



Deliverable no: 2.7
Deliverable title: Article on maintenance of regional languages
Lead beneficiary: CNRS - IKER
Work package: 2. Regional Languages

Planned submission date: 30/09/2018
Date submitted: 30/09/2018

Project acronym: AThEME
Project full title: Advancing the European Multilingual Experience
Grant agreement no: 613465



This document was prepared by the researchers involved in the Regional Languages in Multilingual Europe work package (WP2). It results from the work of many people and has undergone many revisions. A list of members who contributed to this report can be found here:

1. CNRS-IKER: Ricardo Etxepare, Urtzi Etxeberria, Aritz Irurtzun, Irantzu Epelde (Basque) and Milan Rezac, Mélanie Jouitteau (Breton)
2. UU: Myrthe Bergstra and Norbert Corver (Frisian)
3. University of Rijeka: Maša Plešković, Branka Drljača Margić, Tihana Kraš (Fiuman dialect).

CORPUS PLANNING IN LANGUAGE CONTACT SITUATIONS. SOME RELEVANT ISSUES FOR MINORITY LANGUAGES

0. Introduction¹

This article examines the complex articulation between the setting up of a standard language and the accompanying political and social changes that explain the relatively successful language shift reversal evolution of Basque. In passing, we compare aspects of the Basque evolution with comparable elements in other European minority languages, in particular Frisian and Breton. The work provides an overview of some of the strategic issues related to corpus planning in language maintenance, and addresses some of the paradoxical consequences that a successful process of language maintenance and advancement, involving the massive incorporation of L2 speakers to the social area of language use, may have in relation to the stability of the norm.

Schema

1. The project of a shared language
2. The standard
 - 2.1. Background
 - 2.2. Codification
 - 2.3. Elaboration
 - 2.4. Conclusions
3. Basque in the educational domain
4. Contact, dialects and the standard
5. Legal background
6. Conclusions

1. The project of a shared language

What motivates a linguistic minority to maintain its language? In the 1960's, Basque, as a minority language in a diglossic region, was thought to be in a very critical situation, even on the verge of extinction, and in need of strong support if it were to survive. What did Basque families and the community do to pass on their "threatened" language to the next generation? There is general agreement among scholars that the path towards the normalization of the Basque language that has been followed since the 1960's has

¹ This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no. 613465.

indeed been very successful, but it still remains to be seen whether language policies will continue to have the same level of success in the future as they have had until now.

In the early 1960's Basque was restricted to private usages. It was losing more and more speakers, dialects were increasingly more different from each other, and, consequently, understanding was hindered. Those problems were directly related to the minoritized status of Basque in respect to the dominant languages: Spanish and French. That status was firmly sustained by two main ideas generally assumed at that time. On the one hand, it was the idealization of one nation/one national language, and, on the other, the idea that only developed languages were adapted to fulfil the role of national languages (Ricento 2000). Developed languages were written, standardized and flexible to the demands of technological and social advancement (Fishman 1968). At that time, Language Planning started developing as a discipline, based on the belief that language problems could be solved through planning. Haugen's (1966: 16-26) fourfold language planning model was particularly influential: selection of the norm, codification of the form, elaboration of function, and acceptance by the community.

A recurrent concern of language planners is to make the language fit for (new) purposes, in other words corpus planning. In the Basque case, there have been two primary concerns: the creation of a standard language and vocabulary expansion. One of the reasons for the foundation of the Royal Academy of the Basque Language (Euskaltzaindia)² in 1918 was, in addition to the usual language-academy functions, that of establishing a standard language, above all a written one, in the face of a complex dialectal scenario. The second task, vocabulary expansion, is important if the language is to be used for new functions³. But establishing a standard language was the primary goal of the Academy. The standardization process started under the Franco dictatorship in Spain, when the use of Basque was mainly limited to the home. Indeed the Basque language was totally excluded from public areas such as administration and education and the language had an extremely reduced presence in the media at the time. There was a widespread preoccupation concerning the status and future of the language among

² See:

http://www.euskaltzaindia.eus/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=4179&Itemid=787&lang=en

³ At the present time the Academy oversees the work of the Basque government and other agencies in this area. There are top-down planning units at all levels of government, in education obviously (see section 3), but also to a (very much) more modest degree in health, policing and justice. A minority of companies also have language planning personnel, assisted by outside consultancies.

many sectors of society, including teachers, writers and linguists, and many people started to realize that the development of a standard variety was essential for the survival of the language. It was the Basque language Academy which took up this challenge. Even though some decisions regarding orthography and other matters were controversial, there was great interest in intellectual circles and in society at large in the new strategies for the promotion of the Basque language proposed by the Academy.

Taking into account the Basque language problems as well as the trending models for language planning, the creation of a standard Basque was considered necessary to avoid further differentiation of dialects, to gain new speakers, and to extend language to formal areas. The Academy initiated the process of standardizing Basque in 1968, by selecting as a starting point a composite linguistic model based on the central dialects of the language. In the 1970's the basic orthographic and morphosyntactic norms for *euskara batua* (unified basque) were codified. Nevertheless, these norms were only the beginning of the codification process, since "grammatication" and "lexication" processes devoted to obtaining the typical product of all codification (prescriptive orthography, grammar and dictionary) (Haugen 1983) have dragged on to the present.

It is worth noting that the defense of the standard language was linked to a progressive ideology. To position oneself in its favor was to be identified with a movement to free the language from a traditionalist and conservative ideology (Sarasola 2016). Conservative intellectuals and a majority of the clergy were opposed to standardization.

Any initiative in favor of the elaboration and diffusion of Basque needed a critical mass to support it, and there is no doubt that there were many people in its favor, citizens who worked anonymously in favor of Basque, in favor of the standard model. Had it not been for this support, the elaboration of the language would have been greatly restricted. It was the younger generation who reinforced the standard model, reflecting their rejection of the traditionalist ideology that had previously prevailed in Basque academic circles. However, while it can be said that a generational dispute was taking place in a sense, the fact is that some senior Basque scholars were also in favor of the standard, including L. Villasante⁴, Txillardegi and K. Mitxelena. After fifty years, long enough to be able to make an assessment of the success of standardization, there is general

⁴ Luis Villasante was elected president of the Basque Academy in 1970. He worked hard while he was in charge of the Academy (1970-1988), pointing the path towards unification of "common literary Basque" (Villasante 1970, 1972, 1980, 1988). He is considered the Father of the unification of the language.

agreement that the revitalization and reinforcement of the language rely largely on the creation of a standard variety (Salaburu 2015, 2018, Sarasola 2016). These authors have stressed that the standard language was the crucial tool that was needed to overcome the critical state in which the language found itself in the 1960's. Nowadays, Basque is still a minority language, with wider or more limited use depending on the geographic area, but it cannot be denied that the creation of the standard has been a very positive tool for overcoming the critical state in which the Basque language found itself and for accessing functions which it never had before.

2. The standard

Over the last fifty years, the Academy has led the process towards the standardization of the Basque language. Euskaltzaindia has formulated the rules for the standardization of the language, has promoted its normalization and has undertaken linguistic research with the goal of preserving the language. Euskaltzaindia's open meeting held in the Sanctuary of Arantzazu, Gipuzkoa, in 1968 is usually taken as the starting point for the standardization process. This was not, however, the first attempt towards standardization ever made. Previously there had been other attempts to create a standard variety, but they had not succeeded. The standard Basque language promoted by Euskaltzaindia has received the name of «euskara batua» or Unified Basque⁵.

There is general agreement among scholars that the path towards the standardization and normalization of the Basque language that has been followed since 1968 has indeed been very successful (see Zuazo 2000, Salaburu 2015, Sarasola 2016, among others). This success is reflected in a dramatic increase in the percentage of Basque speakers among the younger generations and the wide acceptance and use of *euskara batua* in education, public administration and the mass media.

In the first subsection, we will describe the standardization process that has been followed. Then, in subsection two, we will consider the main aspects of the language that have been standardized. In subsection three, we will discuss the most important stages in the elaboration of the functions of the standard language (in the sense given to

⁵ For an extended study on the standardization of Basque, see Hualde & Zuazo 2007 and Zuazo 1988a, b, 2005.

this term in Haugen 1972). Finally, in subsection four, we will draw some relevant conclusions.

2.1. Background

As already mentioned, Euskaltzaindia took the lead in the process of language standardization in the Basque community. The Academy was created in 1918 as said, but it was only in 1968, at its open meeting held in Arantzazu, Gipuzkoa, to mark its 50th anniversary that the process of standardization of the language truly began. Euskaltzaindia had asked the linguist Koldo Mitxelena (1915-1987) to write the main proposal to be presented and discussed at the meeting. Mitxelena's report starts with the following words:

Ezinbestekoa, hil edo bizikoa, dela uste dugu euskara batasun bidean jartzea. Haur eta gazteei euskaraz irakasten baldin bazaie, eta euskaraz irakatsi behar euskara biziko baldin bada, premiazkoa da guztiei batera edo bateratsu irakastea. Nahi eta behar dugun batasun hori, lehen urratsetan behintzat, euskara idatziarena, izkribuzkoarena da. Eta, euskara idatziaren barrutian, irakaste lanetan dugu beharrenik batasun hori, irakurlearen atseginerako egiten den literatura “ederrean” baino areago. (Euskaltzaindia 1968: 203).

[We believe that it is crucial to put the Basque language on the path towards standardization; it is a matter of life or death. If children and young people are taught in Basque —and they must be taught in Basque, if the Basque language is to survive— it is essential that they all be educated in the same way or similarly. The unification that we need and want, at least as a first step, is that of the written Basque language. And, within written Basque, it is most necessary in educational materials, more so than in “belletristic” literature made for the enjoyment of readers].

Although 1968 was the year when Euskaltzaindia decided to assume primary responsibility in the standardization of the Basque language, the process had started outside of the Academy a few years earlier. In 1964, Txillardegui (pen name of J.L. Alvarez Enparantza), a Basque linguist and writer, chaired a meeting in Baiona (fr.

Bayonne) where a number of writers, specialists in Basque and scholars concerned with the situation of the Basque language (including J. M. Bilbao, J-L. Davant, R. Idiart, E. Irigaray, T. Monzón, J. Solaun and Txillardegui), expressed the need for a standard language (see Txillardegui 1974). This meeting played a significant role in the organization of the Academy's meeting celebrated in Arantzazu four years later.

