often literate in more than one language and switched between, say, Hungarian, German and Slovak for professional purposes, and as a sign of social prestige. Those in society who had less ability or need to read and write were more prone to mixing dialects. Code switching and mixing are well-known linguistic patterns as such. However, we will see how widespread they remained, and how charged with extra-linguistic meaning they had become, in the late Habsburg Empire.

Bio
Jan Fellerer graduated from the University of Vienna. After a few years at the Department of Slavonic Philology at the University of Basel, he took up the post of University Lecturer in non-Russian Slavonic Languages at the University of Oxford, Wolfson College. His main research interests lie in the fields of Polish, Czech and Ukrainian linguistics and philology with special reference to the modern period from the 18th century to the present day. He has published on Slavonic syntax, aspects of the history of Polish, Czech and Ukrainian, language contact and historical sociolinguistics, including a book on multilingualism in 19th-century Galicia (2005), and an edited volume on discourses of resistance in the late Habsburg Monarchy (2003). He is currently preparing a monograph on the linguistic situation in late-19th and early 20th-cc. Lviv, with special reference to the city's historical Polish dialect. He is also co-editing the volume on the Slavonic languages in the series 'Oxford Guides to the World's Languages'.

Multilingualism in the Ottoman Empire

Benjamin Fortna, University of Arizona

This presentation begins with a general overview of the linguistic conditions in the Ottoman Empire. After briefly surveying the historical dimensions of linguistic interaction reflecting the ebb and flow of Ottoman expansion and contraction (including the Westward movement of Turkic speakers into the central Islamicate lands and Anatolia from the 11th century CE, the expansion of recently consolidated Ottoman rule into the Balkans from the 14th century, and the influx of Muslim refugees into the shrinking borders of the empire as a result of military defeats and ethnic cleansing in the 19th and early 20th centuries), the paper focuses on three main factors affecting the linguistic dispensation in the Ottoman lands: 1) the inherently multilingual nature of Ottoman Turkish as an amalgam of three languages, namely, Turkish, Arabic, and Persian, and its broader socio-cultural implications; 2) the variety of the linguistic experience in the empire, including the fact that there was often no clear correlation between ethnicity,

religion, and mother tongue, e.g., large numbers of Armenians, Turks, and Greeks, whose first language was not Armenian, Turkish, or Greek, respectively, and; 3) the ways in which the advent of nationalism and Western influence affected the linguistic scene in such a diverse and demographically mixed empire. The presentation ends by considering the implications of post-Ottoman linguistic policies, especially the nation-state's monolingual focus, for the study of Ottoman historical linguistics.

Bio
Benjamin C. Fortna is Professor and Director of the School of Middle Eastern and North African Studies at the University of Arizona and formerly Professor of the History of the Middle East, SOAS, University of London. His research focuses on the late Ottoman Empire and the early Turkish Republic. He received his degrees from Yale, Columbia and the University of Chicago; his publications include *The Circassian: A Life of Eşref Bey, Late Ottoman Insurgent and Special Agent* (Hurst and Oxford University Press, 2016), *Childhood in the Late Ottoman Empire and After*, ed. (Brill, 2016), *Learning to Read in the Late Ottoman Empire and the Early Turkish Republic* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), and *Imperial Classroom: Islam, Education and the State in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Oxford University Press, 2002).

Han-Manchu Language Contact and Shift during the Qing Dynasty (1636-1912) China and beyond
Li Wei (University College London), Wang Difei (Heilongjiang University), and
Zhu Hua (Birkbeck College)

The American Historical Association (AHA) on its website states the following under 'The Oldest Living Civilization':

> "An old missionary student of China once remarked that Chinese history is "remote, monotonous, obscure, and-worst of all-there is too much of it." China has the longest continuous history of any country in the world—3,500 years of written history. And even 3,500 years ago China's civilization was old!"

Similar claims are even more often made by the Chinese themselves, giving the impression that their nation has been strong and unified before and over the millennia. The fact is though that until the twentieth century, China has been ruled by ethnic minority groups, whose languages and cultures have had a fundamental impact on what is widely understood as Chinese today. The last ethnic minority ruled dynasty was the Qing Dynasty (1636-1912), one of the longest lasting imperial dynasties of China that consolidated the territorial base of modern China, and indeed one that had arguably more contacts with non-Chinese peoples and cultures than any other dynasties in Chinese history, though not all the contacts benefited China's national interests (e.g. the Opium Wars and the secession of Hong Kong). The ethnic group in question is Manchu, whereas the majority of the Chinese people are of Han ethnicity.