Researchers on this topic unanimously highlight the crucial contribution to the standardization process made by three key individuals: Koldo Mitxelena, Txillardegui and Gabriel Aresti. Through the quality of his scholarship, K. Mitxelena (1915-1987) almost single-handedly managed to elevate the status of the field of Basque linguistics and philology on a global scale. As we have mentioned, he was also the author of the report approved by Euskaltzaindia at its 1968 meeting. Txillardegui (1929-2012) was an engineer, linguist, and writer who was very active in cultural and political circles at the time. Finally, G. Aresti (1933-1975) was one of the most important writers of the time, whose poetry marked a turning point in the history of Basque language and literature. These three scholars, each from his own field of study and from a different perspective, laid the foundations of the standard Basque language: Aresti used it in his literary writings, Txillardegui devised and proposed ways to unify the language, while Mitxelena carried out the project through Euskaltzaindia. The three of them are major cultural and political referents of the time when the standardization process began.

To mark the 10th anniversary of the meeting celebrated in Arantzazu, another open meeting was held in Bergara, Gipuzkoa, in 1978. The goal of the Bergara meeting was to evaluate the progress that had been made in the standardization of the language since the proposal had been presented ten years before. The members of the Academy concluded that progress until that point had been significant and decided on a future course of action.

As stated in the proceedings of the 1968 Arantzazu meeting, starting with the quote we have included above, at the time the main emphasis in the standardization process of Basque was the written language, not just as a formal medium but also as a way to develop a formal register of language which could be used in all aspects of everyday life.

Nevertheless, we should not overlook the fact that the need to create a standard written language had been felt before 1968 and that there had been several previous attempts to do so throughout the centuries. These attempts will be summarized below in chronological order.

The first book published in Basque is *Linguae Vasconum Primitiae*, written by Bernat Etxepare, parish priest of Eyheralarre (a town then in the Kingdom of Navarre, now in France), and published in Bordeaux in 1545.

Almost all texts published in the 16th to 18th centuries had a religious profile: they are translations of the Old and New Testaments or translations of texts to be used in the religious liturgy (catechisms and similar texts). One important exception is an unpublished manuscript by the Alavese aristocrat Joan Pérez de Lazarraga (1564-1567), which includes a pastoral novel. Etxepare's book also includes both religious and secular poems (Bilbao et al. 2011). In addition, in the 17th century a couple of minor technical works on sea navigation and farming were published. Works with belletristic aims increased in number during the 18th and 19th centuries and especially in the 20th century. All other types of texts to which Basque speakers had access, for example, administrative texts and educational texts, were written in Spanish or French. This fact underscores the sociolinguistic situation that Basque has had, that of a minority language. Throughout the history of Basque, the functions assigned to the language tended to be always very limited. The use of Basque was largely confined to the family and to informal communication at the local level, as said before. This remained true until the creation of the standard language.

Some attempts to create a standard language before 1968 are mentioned below. These proposals were only concerned with literary writing, since the texts produced in Basque were of this type (we include here texts of a religious nature).

When studying texts written in Basque and attempts to create a unified writing model, it is necessary to distinguish different geographical areas. The first initiatives in this direction came from Iparralde (the Northern Basque Country, in present-day France).

One of the most striking features of Basque is the amount of dialectal diversity that is found within a very small territory. Dialectal diversity was one of the stumbling blocks that writers had to confront if they hoped to reach readers beyond a small local area. The first known proposal for a unified written language was put forward by Joanes Leizarraga (1506-1601), a Calvinist preacher who first translated the New Testament into Basque, under the instructions of the Queen of Navarre, Jeanne d'Albret, who had converted to the Calvinist faith. In the preface to his work, entitled "Heuscalduney" ('To the Basques'), Leizarraga makes reference to the great amount of local variation found within the Basque language, which, in his words differed almost from house to house. His proposal was to create a hybrid language using elements from all varieties spoken in Iparralde, with the aim of reaching as many readers as possible. Leizarraga did not have any followers.

Another attempt to create a standard language was carried out by the members of the so-called School of Sara, who developed the written variety known as Classical Lapurdian (Sara is a town in the province of Labourd, in French, or Lapurdi, in Basque). The masterpiece of this school is considered to be the book *Gero* 'Later', written by Pedro Agerre "Axular" (1554-1644). Axular, in the introduction to his work, remarks on the difficulty of reaching all Basque readers, due to the wide dialectal variation that was found in the ways of speaking the language in different provinces. The writers of the School of Sara adopted a written language based on the dialect spoken on the Lapurdian coast. This model gained some acceptance in the Northern Basque Country, but it never became the undisputed written standard, even in this region. The Zuberoan writer, Jean de Tartas, also refers to the issue of dialectal diversity in his work *Onsa hilceko bidia* ['How to Die Well'] (1666). Like Leizarraga before him, this author adopted a hybrid language containing elements from several Iparralde varieties.

None of these proposals achieved complete success. The proposals mentioned so far have their origins in Iparralde, since the main written production in the 16th-17th centuries and the first half of the 18th century came from there. Around the middle of the 19th century the epicenter changed from the Northern Basque Country to the Southern

Basque Country. We need to go back a couple of centuries, however, in order to understand the situation in the Southern Basque Country or Hegoalde.

As far as Hegoalde is concerned, then, the first writer who mentioned the problems posed by the lack of a unified written language is Manuel Larramendi (1660-1766). This author used the Gipuzkoan variety in the few texts he wrote in Basque. Other authors after him also debated which variety to choose as a basis for a unified written language, the main contenders in Hegoalde being the Gipuzkoan and the Bizkaian dialects. A case worth mentioning is that of the Bizkaian Catholic priest and writer J.A. Moguel (1745-1804), who published the same text first in Gipuzkoan and a few years later in Bizkaian. It appears that the reason for this was that his fellow Bizkaian priests had not approved of his decision to write in Gipuzkoan.

At the end of the 19th century, the need for a unified variety became more evident, a clear sign of the increasing urgency of the matter. Arguably, Basque nationalism as a structured ideology was born at that time. This new ideology triggered an intensification of debates about the Basque language and culture, the issue of language standardization taking center place. A major participant in these discussions was Sabino Arana Goiri (1865-1903), founder of the Basque Nationalist Party.

In 1918 Euskaltzaindia was founded, its main objective being the creation of a standard language. As already mentioned, since then, Euskaltzaindia has been responsible for creating and developing this standard. In Euskaltzaindia's trajectory, three main stages can be distinguished, marked by historical events:

- 1918-1936 (from its foundation to the Franco uprising and the beginning of the Spanish Civil War). In its first stage, the members of the Academy, under the direction of its first president, R. M. Azkue (1864-1951), worked on the strengthening the institution and establishing its goals. At the time, there were some debates regarding the best variety to be taken as the basis for the standard language. Among the different proposals that were presented, Azkue's *gipuzkera osotua* "enhanced Gipuzkoan" was the most elaborated and most widely accepted. This proposal took the Gipuzkoan dialect as the basis for the standard variety. Under this proposal, the future standard

language would thus be based mostly on Gipuzkoan, but including morphological, syntactic and lexical features from other dialects.

- 1945-1968 (from the end of the Second World War to the Congress of Arantzazu). The activities of the Basque Academy came to a halt during the Spanish Civil War and WWII. After the enforced stop caused by the two wars and the first years of Franco's dictatorship in Spain, a large sector of Basque society started to demand a standard language, a request that was linked to the cultural and political renaissance that was taking place at that time. Bascologists, Basque writers, and language activists were painfully aware of the critical situation of Basque, and the creation of a standard language was one of the measures proposed to deal with this critical situation. Euskaltzaindia assumed this task, under the guidance of K. Mitxelena.

- 1968 (from the Arantzazu meeting to the present). Euskaltzaindia's meeting at Arantzazu in October of 1968 is considered to be the birth date of Standard Basque as we know it today. This is when a unified written standard started to be established, codified and elaborated. This is when norms for the modern written language were first formulated. Previous attempts to create a standard language had been unsuccessful, but this time the proposal was developed with the support of cultural, social and political initiatives. In the process of creating the standard language, there were many discussions, including heated debates and confrontations between those defending a standard variety and those who did not see the need for it. There were also debates and controversies about the specific standard model to choose and how to go about selecting its features. Disputes did not only take place within the Academy; it became a social debate. Eventually, the forces in favor of the standard language proposed by Euskaltzaindia prevailed.

- In the last two decades, signs of a new vernacularization process have become apparent, as in other parts of Europe, reinforcing the antagonistic idea of a folk speech / standard language dichotomy, which tends to confuse the functions of each of the two varieties (Elordui 2016). Nevertheless, it seems that lately the idea of vernacularization is losing strength. Some scholars (e.g. Sarasola 2016) have concluded that the process of standardization of Basque has already been completed.

2.2. Codification

The development of standard Basque is a recent phenomenon. As already noted, the linguist Koldo Mitxelena was charged by the Basque Academy with the task of guiding the standardization process. It was Mitxelena who set the guidelines for the new standard model. With this proposal for a standardized language, the Basque Academy was responding to a strong societal demand for education in Basque and for the use of Basque in the media and public administration. In the following subsections, the steps in the standardization of the Basque language will be reviewed.

Mitxelena's proposal for standard Basque was published in October 1968. This pioneering report included some recommendations about orthography, morphology, lexical variants and the adaptation of neologisms. Because of the particular circumstances that surrounded the Basque language, an aspect that has required the serious attention from the Academy is the regularization of orthography. In fact, perhaps surprisingly, one of the most controversial elements of the Academy's standard variety was the use of the letter <h> (Sarasola 2016: 23). Traditionally, the letter <h> had very high frequency in texts produced in Iparralde, where it has (or had) phonemic value. In Hegoalde, on the other hand, this phoneme was lost centuries ago and Basque writers from Hegoalde did not use the grapheme <h> at all. The inclusion of the letter <h> in the Basque alphabet, as proposed by Euskaltzaindia, was a matter of contention during the first stages of the standardization process, since the majority of Basque speakers, who did not have aspiration in their dialect, had to learn where to place these <h>'s, which for them were silent.

Although Mitxelena's proposal laid the foundations for the written standard language, it did not address all aspects of the standard language. Regarding morphology, for example, the proposal was silent about many important aspects such as noun morphology, the morphology of auxiliary verbs (an area of great variation among Basque dialects), the form of demonstratives (another area of great variation among Basque dialects), etc. Between 1968 and 1978, the Basque Academy published the following rules in its official journal, *Euskera*:

- “Euskaltzaindiaren VII. Biltzarreko (Arantzazu 1968) erabakien ondorioz sortutako hiztegia” [Lexicon produced after the decisions taken at the 7th meeting of Euskaltzaindia (Arantzazu 1968)], *Euskera* 13 (1968).
- “Hilabeteen izenen batasuna” [Unification of the names of the months], *Euskera* 16 (1971).
- “Aditz laguntzaile batua” [The unified auxiliary verb], *Euskera* 18 (1973).
- “Aditz sintetikoa” [Synthetic verbs], *Euskera* 22-2 (1977).
- “Kontsonante busti-palatalen grafiaz Euskaltzaindiaren erabakia” [Euskaltzaindia’s decision on the orthography of palatal consonants], *Euskera* 24-1 (1979).
- “Erakusleak” [Demonstratives], *Euskera* 24-2 (1979).
- “Deklinabidea: Euskaltzaindiak deklinabideaz eskaintzen duen erabakia” [Declension: Decision made by Euskaltzaindia on declension], *Euskera* 24-2 (1979).
- “Euskal alfabetoaren letren izenak” [The names of the letters of the Basque alphabet], *Euskera* 24-2 (1979).
- “Maileguzko hitzak” [Loanwords], *Euskera* 29-2 (1984), *Euskera* 30-2 (1985).
- “Euskaltzaindiaren gomendioak eta erabakiak. I.” [Euskaltzaindia’s recommendations and decisions, I] *Euskera* 36-3 (1991).
- “Euskaltzaindiaren gomendioak eta erabakiak. II.” [Euskaltzaindia’s recommendations and decisions, II] *Euskera* 37 (1992-1).
- “Euskaltzaindiaren gomendioak eta erabakiak. III.” [Euskaltzaindia’s recommendations and decisions, III] *Euskera* 37 (1992-2).
- “Euskaltzaindiaren gomendioak eta erabakiak. IV.” [Euskaltzaindia’s recommendations and decisions, IV] *Euskera* 37 (1992-3).

Since 1968, Euskaltzaindia has worked continuously towards the codification of standard Basque by publishing a number of rules and recommendations on its webpage (www.euskaltzaindia.eus). So far, 184 rules have been published on the webpage, 68 of which are lists of words in their approved standard form; that is, a standard Basque lexicon. Given the fact that all Basque speakers are fully bilingual in French or Spanish, codification in the case of Basque involves distinguishing between Basque, on the one hand, and Spanish and French, on the other. Since which lexical items belong to the Basque lexicon is not always evident to bilingual speakers, the Academy established a clear criterion: following Mitxelena’s advice, the Academy ruled that a word should be

considered “Basque” to the extent that it has a tradition in Basque usage (Euskaltzaindia 1959). One of the major tasks carried out by the Academy is precisely Euskaltzaindia’s Dictionary, produced under the direction of Ibon Sarasola between 1991 and 2015, with 37.884 entries (free online dictionary).

See:

http://www.euskaltzaindia.eus/index.php?option=com_hiztegiabildatu&view=frontpage&Itemid=410&lang=en

Another major task undertaken by the Academy (between 1985 and 2011) is the production of a general grammar of standard Basque, of which seven volumes have appeared so far (EGLU I-VII; Euskaltzaindia 1985-). With the publication of its grammar of standard Basque, the Academy is fulfilling one of its main objectives, completing a task first initiated by Manuel de Larramendi, who was the author of the first Basque grammar ever to be published (Larramendi 1729). Larramendi’s grammar was based on the Gipuzkoan dialect, and had an enormous influence on the development of Basque writing in the Southern provinces.

As is the case for all standard languages, standard Basque was initially conceived as a medium for written communication. In 1998, however, the Basque Academy published a set of recommendations that addressed a number of issues that had arisen regarding the proper pronunciation of standard Basque in formal communication. The role of the written language has thus been central to the standardization process; however, as standard Basque is also a spoken language, the Academy has also given importance to the pronunciation of the standard variety in formal contexts. Recently, the Academy’s Pronunciation Committee has proposed that a link should be established between the pronunciation of standard Basque and that of the different local dialects⁶, so that Basque can develop all the necessary registers for complete and normal use (Oñederra et al. 2015).

2.3. Elaboration

⁶ The unification tendencies between standard and dialects are currently a matter of opinion and debate among Basque linguists; see, for instance, Aurrekoetxea 2004.

This subsection deals with the acceptance that the standard variety has found in the Basque community, its integration in the linguistic repertoire of Basque speakers, and the progress that has been made in this respect.

Elaboration is the continued implementation of norms to meet the functions of “a modern language” (Haugen 1983): terminology for all the scientific and humanistic disciplines. But elaboration of the language is not only a matter of scientific vocabulary. It involves also the extension of linguistic function into the realms of imaginative and emotional experience. Here the enrichment comes more clearly from the artistic community (Haugen 1966). The most important process is acceptance by the community, since for a norm to become a real element of the language it must be integrated into the speakers’ discourses. The process of acceptance by the community, also called implementation, is the activity of a writer, an institution, a government in adopting and attempting to spread the language form that has been selected and codified... this is done by producing books, pamphlets, newspapers, textbooks and so on adopting and attending to spread the language forms that have been selected and codified (Haugen 1983).

Once the standard was established, the codification and elaboration of functions of this standard was carried out. Attention was paid to both corpus planning and status planning. Undoubtedly, in order for a standard model to succeed, it has to reach most of society; in other words, in order for this standard to achieve as wide a dissemination as possible, it is necessary to carry out the elaboration of its functions. Haugen (1983) explains that the four steps in his model are not necessarily temporally successive, but may be simultaneous and cyclical. In fact, that simultaneity happened in the case of Basque, since writers, journalists and teachers got to apply the norms at the same time that the Academy was codifying them. Several factors in the process of elaboration deserve to be emphasized.

The struggle for a standard Basque has been long and arduous. For many proponents of the Academy’s standard, the future of the language depended on its successful standardization. In the 1960’s, when the standardization process started, the Basque language was thought to be on the verge of extinction and in need of strong support if it were to survive. One of the most remarkable aspects in the revitalization and reinforcement of the Basque language has been its successful use in the educational

system (see section 3). Traditionally, the only vehicular language in the educational system was Spanish in the Southern provinces and French in the Northern ones. In the decade of the 1960's, Basque began to be used as a language of instruction in some private schools, but only in a semi-clandestine way, without any official recognition. Taking into account the whole school-age population in the Basque Country, the use of Basque in some private schools was a rather marginal phenomenon. With time, however, education in Basque strengthened and expanded. Some years later, as the official status of the Basque language changed, Basque immersion schools were created, where the only functional language was Basque.

In order for Basque to become fully integrated throughout the school system, it was necessary not only to train teachers in Basque, but also to create classroom materials in the language. For all these tasks standard Basque was an essential tool.

Along with the education of children, it is worth mentioning the teaching of Basque to adults and the establishment of adult literacy courses in Basque. Thousands of adults went to schools in order to learn to write and read in Basque; that is, in standard Basque. Today there are many schools for adults providing instruction and literacy in Basque, and these have been directly responsible for the creation of many New Basque Speakers.

The educational needs of both children and adults demanded the creation of new materials: reading materials, work materials, etc. To this end, several publishing houses were founded at this time. By 1970 a small group of scientists and engineers started to produce teaching materials and popular science articles in Basque (Irazabalbeitia 2002). In 1972 the Elhuyar cultural association was created with the aim of promoting science in Basque. In 1974, *Elhuyar*, a popular science journal in Basque, was published for the first time. It was also at this time that the Basque Summer University (Udako Euskal Unibertsitatea) was created with the aim of promoting a Basque University: in the following years some teaching materials for the most basic university subjects were elaborated in Basque. Consequently, new usages of Basque overlapped with the codification of the standard variety of the language and they worked as testing grounds for elaborating and implementing the incipient norms.

Writers also felt the need for a unified language. It can be said that some authors had in fact already begun to make attempts towards standardization before 1968. For example, the book *Maldan behera* (1960) by the poet Gabriel Aresti is written in a type of language very similar to that which was later proposed as the standard variety.

Several general-interest magazines of the time, including *Zeruko Argia* ('Light from Heaven') (1919-1936, 1954-1980 and 1980-) and *Jakin* ('To Know') (founded in 1956) also played an important role in the diffusion of the standard. The members of the editorial boards of these magazines agreed that they would write in Basque for a readership that could include all provinces of the Basque Country. For this to be possible a standard written model was needed. These magazines supported and adopted the standard proposed by the Academy.

The creation of a standard model has resulted in a huge increase in the number of books, journals and other materials written and published in Basque. Literary writers, while needing the standard variety, were also its strong disseminators, and the creation of a standard model has had a direct impact on the proliferation of works published in Basque.

It is well known that socio-political factors often influence the life of languages. The Basque Autonomous Government, which includes the provinces of Bizkaia, Gipuzkoa and Araba/Álava, was established at the end of the 1970's, when Basque became the co-official language of this autonomous region. Although initially there was some debate regarding which variety or varieties to use for administrative purposes, the standard variety promoted by Euskaltzaindia was quickly selected. The co-official language status enjoyed by Basque in this territory gave legal validity to the language. Basque became a language of administration, a function that had until then been only held by Spanish. Nevertheless, Spanish had and continues to have greater weight as a language of administration and that the use of Basque in public administration has had to overcome many hurdles. Even now, there is still a long way to go in the use of Basque as a language of government and administration.

In this context, we must also mention the introduction of Basque into the official, public education system. We mentioned above that the first schools in Basque were created by private initiative, and that they were outside the law, since they did not have any legal

support. Nevertheless, the societal engagement and effort made by these schools established a very solid foundation for the creation of the official public Basque school system. With the granting of co-official status to Basque, another arena was opened to the language: the public educational system.

In spite of the diverse sociolinguistic situation and diverse legal protection that it has had in the different territories where the language is spoken (Autonomous Community of the Basque Country, Navarre and Iparralde), the linguistic variety chosen for the educational system has been *euskara batua* in all Basque territories.

Regarding the use of Basque in higher education, the Universidad del País Vasco /Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, a public Basque university, was founded in 1980. This opened the possibility of pursuing college-level and post-graduate education in Basque. At the beginning, however, very few classes were offered in Basque, since there were almost no lecturers who could teach in this language. In addition to this, the lack of teaching materials in Basque was also a serious problem. These obstacles are gradually being overcome (Barandiaran et al. 2010).

Another important event for the dissemination of the standard model was the creation of EITB (Euskal Irrati eta TeleBista ‘Basque Public Radio and Television’) in 1982. Standard Basque was also chosen as the vehicular language of this audiovisual medium. Presenters and speakers, using the standard variety, reached audiences of thousands. Initially, for most of EITB’s viewers-hearers *euskara batua* was an unfamiliar kind of Basque, but gradually most people became used to it. Without any doubt, the audiovisual medium helped greatly to overcome any initial reticence. Along with the audiovisual media, the magazines *Argia* (following *Zeruko Argia*) and *Jakin* (1956-) and other periodical publications in Basque, also deserve a special mention, as does the only newspaper written in Basque, *Euskaldunon Egunkaria* (1991-2003), now *Berria* (2003-)⁷.