The Manchus are the largest branch of the Tungusic people, who are spread out in Eastern Siberia and Northeast Asia. The Manchus have their own distinctive language, known also as Manchu. It is typologically very different from Chinese. The two languages, like the two ethnicities, have had extensive contact with each other over history. Manchu's influence on the northern varieties of Chinese, i.e. Mandarin (reputedly a transliteration of the term Man Da Ren, or Manchu gentleman) is particularly well documented. In present-day China, Manchu is regarded as an endangered language, and there are many different revitalization initiatives. Manchu is officially regarded as an ethnic minority in China.

Despite the popularity of major tourist attractions such as the Forbidden City in Beijing, the former Manchu Emperors' residence, and Bertolucci's film The Last Emperor, knowledge of the Manchus outside China is very limited. In this presentation, we trace the origins and paths of Manchu-Han Chinese contact and the shift from Chinese learning Manchu to Manchu learning Chinese. We discuss historical documents that give indications of what happened in the Qing imperial court and the extent of bilingualism amongst the ruling Manchu elite and the ordinary people. We also look at the socio-cultural interactions and mutual influences between the Manchu and the Han peoples. Finally, we explore the role of the Manchu language and culture in the contemporary society of China and how it is being used by the current authorities for various political gains.

Bio
Li Wei is Chair of Applied Linguistics and Director of the UCL Centre for Applied Linguistics, at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London (UCL), UK. He is also Director of the ESRC UBEL (UCL, Bloomsbury, East London) Doctoral Training Partnership (DTP). His research interests are in the broad areas of bilingualism and multilingualism, including language development and disorder of bilingual and multilingual children, social and cognitive processes of bilingual and multilingual practices, and bilingual education. His recent publications include Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education (with Ofelia Garcia, 2014) which won the 2015 British Association of Applied Linguistics (BAAL) Book Prize, The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Multi-Competence (with Vivian Cook, 2016), shorted for the 2017 BAAL Book Prize. He is Principal Editor of the International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism and Applied Linguistics Review, and book series editor for Wiley-Blackwell's Research Methods in Language and Linguistics. He was Chair of the University Council of General and Applied Linguistics, UK between 2002 and 2005. He is Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences, and Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, UK. Of particular relevance to this paper, he is Manchu-Chinese from Beijing.

Wang Difei is a Post-Doctoral Research Fellow in the Research Centre for Manchu Language and Culture at Heilongjiang University, Harbin, China.

Zhu Hua is also Manchu-Chinese. She is Professor of Applied Linguistics and Communication at Birkbeck College, University of London, where she is also Assistant Dean of for Postgraduate Studies in the School of Social Sciences, History and Philosophy.

Paradoxes of language revitalisation

Pia Lane, University of Oslo

Linguists' concern with language revitalisation may be traced back to efforts to document and 'save' Native American languages around the turn of the twentieth century (Costa 2016). The term revitalisation presupposes that something is in danger or threatened – hence, revitalisation often is seen as a response to language endangerment. The loss of minority languages has been investigated in various settings, such as Norwegian in the US (Haugen 1953) and Gaelic in Scotland (Dorian 1981), but Fishman's (1991) work on reversing language shift laid the ground for an engagement with language shift and revitalisation amongst sociolinguists.

Language revitalisation is often portrayed as positive and emancipatory, but this process can also be a difficult process for the individual. The history of indigenous minority languages are associated not only with positive belonging to place and family, but also alienation and shame, described by King and Hermes (2014) as 'the scars of colonization'. Indigenous languages are often perceived as belonging to a specific group of people and rooted in a cultural context, and their speakers may be portrayed as embodying this rootedness. Such new speakers who have acquired an indigenous language through the educational system (O'Rourke and Pujolar 2015) may therefore be expected to reclaim what they already ought to possess. A case in point is the current efforts by authorities and speakers to revitalise Kven and Sámi languages in Northern Norway. This region used to be a multilingual contact zone where speakers of Scandinavian, Finnic, Sámi and Russian languages interacted, but from the 19th century Norway implemented oppressive policies towards the minorities in the North, resulting in a devaluation of local culture and abrupt language shift to Norwegian.

New speakers of Sámi and Kven carry with them a complex history of belonging and pride, but also a feeling of shame and silence, which has been passed on by their parents' and grandparents' generation (Lane 2010). These new speakers often find themselves in a precarious position: a key goal of language revitalization efforts is to enable individuals to reclaim a minority language, but paradoxically these speakers may be perceived as less authentic because the variant acquired through education tends to be standardised, and therefore they may not be recognised as legitimate speakers. This highlights the importance of moving beyond a celebratory discourse of language revitalisation in order to address challenges new speakers may face.