2.4. Conclusions

⁷ *Egunkaria* (Basque for *The Daily*) for thirteen years was the only fully Basque language newspaper in circulation until it was closed down in 2003 by the Spanish authorities due to allegations of an illegal association with ETA, the armed Basque separatist group. After seven years, in 2010 the defendants were acquitted on all charges related to ties to ETA. *Berria* was created in 2003 after the closure of *Egunkaria*. It is published daily, with the exception of Mondays.

In this section we have reviewed the standardization process of the Basque language. The development of standard Basque is a very recent phenomenon, as the foundations of this model were set only fifty years ago. The stimulus for the development of standard Basque must be linked to the strengthening of Basque identity awareness in the 1950s and 1960's. With the new standard, the Basque Academy was responding to a strong societal demand for education in Basque and for an expansion of the roles assigned to the Basque language, including in the mass media and public administration. The linguist Koldo Mitxelena had been appointed by the Basque Academy with the task of laying out the foundations for a new standard and it was he who provided an outline of its main features. Thanks to Mitxelena's reputation and wise guidance since the beginning of the process, the new standard became an instant success. It is true that some people saw things differently and positioned themselves against Euskaltzaindia's new standard language, particularly at the beginning of the process. All in all, however, the process has been very successful. Nowadays, fifty years after standard Basque was proposed, it is encouraging that the functions of the Basque language have been significantly extended. The status of the standard language in the Basque community does not seem to be in any danger. There is also ample evidence that the Basque language itself now has a stable position in society, in spite of some voices⁸ claiming that the Basque language finds itself at an impasse, unable to make further progress, and that society should contribute towards resolving this issue.

3. Basque in the educational domain

The promotion of the use of Basque in formal contexts such as education, administration and the mass media since the late 1970's has been of key importance for the revitalization of the language. For the first time, a great number of Basque-speaking professionals were needed: administrative assistants, translators, journalists, presenters, and above all, teachers (see also subsection 2.3). As a consequence, the number of people who decided to learn Basque grew considerably, due to the fact that instrumental motivations began to accompany identity and cultural ones. Since the recognition of Basque as an official language in the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country (ACBC) and in some areas of Navarre, a considerable number of people have learned Basque as adults and, in addition, more and more parents have chosen the educational

⁸ www.berria.eus/berriatb/3205/

model of full immersion in Basque (model D). Thus, in the ACBC, 78.56 % of the students registered in primary education during the 2016-2017 academic year chose model D. The percentage is lower in secondary education, with 62.15 % of the students choosing the immersion model. In contrast, the presence of Basque as an instruction language is more restricted in vocational education, since only 20.63 % of those studying for mid-level professional degrees (vocational certificates) and only 24.79 % of those studying for upper professional degrees (associate degrees) registered in model D.

As for the Community of Navarre, the Basque immersion model is only offered in some areas and, consequently, roughly 30 % of parents chose this model for primary education. In the northern part of the Basque Country, the model of full immersion in Basque is only available in private schools, since the public education system only offers a bilingual model or a model with Basque as an optional subject.

Regarding higher education, it is important to emphasize that nowadays the Basque language is used quite extensively within university courses. Around 65 % of the students aiming to go to university in the ACBC do their entrance exams in Basque. In the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), with campuses in the three provinces of the ACBC, 92.74 % of the subjects (93.31 % of the ECTS) in the different degrees are offered in Basque, and around 51.5 % of the students do their degree completely or partially in Basque. As for the faculty, 84.01 % of doctoral instructors as well as 57.82 % of non-doctoral instructors are bilingual (Spanish/Basque). In the Public University of Navarre (UPNA), 26.2 % of students do the entrance exams in Basque. The range of subjects in Basque on offer is more limited (20 % of the ECTS), and around 13 % of the students choose some subjects in Basque. Every year, around 250 students in Navarre who have done their university entrance exams move to the UPV/EHU, and roughly 40 of these students register to study in Basque (15.5 %). In the French side of the Basque Country, Basque is excluded from university studies, except in the field of Basque Studies, which are offered entirely in Basque from the first introductory course stage through to the doctoral level. Nevertheless, around 2.5 % of students that receive secondary education in Basque move on to the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU) in order to continue their studies in Basque. It should be noted that, as opposed to students moving from Navarre to the ACBC, who move inside

the Spanish education system, students that come from the Northern Basque Country have to surpass a lot of difficulties related to the differences between the French and Spanish education systems.

The use of Basque as a vehicular language in university courses and in vocational education determines, to a large extent, the future specialist's knowledge of specialized terminology and phraseology in the language and, consequently, their proficiency to use the language in professional situations. This increase in the knowledge of specialized registers of Basque is very opportune, since the use of this language in mass media, public education and public administration has grown considerably in recent decades.

4. Contact, Dialects and the Standard

In the last 30 years the situation of the Basque language has experienced a set of crucial changes as compared to the situation of the language in the beginning of the eighties. These changes have occurred at a different pace in the Spanish side of the Basque speaking area, particularly in the Basque Autonomous region, and in the French one, where the Basque language is not yet an official language, but where nevertheless efforts to develop a Basque immersion school system and basic policy instruments have developed steadily. One of the achievements of the Basque linguistic community which is at the base of the spreading of Basque as a vehicular language in the educational system is the creation, initiated already during the Spanish dictatorship time, of a standard variety and a substantive corpus of reference that ensures a basic coherence in the language choices made in written and in formal Basque. This achievement must be set against the background of a highly divided language situation, with old and sometimes lively dialectal divisions, as well as several literary traditions, distributed across the Basque speaking territories, and initiated in different historical periods (see Zuazo, 1988, 1998). The creation of the standard has been instrumental in the very possibility of a Basque speaking school system (see section 3), as well as in the development of a modest cultural and entertainment industry, with a sizeable number of potential consumers. The historical process leading to the standard has been reviewed in detail in the preceding section.

The challenge represented by corpus normalization has been successfully met in Basque. Standard Basque is generally accepted as the common language variety for most Basque speakers, it has a prominent place in the domain of formal linguistic expression, it is the vehicular language of both bilingual and immersive education, and it is systematically reproduced in both mass-media and high cultural production (literature, academic production of all types). Moreover, Standard Basque has progressively become the early L2 of all those speakers who learn the language via the educational system, either because they live in households in which Basque is not spoken, or inhabit areas of the country in which access to vernacular Basque is not guaranteed. The massive incorporation of early and late L2 speakers of Basque is probably the most important change that the Basque linguistic landscape has undergone in the last 30 years. In this, the Basque situation differs from other regional languages like Frisian, whose social use appears to be mostly confined to L1 speakers. It may be closer to the situation in Breton, in which a progressively larger number of bilingual speakers seem to have learned the language at school. Here, it is perhaps the sheer number of speakers and the existence of a strong L1 community along with an increasing L2 population that sets the Basque scenario apart from the Breton one (leaving aside the strong institutional commitment to the survival of the language and the solid educational and institutional support that Basque has in the Spanish side). The incorporation of L2 speakers to the arena of language use is at the same time a distinctive sign of the improvement in the condition of the Basque language, and a key element in its advancement, advancement that can be objectively measured in terms of both competence and use. Looking at this significant feature of the evolution of Basque from the standpoint of the late sixties and seventies, when the bases of Standard Basque were laid for the first time, the massive incorporation of L2 speakers to the Basque speaking population could be seen as having potential disruptive effects. The sociolinguistic situation that adumbrated Standard Basque was one in which the typical Basque speaker was an L1 speaker, nurtured in the context of familiar and regular language use, and evolving in a relatively strong Basque speaking environment. The relative weight of this type of speaker in the Basque sociolinguistic scenario is presently considerably lower than in the 70s. This shifting sociolinguistic scenario is potentially relevant for corpus planning. We may wonder how the vernaculars used by L2 learners compare with regard to the kind of Basque reflected in the standard norm. Early L2 and

late L2 learners have developed their linguistic knowledge from a Spanish or French speaking background. How does contact with a language that is typologically so different from Basque impact on basic structural and morphological choices regarding the forms historically adopted for the standard? This question can also be raised for other regional languages that have developed a standard, as Frisian and Breton. The Basque situation comes nevertheless with a particular quirk: language contact is associated not to one language, as in those cases, but to two hegemonic languages, Spanish and French. Unlike the Frisian or the Breton cases, contact derived change does not push the norm along the same grammatical vectors (Sarasola 2016). In this section, we reflect on the impact that language contact may have in corpus planning.

4.1. Contact triggered change as a historical fact

Basque has been historically subjected to the linguistic influence of three neighbouring languages: Spanish, French and Occitan (by way of its Gascon variety). This influence has been ordinarily invoked as a trigger for some of the major changes arising since the Middle Ages in such different areas as the determiner system (derived from the demonstrative one, as in Romance, see Manterola, 2015), or the emergence of perfect periphrastic constructions in the verbal domain, which can be compared to similar evolutions in Romance languages, and involve a participial suffix of Latin origin (*-tu*). The temporal and aspectual system of Basque underwent a radical change between the XVth and the XVIIth century (Mounole, 2011), in which the present TAM system arises, with its triple aspectual distinction (imperfective, perfective and prospective), a temporal system based on the past/present distinction, a reduced number of directly inflected verbs in favour of periphrastic constructions, and a subjunctive mood that accommodates the non-realis finite forms which included past tense reference in earlier times. The resulting system is closer to the Romance one in several respects. It is probably not a matter of chance either if eastern dialects, those that belong in the French area, don't systematically use locative *egon* ("be somewhere") and non-locative *izan* ("be") to overtly mark the stage-level/individual-level distinction in non verbal predication (French does not make that distinction), or that eastern dialects make no distinction between auxiliary *have* and possessive *have*, exactly as in French. This is a distinction that is made by Spanish (*haber* vs. *tener*), and by the central and western varieties of Basque in contact with it (Etchebarne, 2012:127-129). Since the XIXth

century, we also have attestations of Differential Object Marking in some of the Basque varieties in contact with Spanish (see recently Rodríguez-Ordoñez 2017, and Odria, 2017), a phenomenon that has generalized in the last century to many, if not most, of those varieties (see the database Basque in Variation, as well as work by Fernandez and Rezac, 2016). Contact-induced change is pervasive in the history of Basque, and it shows that bilingual speakers have always constituted a substantial part of its speaking population. The present scenario, shared by many other minority languages (for instance Breton, see Jouitteau, 2018), differs significantly from the previous though: today, all speakers of Basque are at least bilingual (either French or Spanish speakers), and an increasing percentage of the younger speakers are early or late L2 speakers.

Traditionally, the sources of tension in the development of the standard have been related to the traditional Basque dialectal varieties. The first efforts in corpus planning were aimed at bridging the gap between the different Basque vernaculars, those that were transmitted orally, but also those that were associated to regional literary standards, illustrated for instance in Arturo Campion's *Gramática de los cuatro dialectos literarios de la lengua euskara* (1884). Pierre Lafitte's *Grammaire Basque* (1944) can also be understood as the grammar corresponding to the literary language used in periodicals and literary works in Iparralde until the very recent spreading of Standard Basque. More recently, as a result of the success of the Basque immersion school system and of the spreading of the language among young speakers of different learning backgrounds, a new typology of speakers has emerged, whose mother language is not necessarily Basque, but French or Spanish (or some other language), and whose linguistic competence in the Basque language is first acquired in the school at an early age (obligatory schooling starting at age six). The emergence of this new typology of speakers, added to the considerable pressure of the majority languages (French and Spanish), has brought up a new source of tension between actual spoken Basque and the standard based on traditional linguistic choices. This tension materializes in linguistic changes which may seem to affect central areas of Basque grammar like word order, the case-system, inflection paradigms, discourse particles, or differential aspects of the Basque grammar, such as the use of evidentials. The extent of this phenomenon, as well as its sociolinguistic characterization in terms of context and age of acquisition and other sociological variables remains to be determined. This grammatical shift is a relevant sociolinguistic phenomenon, with a potentially important impact on normative

and practical aspects of corpus planning, and the accessibility of the language-based Basque cultural production to an increasing number of potential consumers. We offer in the following a modest typology of contact-induced change in relation to corpus planning, and evaluate the challenges that they pose to the stability of the norm. We discuss the fact that contact-induced change in Basque involves two separate linguistic areas, one in which the hegemonic language is French, and another one in which the hegemonic language is Spanish, and examine the particular difficulties that this linguistic configuration raises for corpus planning in the Basque Country. We briefly compare the Basque situation with other regional language minorities. We consider that the issues raised here are of general value for corpus planning in the context of regional minority languages.

4.2. Convergence and Corpus Planning

We talk about convergence when “a feature of language X has an internal source, i.e. there is a systemic motivation for the feature within language X, and the feature is present in a further language Y with which X is in contact” (Hickey, 2013:19). In that case, we say that “internal and external sources ‘converge’ to produce the same results” (Hickey, 2013:19). Convergence situations are a pervasive type of contact induced change, but they are not necessarily problematic for corpus planning, as they affect the relative weight of functionally equivalent structural variants in language use, and normative regulations are usually blind to this kind of consideration. We will examine a well attested case of convergence at the lexicon-syntax interface in Basque. Data are gathered from the database Norantz (www.norantz.fr) created at the lab Iker, which gathers elicited data from 59 Basque speakers of different age and linguistic background and has as its aim the identification of the most recent linguistic changes of the Basque language in Iparralde. This database allows us to examine the evolution of reflexive strategies along different age ranges.

4.2.1 Reflexivity in Basque

Basque has two reflexive strategies, one based on the body-part expression “X’s head” and another one based on the intransitivization of a transitive predicate (see Etxepare, 2003; Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria, 2012; Etxepare, forthcoming). We illustrate them here:

- (2) a. Bere burua ikusi du ispiluan
 his/her head.the seen has mirror.in
 “He/she saw himself/herself in the mirror”
- b. Ispiluan ikusi da
 mirror.in seen he/she.is
 “He/she saw himself/herself in the mirror”

In (2a) reflexivization is based on the use of a body-part phrase, that in Basque involves the head. In (2b) it is the presence of the intransitive auxiliary in combination with a transitive lexical predicate that triggers a reflexive reading. Both strategies are not completely interchangeable. Let us briefly introduce the grammatical and semantic contexts in which the two structures are used.

As observed by Reuland (2011), lexically reflexive predicates and predicates reflexivized by a complex SELF anaphor (the equivalent of the body-part anaphor in Basque) make different contributions to the reflexive interpretation conveyed by the predicate. The distinct contribution of lexical and syntactic reflexivity is apparent in contexts such as the Madame Tussaud examples first discussed by Jackendoff (1992). As a concrete instantiation of this context, imagine that Ringo Starr goes into Madame Tussaud’s wax museum, which contains a statue depicting him. Upon seeing the statue, Ringo is bothered because the museum has chosen to portray him with a beard, though he himself prefers a shaven look. He decides to take out his razor and shave the statue that portrays him. Reuland notes that in this context, it is felicitous in Dutch to say (3b), which contains a reflexivizing anaphor, but not (3a), with an inherently reflexive-marked predicate:

- (3) a. Ringo scheert zich
 Ringo shaves SE
 ‘Ringo shaves himself’ (Ringo≠statue)
- b. Ringo scheert zichzelf
 Ringo scheert SELF
 ‘Ringo shaves himself’ (Ringo=statue)

Conversely, it could happen that the statue Ringo discovers at the wax museum is one that doesn't have a beard. Watching it, Ringo realizes that he looks much better without a beard: he pulls out his razor and begins to shave his own face. In this context, Reuland notes, (3a) is felicitous but (3b) is not.

The two Basque reflexive strategies differ along the same lines (Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria, 2012). Consider a grooming predicate like *apaindu* “embellish, fix up”, one that admits both the complex anaphor and the intransitive option. (4a,b) show that *apaindu* ‘to embellish, to fix up’ admits both a body-part reflexive anaphor and the intransitivization strategy. (5a-c) show that the two possible reflexive forms have a distribution parallel to the Dutch *zich/zichzelf*: if we want to express identity with regard to the wax statue, we must use the body-part anaphor. The intransitivization strategy does not allow this possibility.

(4) *Apaindu* “fix up, embellish”

a. Bere burua apaindu du
 His head embellished has
 “He/she fixed himself/herself up”

b. Apaindu da
 embellished is
 “She/he fixed himself/herself up”

(5) a. Ringok bere burua apaindu du argizarizko irudian
 Ringo.erg his head.d fix.partc has wax.of image.in
 “Ringo fixed himself up (embellished) in his wax statue”

b. Ringo (*argizarizko irudian) apaindu da
 Ringo.abs wax.of image.in fix.partc is
 “Ringo fixed himself up in his wax statue”

c. Ringo apaindu da

Ringo.abs fix.partc is
 “Ringo fixed himself up” (pure reflexive only)

Comparative deletion constructions provide another context where the two types of reflexive relation are distinguished. The lexically reflexive-marked predicates allow only a sloppy interpretation, while the syntactically reflexive-marked predicates allow either a strict or a sloppy reading (Sells, Zaenen and Zec, 1987). The same asymmetry between sloppy and strict readings arises in the case of the two reflexivization strategies in Basque. Only in the presence of the body-part anaphor is a strict reading possible (6b), as opposed to (6a):

(6) a. Miren bere abokatua baino hobeki defendatu zen
 Miren.abs her lawyer.det but better defended was
 ‘Miren defended herself better than the lawyer defended himself’
 NOT ‘Mireni defended herself better than the lawyer defended heri’

b. Mirenek bere abokatuak baino hobeki defendatu zuen bere burua
 Miren.erg his lawyer.erg but better defended she.had his head.absabs
 ‘Miren defended herself better than the lawyer defended himself’
 ‘Mireni defended herself better than the lawyer defended heri’

The Madame Tussaud’s examples, as well as the comparative deletion cases show that SELF anaphors allow an interpretation in which the anaphor is referentially dependent on its antecedent, but is not necessarily identical with it. Lidz (2001) calls such anaphors near-reflexives. The difference between near-reflexive predicates and semantically reflexive predicates is shown in (7) (Lidz, 2001:129):

(7) a. $\lambda x [P(x,x)]$ (semantic/pure reflexive)
 b. $\lambda x [P(x, f(x))]$ (near-reflexive)

(7a) indicates that the two arguments of the predicate P are identical, or that one single entity realizes both roles of the predicate. In (7b), the second argument is a function

taking the first argument as input and returning an entity that is representationally related to that argument (Reuland, 2001:481).

In many cases, representations (7a,b) will be extensionally identical. The near-reflexive function does not prohibit the antecedent and the anaphor from being the same entity in the world, particularly if f can be the identity function. On the other hand, in pure reflexive anaphoric relations the anaphor and its antecedent must be identical. This may account for the fact that the intransitive reflexivization strategy, unlike the body-part anaphor in Basque, forces *de se* readings. To illustrate this fact, consider a context where a group of painters examines an old file with drawings from the art school of their youth. One of them, let's call it Xabier, pulls out an old drawing that he finds extraordinary and starts to praise it. He doesn't remember that the painting is his (many years have elapsed since art-school), but *Jon*, who is next to him, does. In that context, Jon can say (8a), but cannot say (8b):

- (8) a. Xabierrek bere burua goraiatu du, baina ez da konturatu
Xabier.erg his head.abs praise.partc has but neg is realized
'Xabier praised himself, but he didn't realize'
- b. Xabier goraiatu da, #baina ez da konturatu
Xabier.abs praise.partc is, but neg is realized
'Xabier praised himself, but he didn't realize'

The intransitive reflexives therefore, require strict identity between the arguments coindexed in the anaphoric relation, as in (7a).

In traditional Basque, the two reflexive constructions differ in another important regard: the intransitivization option is only possible between co-arguments. The body-part anaphor is the only possible one otherwise. According to Reinhart and Siloni (2005), this corresponds to a parameter that distinguishes languages in which the reflexive function is established in the lexicon, and languages in which it is a result of chain formation (a syntactic phenomenon). In those languages, reflexive relations are built under conditions which are very similar to those under which A-movement is possible. Reflexivization in Romance for instance, can spread across causative constructions:

- (8) a. Jean s_i'est fait [inviter __i ce soir]
 Jean SE is made invite-inf tonight
 'Jean got himself invited tonight'
- b. Juan se_i ha hecho [invitar __i esta tarde]
 Juan SE has made invite-inf tonight
 'Juan got himself invited tonight'

Nothing like this is possible in Basque, where the analogues of (8a,b) are out:

- (9) a. Xabierrek Miren gonbidatu-arazi du gaur gauean
 Xabier.erg Miren.abs invite-cause.partc has today night
 'Xabier made invite Miren tonight'
- b. *Xabier gonbidatu-arazi da gaur gauean
 Xabier.abs invite-cause.partc is today night
 'Xabier got himself invited tonight'

The causative structure in Basque is underlyingly biclausal, as shown by Ormazabal (1990b) and Oyharçabal (2002), with the final form being derived by incorporation of the embedded lexical verb to the bound causative verb. As we have just shown, complex predicate formation, a derivational phenomenon, does not license an intransitive reflexive in Basque.