Bio
Pia Lane is Professor of multilingualism at the Centre for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (MultiLing) at the University of Oslo where she coordinates the research group Multilingualism, ideologies and language policies. She has investigated multilingualism from a range of theoretical perspectives, primarily drawing on data from Kven and Sámi-speaking areas in Northern Norway. Currently, her main research focus is multilingualism, language policy and language revitalization and reclamation. She was PI of the project Standardizing Minority Languages which resulted in the volume Standardizing Minority Languages: Competing

Ideologies of Authority and Authenticity in the Global Periphery, Routledge (co-edited with James Costa and Haley De Korne).

Late Capitalist Multilingualism

Alexandre Duchêne, University of Fribourg

Today, Western media often tell consumers that multilingualism is good for them and that it constitutes an important economic asset for society. Advertisements for language schools promise that learning a foreign language will result in better jobs and pay, while educational policies stress the importance of language learning for the future professional success of children. Businesses are happy to highlight the multilingual skills of their workers as proof of their international character. All these arguments link language skills with access to the job market, increased salary, creativity, and high work productivity in a world that is internationally interconnected and service and information-oriented – and as such highly multilingual. Far from being vilified, multilingualism is depicted as a good, as a useful product, and as an added value for both individuals and the economy. These celebratory discourses are the starting point of this presentation. Rather than taking them for granted, I scrutinize the complex logic and practices behind the construction of multilingualism as capital in contemporary societies. I argue that these discourses tend to essentialize and oversimplify a process that is highly complex by nature. Indeed, not every speaker and not every language skill has the same value everywhere and at all times. Multilingualism is not neutral, but rather intrinsically embedded in social and historical processes that inform what counts as legitimate speakers, languages and practices. Multilingualism, hence, is not an abstract concept but should be seen as a site of struggle for the access and distribution of knowledge and resources. Indeed, what constitutes desirable multilingual competence, a desirable multilingual speaker, and desirable and less desirable languages (or combinations thereof) is part of the economics of linguistic exchange; these factors are highly variable and dependent on historicities, contexts and markets. In showing the complexity of the role of multilingualism I explore the darker side of the late capitalist economic celebration of multilingualism and examine the complex ways in which multilingualism (and not just monolingualism) can contribute to the reproduction of social inequalities.

Bio
Alexandre Duchêne is a Full Professor of the Sociology of Language at the University of Fribourg and is a Co-Director of the Institute of Multilingualism. His research is situated at the interface between linguistics and social science and is concerned with the role of language in the production of differences and social inequalities. He was invited professor at ENS Lyon (France), the University of Jyväskylä (Finland), the Université Laval (Canada) and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (USA). He is the General Editor of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* and, together with Deborah Cameron, he co-edits the Routledge series *The Politics of Language*. His publications include *Ideologies across Nations* (De Gruyter, 2008), *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit* (with Monica Heller, Routledge, 2012) and

Language Investment and Employability (with Mi Cha Flubacher and Renata Coray, Pagrave, 2017).

Day 2 Discussant

Susan Gal, University of Chicago, USA

Bio
Susan Gal is Mae and Sidney G. Metzl Distinguished Service Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics at the University of Chicago; currently she is also Director of the Center for East European, Russian and Eurasian Studies. She received her PhD from the University of California, Berkeley in 1976. Gal's research specializations include linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, multilingualism, variation and differentiation, gender differences, language and politics, linguistic ideologies, Hungarian and German. She has also written about translation and the materiality of linguistic practices. In addition to journal articles and chapters, her publications include *Language Shift* (1979), *The Politics of Gender After Socialism* (2000, with Gail Kligman), *A Nyelv Politikája* (2018, The Politics of Language, in Hungarian) and *Signs of Difference: Language and Ideology in Social Life* (2019, with Judith T. Irvine). Gal co-edited *Languages and Publics: The Making of Authority* (2015), with Kathryn A. Woolard). Her current research in Europe examines the connection between language and political economy. She is interested in how standard national languages constrain minority-language speakers, and how translation connects but also separates populations of speakers. Although multilingualism is increasingly valued for some, it co-exists with the devaluation of immigrant linguistic practices. For her, discourses around language are a rich and important source of evidence about social life, their exploration reveals the nature of discordant cultural values, political tensions and the possibilities of negotiation.

UiO : University of Oslo

MultiLing