Another set of cases that distinguishes the two types of languages from each other are those related to the presence of a high applicative morpheme, in the sense of Cuervo (2003) or Pytkkanen (2001, 2008). Basque and French, for instance, contrast sharply in the availability of dative reflexivization. The latter is completely impossible in Basque (11a-b), but available in French (10a-b) (see Labelle, 2008). (10a-b) instantiate non-lexical datives, datives that cannot be part of the theta-grid of a lexical entry:

- (10) a. Jean s'est acheté une voiture
 Jean SE is bought a car
 'Jean bought himself a car'

b. Jean s'est coupé les cheveux

Jean SE is cut the hair

'Jean got a haircut'

(11) a. *Xabier auto bat erosi da / zaio / du

Xabier car one bought is Aux[3sA]/ [3sA-3sD]/[3sA-3s.E]

'Xabier bought himself a car'

b. *Xabier ilea moztu da / zaio / du

Xabier-abs hair-abs cut Aux[3sA]/ [3sA-3sD]/[3sA-3s.E]

'Xabier got a haircut'

4.2.2. *Disruptive and non-disruptive change*

From the standpoint of the precedent facts, what would constitute a significant challenge from the point of view of corpus planning? Let us define the following three levels of disruption in the operativity of a given norm (in this case the one governing the proper use of reflexive strategies in Basque). A linguistic change may be such as:

(i) to require no reformulation of the norm (call it level 0)

(ii) to require the reformulation of the norm (level 1)

(iii) to undermine the conditions under which the norm is possible (level 2)

Those three levels of disruption bear an increasing cost for corpus planning, understood as a body of regulatory dispositions that establish a common linguistic ground for a linguistically diverse community. Let us examine each of them. Changes that locate themselves in level 0 are those that exploit the inherent redundancy of the reflexive alternation: the body-part reflexive has a wider semantic distribution than the intransitive one, and via semantic interpretation (the identity function interpretation of *f*), it can mimic the meaning of the latter. In other words, it can occur in those cases in which the intransitive strategy occurs, and beyond. Spanish and French do not have the body-part option. They have the option of bundling two arguments together via the use

of a SE anaphor, that can occur in all syntactic contexts in which the Basque intransitive strategy occurs. The convergent option therefore in the context of Basque-Romance contact is one that favors the intransitive strategy. The database Norantz provides supporting evidence for this process, as one examines the choice of body-part and intransitive strategies in those cases in which both are possible. Consider a French sentence like *Vous vous êtes vu dans ce film?* “Did you see yourself in that film?” (Question C33 in the database), that informants were asked to translate to Basque. The database presents three age ranges: (i) people 70 years old or more; (ii) people between ages 40-60; (iii) people below their 30s. Here’s a simple table of the use of the two strategies. The first age range counts 15 informants. The second one 12. The third one 32. I will provide percentages for each group:

Table 1

Age range	70+	60-40	-30
<i>Body-Part</i>	94%	75%	53%
<i>Intransitive</i>	6%	25%	47%

The data show a clear shift in the use of the two strategies, from the almost exclusive option for the body-part anaphor (a near reflexive, *f* being the image of the subject) to the levelled use of both strategies in the younger generation of speakers. The cost of this shift in the context of the norm is zero. That is, nothing must be changed in the norm to account for convergence effects. It is only the relative weight of the existing alternatives that changes as a result of contact.

What kind of change would require a normative action in Level 1? Consider a different example, the translation of the French sentence *Je ne m’aime pas beaucoup* “I don’t like

myself very much”. The Basque predicate is a stative, non-verbal predicate, based on the adjective *maite* “beloved/likeable”:

- (12) Ez dut nere burua biziki maite
 neg Aux my head much love
 “I don’t like myself very much”

I will follow Berro (2015) in taking non-verbal stative predicates to involve a copular construction with a Small Clause complement. The subject is introduced by a higher preposition, outside of the small clause. Incorporation of P into *be* results in *have* (see Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria, 2012, for a detailed discussion of this type of structure in the domain of modal constructions in Basque; Kayne 1993 for the decompositional view of *have*):

- (13) ...BE [I P_{Experiencer} [Small Clause body-part anaphor likeableADJECTIVE]]

The interesting aspect of this structure in relation to the previous discussion, is that the experiencer subject in the Specifier of P, and the subject of the Small Clause are not co-arguments. Reflexivity in this case could not be expressed by the intransitive strategy, if this strategy is bound to occur only in co-argument configurations. The data coming from the highest age-range is significant in this regard: there is not a single example of intransitive reflexivity in this case, despite the fact that loving oneself is most naturally interpreted as a *de se* relation.

Table 2

Age range	70+	60-40	-30
<i>Body Part</i>	100%	88%	66%
<i>Intransitive</i>	0%	16%	34%

The speakers between 60 and 40 show a small percentage of cases of this type. Younger speakers present a considerable increase in the use of the intransitive strategy. Nevertheless, as we can see by comparing both tables, the percentages are lower than

the ones we observe in the free-alternation cases of Table 1. This means that for a number of speakers that preferentially use the intransitive strategy in the free-alternation cases, the option of using it in non-coargument configurations is not available. Table 2 must be related to the increasing use of the intransitive strategy with non-lexical datives, along the lines of Romance SE. Although the database *Norantz* does not contain examples of this type, they have become a recurrent target of normative injunctions. Examples such as (14a,b) become more and more common, despite active stigmatizing efforts.

(14) a. Ilea moztu da

hair cut is

“He cut his hair” (French Il/elle s’est coupé les cheveux)

b. Kotxe berria erosi da

car new bought is

“He/she bought a new car” (French Il/elle s’est acheté une voiture)

The eventual spreading of this change may trigger the need to alter the linguistic norm that governs the use of reflexives. It therefore raises the corpus planning cost of the change to Level 1. The Basque intransitivization strategy, used also for impersonals and reciprocals, is being reinterpreted along the lines of Romance SE constructions. The relative distribution of the two reflexive strategies in Basque is as a result heavily disturbed vis-à-vis the traditional distribution. Note that we didn’t address the potential semantic reorganization of the system. The eventual generalization of this change takes us to the scenario 1, a costly move in corpus planning.

Level 1 situations do not necessarily lead us to the type of costly move that implies the heavy remodeling of interface grammatical conditions. Sometimes, the move may consist in accepting a relatively circumscribed functional reorganization, as in absentive constructions in Frisian. Frisian is a regional language under heavy pressure from Dutch. As Dutch is the majority language in the area and all speakers of Frisian are fluent in Dutch, contact-induced changes are frequent. Frisian is full of Dutch loan words, but there are also influences of Dutch in the Frisian syntax, as illustrated for example in work by Hoekstra & Versloot (2015), who show that because of contact

with Dutch, speakers of Frisian allow multiple orders in verb clusters, rather than just the one Frisian order. A similar change resulting in the emergence of alternative forms is the change which we find in the absentive (Bergstra, in progress). The absentive, illustrated in (15), looks a bit different in Dutch than in Frisian. Because of its different properties in the two languages, the Dutch construction, which has entered Frisian, does not replace the Frisian construction, but the two co-exist in the grammars of Frisian speakers. This is illustrated below.

- | | | | | | | | |
|------|----|-----------------------|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|---------|--|
| (15) | a. | Jan | is | te | fiskjen. | FRISIAN | |
| | | <i>Jan</i> | <i>is</i> | <i>to</i> | <i>fish.infinitive</i> | | |
| | b. | Jan | is | vissen. | | DUTCH | |
| | | <i>Jan</i> | <i>is</i> | <i>fish.infinitive</i> | | | |
| | | “Jan is off fishing.” | | | | | |

The absentive construction involves a subject, a finite form of *to be* and an infinitival verb. In Dutch (see (15b)), this is a bare infinitive, but in Frisian (see (15a)), the infinitive is preceded by *te* (“to”). The meaning of the two sentences is similar: the subject is off to some location, doing the thing that is expressed by the verb (in this case fishing). There are, however, small differences between the two constructions, which limit the kinds of things that can be expressed with it. Questionnaire results show that many speakers of Frisian accept a sentence like (15a) even if *te* would be omitted (215 out of 537 participants rated such a sentence with a 4 or 5 on a 5-points acceptability scale). Without *te*, the construction is similar to the Dutch construction. In fact, the acceptability ratings were correlated with the amount of Dutch that these participants spoke. However, almost all of these participants also rated the Frisian construction with *te* as acceptable. This suggests that the Frisian construction is not replaced by the Dutch construction, but that both exist in the Frisian language of these speakers.

4.3. Worst Case Scenarios: Questions in Labourdin Basque

The previous case-studies, based on the reflexive constructions in Basque and the absentive construction in Frisian, provide an illustration of the lower and intermediate cost-level moves in corpus planning under language change. In the less favourable scenario, one in which the reinterpretation of the intransitivization strategy along the

lines of Romance SE constructions takes hold, the situation is manageable by reformulating the norm along the necessary lines. The intermediate situation, reflected by a comparison between tables 1 and 2, raises the obvious question of what to do, from the point of view of the spreading of the new forms, with the existing normative frame. Corpus planning typically adopts a conservative stance. Literary forms, those that are attested in the written tradition of the language, take precedence over novelties, and there is a sense in which the standard is there also to provide a linguistic model, not just a mirror of language use. The continuous tension between rapidly changing language feature sets and the set of grammatical norms that underlie the model language is a defining characteristic of the present-day sociolinguistic situation in Basque. The issue is one that concerns the scope of the norm: what the norm is for and for whom it is intended is part of the calculations that corpus planning must address when deciding about whether it should evolve together with the current expanding usage. The operativity of the norm is based on the idea that this calculation can be made in relation to a shared object (the language) and that the ensuing decisions can be applied in the context of a linguistic community that shares a basic common linguistic background. This is the normal case of language change, and in relation to the normal case, corpus planning is typically a very slow-reacting device. The worst case scenario (level 2) is one in which the very issue of the scope of the norm is in question. The relevant scenario in the Basque case is one in which contact is confined to linguistic features which are not shared by Spanish and French. We will illustrate this scenario by following recent work by Duguine & Irurtzun (2014). Duguine and Irurtzun have recently analyzed the appearance of a new *Wh in situ* question construction in the speech of young speakers of the Labourdin dialect of Basque, something that the authors link to the sociolinguistic profile of the speakers of this dialect (early and late L2 learners) and the influence of French. This strategy results in word orders which are the opposite of the french ones, as one would expect from an SOV language like Basque. In-situ wh-questions in the Labourdin dialect spoken by youngsters give rise to word orders that go against one of the basic shared rules of sentential word order in Basque, the so-called *Altube's generalization* (1929). Altube's generalization captures the observation that wh-words and foci occupy the immediately preverbal position in Basque:

(15) a. Nork erosi du liburua? (General)

Who.ERG bought has book.the
“Who bought the book?”

b. Nork liburua erosi du (In-situ, only youngster labourdin)
who.ERG book.the bought has
“Who bought the book?”

That (15) constitutes the Basque equivalent of a French in-situ question is shown by the fact that the lack of adjacency between wh-word and verbal complex is only possible when the relative position of the wh-word vis-à-vis the rest of the argument is the unmarked position. Thus, in that very same variety (let’s call it Youngster Labourdin), (16) is an impossible sentence:

(16) *Zer Jonek erosi du?
What Jon.erg bought has?
“What did John Buy?”

The contrast between Youngster Labourdin and traditional Basque recalls Sorace’s hypothesis (2009) that the syntax-discourse interface is one of the particularly vulnerable areas of grammar in L2 acquisition. The contrast between traditional and more recent word order generalizations also point to an important fact about contact induced change in Basque: contact with French and Spanish leads contact-induced change in different directions for each of the two sides of the French-Spanish border. This is one of the major difficulties that contact induced change poses to the maintenance of a unified standard for the entire Basque speaking region.

5. Legal frame for the development of the language

Basque is, at present, co-official with Spanish in the ACBC, which comprises the three provinces of Bizkaia, Gipuzkoa and Araba. It also has a more restricted official status in

Navarre, which is a separate Autonomous region within Spain⁹. It lacks official status in the three historical territories of France¹⁰. There is no administration common to all territories where Basque is spoken (divided as they are between Spain and France and even, within Spain, into two separate administrative regions with different legislation regarding the Basque language).

The Basque Government has an explicit language policy for supporting Basque in the ACBC, the only area where Basque is official. After the change of regime in Spain, there was widespread support for a change in the legal status of Basque. The new Spanish Constitution (1978) opened the door to establishing a certain official status by law for the other languages of Spain and both the ACBC (in 1982) and Navarre (in 1986) made use of it. Those regional laws have given rise to much further secondary legislation since then. There has been no such advancement in the French Basque Country, although greater tolerance is visible. Some Basques seek further changes in the law (for example, to make Basque medium schooling compulsory for everybody or to establish monolingual Basque-speaking areas), but these pressures seem to arise from a misunderstanding of the role of laws in language change. A law establishes the language playing field through choices which can be in consonance with, or militate against, societal language dynamics. At best, it facilitates change by permitting use of a (minority) language in new functions or by new speakers and by legitimating the provision of funds to support such changes. Like schooling, it cannot be the sole agent of language change. Although the laws mentioned are slightly out-of-sync with the present situation, trying to tighten them in favour of Basque could equally lead to an 'anti' backlash, with no obvious gain for the language.

The Basque Government has entrusted the Deputy Ministry for Language Policy with the designing and drawing up of a General Plan for Encouraging Basque Language Use in collaboration with the Basque Language Advisory Board, which will have to be debated and subsequently approved by the Government's Cabinet meeting. This is a strategic plan with the following aims: 1) to reach a consensus on short and medium-

⁹ For an extended study of the Charter Decree regulating the use of Basque in the public administration of Navarre [Decreto Foral 372/2000, de 11 de noviembre, por lo que se regula el uso del vascuence en las Administraciones Públicas de Navarra], see Erize (2001).

¹⁰ The use of Basque is limited in France (around 11% use it at home and among friends). Its use is poor in formal contexts (for example, it consists of the 8,3% in local council services and 3,5% in health care). In general, the sociolinguistic situation of the language has declined at this point.

term language normalisation aims with a view to adapting the programmes and establishing evaluation criteria; 2) to carry out an in-depth analysis of budgetary allocations for Basque language recovery whilst foreseeing the future effect of current plans with a view to establishing priorities; 3) to study the proposals for improving inter-institutional coordination on the one hand and the coordination between public powers and social initiatives on the other.

The Basque Language Advisory Board is a meeting place for different institutions and people who work in the field of normalisation and its aim is to advise on the general plan for Basque normalisation and monitor and assess the degree to which the Plan is adhered to. The Board is presided over by the Lehendakari (the President of the Basque Government) and has 39 members: 14 of them represent institutions and public powers and the other 25 have been selected from people with a recognised prestige in the Basque-speaking world. The Board also has four specific commissions: Place names; Use Plans; Continuity and the Inter-Generational Transmission of Basque and The Media.

As said, in the ACBC and in Navarre (but mainly in the ACBC), Basque language speakers have gained partial control in a range of private and national institutions. However the advance is very limited in the Northern Basque Country. Two languages coexist in the Northern Basque Country (NBC) or French Basque Country. One, official and all-powerful, is present in all areas of use: the French language. The other, the Basque language, is non-official and more and more excluded from the areas in which it has traditionally been present, that is to say the family, the immediate community and social areas such as religion.

The vitality of the Basque-speaking community is rather weak in the NBC, compared with other Basque communities. Thanks to the four sociolinguistic surveys made since 1991, we now have a diachronic perspective of the situation in the entire Basque Country. Full bilinguals have increased from 21.39 % in 1991 (505,200) to 25.7 % (665,700) in 2006; passive bilinguals have increased from 7.71 % in 1991 (182,700) to 15.4 % (397,900) in 2006. Much progress has been made in the ACBC due to an active institutional language policy, whereas little progress has been made in the NAC.

Since 1991 the situation is one of ongoing decline in the NBC. Full bilinguals reduced in number from 32.73 % (66,200) to 22.5 % (51,800) in 2006; nevertheless, passive bilinguals increased from 7.04 % (14,700) in 1991 to 8.60 % (19,800) in 2006. The unilingual French speakers are now 68.90 %, which represents about 158,600 people. One third of all bilinguals are over 65 years of age (Basque Government, 2008: 81). The rapid growth of the population in the NBC is mainly due to continuing immigration from other areas of France. French speakers, therefore, are greater in number in NBC, and all Basque-speakers are bilingual. There are no longer any unilingual Basque people.

All the specialists agree with the fact that, in order to guarantee the future of a language, the fundamental step of intergenerational transmission through families must be taken (sixth stage in the Fishman's Reversing Language Shift model; Fishman 1991: 398-399; 2002: 467). We quote the last sociolinguistic survey:

In the ACBC and Navarre, more than 98% of children whose parents are bilingual learn Basque at home. Although the corresponding proportion for the North is also high, it stands at ten percentage points lower than in the other regions (...). When one parent doesn't speak Basque, 20 % of children in the ACBC, 9.1 % of Navarrese and 4.6 % of northern children still learn Basque at home (Basque Government, 2008: 211).

We cannot say that language loss is reversing, or at least stabilizing in this part of the Basque Country, even if, for the first time in 2006, the decrease in the number of full bilinguals has stopped for inhabitants from 16 to 24 years of age, and their numbers have begun to rise. This decrease is due to the development of Basque school teaching. As mentioned above, we can say now that the ideological orientations that the French State adopted toward minority languages have changed, at least partially. This is the case with local authorities in the NBC, too. Assimilationist ideology has become weaker and local decision-makers have moved now from *laissez-faire* to an active linguistic policy¹¹.

¹¹ The Office Public de la Langue Basque (OPLB) was created recently (2004) based on public funding, with Basque-supporting and promoting specific policies. For example, they are currently working on a Basque teaching program for elementary and high school teachers and students.

All in all, the situation in the French Basque Country is still one of decline, even if that decline has now slowed. The massive presence of French is a continual invitation to many Basque speakers to use it, even where Basque is a realistic option: where this occurs within the family it is a source of considerable concern for planners. Some Basque speakers, particularly second learners, do not have the grasp of lively colloquial language that is at the heart of everyday language maintenance and transmission.

6. Conclusions

Languages and language varieties usually become endangered because their speakers are in contact with a group whose language or variety has, or is gaining, greater social, political and economic prestige in the local or wider arena. When speakers of a language begin to interact with speakers of one or more languages as in the case of Basque, changes in the language ecology of the speech community can take place. Social functions that were previously conducted in one language (Basque) may now be conducted, at least partially, in another (Spanish, French). Consequently, some degree of change in how one or more of the languages is spoken is a likely outcome.

Clearly the most detrimental outcome for an endangered language is when a whole community shifts to another language; that is, members of the community stop speaking the pre-contact language habitually and mostly speak the post-contact language, which comes to be the language of the next generation. The shift may take place in only one or two generations, but it may also take place over several generations (O'Shannessy 2011: 83). The continual announcements in the 19th and 20th centuries of the approaching death of Basque (and of many other lesser used languages) have fortunately not been fulfilled. A complex phenomenon of language revival, involving at the same time corpus planning and status planning, legal acknowledgement in the form of co-officiality with the hegemonic language (in the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country), active support policy and social engagement has emerged in the last decades. Part of the success story of Basque in the context of European minority languages lies in its capacity to attract new speakers outside the L1 environment, thanks to the spreading of Basque as a vehicular language in the educational system. This is a crucial landmark in the positive evolution of the language and its eventual maintenance. We examine some of the paradoxical results of that phenomenon, that may be exported to other

minority languages in Europe in which corpus planning has resulted in a standard. The paradox is that the very success of the process may have a disrupting impact in the normative consensus that underlies that very process.

References

- Arana Goiri, S. 1980. *Obras completas de Arana-Goiri'tarr Sabin*, ed. M. Ugalde, 2 vols. San Sebastian: Senda.
- Aurrekoetxea, G. 2004. Estandar eta dialektoen arteko bateratze-joerak: ikuspuntu teorikotik begirada bat [Unification tendencies between standard and dialects: A look from a theoretical viewpoint]. *Uztaro* 50, 45-57.
- Axular, P. 1643. *Guero*. Bordeaux.
- Barandiaran, A. et al (eds.). 2010. *La estandarización de la lengua. La recuperación del euskara II*. Eskoriatza: Garabide Elkartea.
- Bergstra, M. (in progress). *Contact-induced changes in the Frisian verbal domain*. Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Berro, A. 2015. *Breaking verbs. From Event Structure to Syntactic Categories in Basque*. Doctoral dissertation, UPV/EHU and Université Bordeaux-Montaigne.
- Bilbao, G., R. Gómez, J.A. Lakarra, J. Manterola, C. Mounole & B. Urgell (eds.). 2011. *Lazarraga eskuizkribua: edizioa eta azterketa (vl. 2)* [online manuscript] Vitoria-Gasteiz: UPV/EHU. <<http://lazarraga.com>>
- Campión, A. 1977 [1884]. *Gramática de los cuatro dialectos literarios de la lengua euskara*. Bilbao: La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca.
- Cuervo, M. 2003. *Datives at large*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Davant, J-L. 1996. Euskalkien eta euskara batuaren arteko harremana nolakoa den Iparraldean [The relationship between dialects and standard Basque in the Northern Basque Country]. *Euskera* 41:3, 531-539.
- Duguine, M. And A. Irurtzun. 2014. From obligatory wh-movement to optional wh-in-situ in Labourdin Basque. *Language* 90-1, 1-30.
- Elordui, A. 2016. Elebakartasunetik heteroglosiara: Gaztea Irratia, bernakulizazioa gazte-komunikabideen diseinu sozioestilistikoan [From monolingualism to heteroglossia: the case of the radio station Gaztea]. *Uztaro* 97, 31-52.
- Erize, X. 2001. El discurso contrario a la “normalización” de la lengua vasca en Navarra (1997-2002) [The discourse against the “normalization” of the Basque language in Navarre (1997-2002)]. *Revista Internacional de los Estudios Vascos*. 46-2, 661-681.

- Etchebarne, M. 2012. Dynamique historique de la langue basque. *Variation dans l'espace et variation dans le temps*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Etxepare, B. 1980 [1545]. *Linguae Vasconum Primitiae*. Edited by Patxi Altuna. Bilbao: Mensajero.
- Etxepare, R. & M. Uribe-Etxebarria. 2012. Denominal necessity modals in Basque. In U. Etxeberria, R. Etxepare and M. Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.) *Noun Phrases and Nominalization in Basque*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 283-329.
- Etxepare, R. 2003. Valency and argument structure in the Basque verb. In J.I. Hualde and J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.) *A Grammar of Basque*. Berlin: Mouton, 363-425.
- Euskaltzaindia. 1959. Euskaltzaindiaren agiria euskal itzei buruz [Report of the Basque Academy regarding Basque words]. *Euskera* 4, 214-215.
- Euskaltzaindia. 1968. Literatura euskeraren batasunari buruz Euskaltzaindiaren agiria [Report of the Basque Academy regarding the unification of literary Basque]. *Euskera* 13, 203-250.
- Euskaltzaindia. 1985-2011. *Euskal gramatika: Lehen urratsak* [Basque grammar: First steps]. 7 vols. Bilbao.
- Euskaltzaindia. 1991. Euskaltzaindiaren bigarren agiria euskal hitzei buruz [Second report of the Basque Academy regarding Basque words]. *Euskera* 36/2, 445-446.
- Fernandez, B. & M. Rezac. 2016. Differential Object Marking in Basque varieties. In B. Fernandez & J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.) *Microparameters in the Grammar of Basque*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 93-138.
- Fishman, J. 1968. Some contrasts between linguistically homogeneous and linguistically heterogeneous polities. In Joshua A. Fishman, Charles A. Ferguson & Jyotirindra Das Gupta (eds.) *Language problems of Developing Nations*, 53-68. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Fishman, J. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. 2002. The primordialist-constructivist debate today. In D. Conversi (ed.), *Ethnonationalism in the Contemporary World*. London-New York: Routledge, 83-91.
- Giles, H. Bourhis, R.Y. & Taylor D.M. 1977. Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*, 307-248. New York: Academic Press.

- Haugen, E. 1966. *Language conflict and language planning: the case of modern Norwegian*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, E. 1972. Dialect, language, nation. J.B. Pride & Janet Holmes, eds. *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 97-111.
- Haugen, E. 1983. The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice. In Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.) *Progress in Language Planning. International Perspectives*. 269-289. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.
- Hickey, R. 2013. Language Contact: Reconsideration and reassessment. In R. Hickey (ed.) *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Wiley-Blackwell, 1-28.
- Hualde, J.I. & K. Zuazo. 2007. The standardization of the Basque language. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 31:2, 143-168.
- Hualde, J.I. 2014. Basque words. *Lapurdum* 18, 7-21.
- Irazabalbeitia, I. 2002. *Zientzia Komunikazioa Euskal Herrian: hurbilketa modukoa* [The scientific communication in the Basque Country: an approximation]. *Hegatz* 30, 47-75.
- Jackendoff, R. 1992. Mme Tussaud meets the binding theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, 1-33.
- Jouitteau, M. (forthcoming). Children Prefer Natives. A study on the transmission of a heritage language: Standard Breton, neo-Breton and traditional dialects. In M. Bloch & M. Ó Fionnáin (eds.). Lublin: Peter Lang.
- Kayne, R. 1993. Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica* 47, 3-31.
- Labelle, M. 2008. The French reflexive and reciprocal *se*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 833-876.
- Lafitte, P. 1979 [1944]. *Grammaire Basque*. Donostia: Elkar.
- Larramendi, M. 1729. *El imposible vencido: arte de la lengua bascongada*. Salamanca: Joseph Villagordo Alcaraz. (Reprinted 1979, Donostia: Hordago).
- Leizarraga, J. 1571. *Jesus Christ goure Jaunaren Testamentu Berria*. La Rochelle. (Reprinted in facsimile 1979. Donostia: Hordago).
- Lidz, J. 2001. Condition R. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32-1, 123-140.
- Manterola, J. 2015. *Euskararen morfologia historikorako: artikulua eta erakusleak*. Doctoral dissertation. UPV/EHU.

- Milroy, J. & L. Milroy. 2012 [1985]. *Authority in Language. Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation* [4th ed.]. London: Routledge.
- Mitxelena, K. 2011. *Obras completas* [vol. X, Norma y unificación de la lengua]. Ed. by Joseba A. Lakarra & Iñigo Ruiz Arzalluz. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia.
- Mogel, J.A. 1800. *Confesio ta comunioco sacramentuen gañean eracasteac*. Pamplona.
- Mounole, C. 2011. *Le verbe basque ancien: étude philologique et dichronique*. Doctoral dissertation, UPV/EHU and Université Bordeaux-Montaigne.
- O'Shannessy, Carmel. 2011. Language contact and change in endangered languages. In Peter K. Austin & J. Sallabank (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Odria, A. 2017. *Differential Object Marking and datives in Basque syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, UPV/EHU.
- Oñederra, M.L.; Elordui, A.; Epelde, I.; Jauregi, O. & J. Salaberria. 2015. Euskaltzaindiaren Ahoskera batzordearen txostena [Report by the Pronunciation committee of Euskaltzaindia]. *Euskera* 60-2, 499-531.
- Oñederra, M.L. 1998. Ahoskera lantaldearen errendapen txostena [Report of the pronunciation work-group]. *Euskera* 43 (1), 265-274.
- Oñederra, M.L. 2016a. Standardisation of Basque: from grammar (1968) to pronunciation (1998). In Ammon, Ulrich, Jeroen Darquennes & Sue Wright (eds.), *Sociolinguistica. International Yearbook of European Sociolinguistics* 30. Berlin: de Gruyter, 125-143.
- Oñederra, M.L. 2016b. The standardisation of pronunciation: Basque today, between maintenance and variation. In Tiekens-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid & Carol Percy (eds.), *Prescription and Tradition in Language: Establishing Standards across Time and Space*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 342-354.
- Ormazabal, J. 1990. Modal verbs in Basque and head movement. In J.A. Lakarra & I. Ruiz Arzalluz (eds.) *Memoriae Ludovico Mitxelena Magistri Oblatae: Pars Altera*. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia. 835-845.
- Oyharçabal, B. 2004. Lexical causatives and the causative alternation in Basque. In B. Oyharçabal (ed.) *Inquiries into the Lexicon-Syntax relations in Basque*. Bilbao: ASJU, 223-253.

- Oyharçabal, B. 1993. Euskara batuari iparraldetik behatuz [The standardization of Basque in the Northern Basque Country]. *Jakin* 76, 79-89.
- Pylkkanen, L. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, T. & T. Siloni. 2005. The lexicon-syntax parameter: Reflexivization and other arity operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36-3: 389-436.
- Reuland, E. 2011. *Anaphora and Language Design*. MIT Press.
- Ricento, Thomas. 2000. Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4 (2), 196-213.
- Rodriguez-Ordoñez, I. 2017. *DOM in Basque: grammaticalization, attitudes and ideological representations*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Salaburu, P. 2015. *Writing words: the unique case of the standardization of Basque*. Reno, Nevada: Center for Basque Studies, University of Nevada.
- Salaburu, P. 2018. El euskera contemporáneo. El largo camino de la unificación literaria. In Gorrochategui, Joaquín, Ivan Igartua & Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), *Historia de la lengua vasca*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Gobierno Vasco/Eusko Jaurlaritza, 799-868.
- Sarasola, I. 2016. *Bitakora kaiera*. Donostia: Erein.
- Sells, P., A. Zaenen and D. Zec. 1987. Reflexivization variation: Relations between syntax, semantics and lexical structure. In M. Lida, S. Echsler and D. Zec (eds.) *Working Papers in Grammatical Theory and Discourse Structure*. Stanford: CSLI, 169-238.
- Sorace, A. 2009. Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language development; beyond structural overlap. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13: 195-210.
- Tartas, I. 1995 [1666]. *Oñsa hilceko bidia* [‘How to Die Well’]. Edited by Patxi Altuna. Bilbao: University of Deusto.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. 2017. Perspectives on standardization: From codification to prescriptivism. In Laurel Brinton (ed.), *English Historical Linguistics: Approaches and Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 276-302.
- Txillardegí. 1974. *Euskara batua zertan den* [Standard Basque, today]. Oñati: Editorial Franciscana.
- Villasante, L. 1970. *Hacia la lengua literaria común*. Oñati: Editorial Franciscana.

- Villasante, L. 1972. *La declinación del vasco literario común*. Oñati: Editorial Franciscana.
- Villasante, L. 1980. *La H en la ortografía vasca*. Oñati: Editorial Franciscana.
- Villasante, L. 1988. *Euskararen auziaz* [On the issue of Basque]. (Colección Eleizalde 9). Lizarra: Gráficas Lizarra.
- Zuazo, K. 1988a. Euskararen batasunaz gogoeta zenbait [Some thoughts about the unification of Basque]. *Jakin* 49, 99-122.
- Zuazo, K. 1988b. *Euskararen batasuna = La unificación de la lengua vasca = L'unification de la langue basque*. Leioa: University of the Basque Country & Euskaltzaindia.
- Zuazo, K. 1998. Euskalkiak, gaur. *FLV* 30, 191-233.
- Zuazo, K. 2000. *Euskararen sendabelarrak* [The medicinal herbs of Basque]. Irun: Alberdania.
- Zuazo, K. 2005. *Euskara batua: ezina ekinez egina* [Standard Basque: The impossible accomplished with effort]. Donostia: Elkar.
- Zuazo, K. 2013. *The dialects of Basque*. Reno, Nevada: Center for Basque Studies, University of Nevada.