

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....	13
1. The social history of Basque: SHB in the international context.....	15
1.1. SHB: the database.....	16
1.2. SHB: Taxonomy for the social history of Basque and minority languages	17
2. Socio-historical setting.....	21
2.1. When.....	23
2.1.1. Characteristics of the documents which have to be dated.....	25
2.1.2. Measurement patterns chosen by SHB.....	25
2.2. Type and quantity of speakers	26
2.2.1. Social attributes	26
2.2.2. Proportion and number of speakers	31
2.2.3. Summary of terms	33
2.3. Geographical position.....	33
2.3.1. Geo-linguistic position	34
2.3.2. Administrative demarcation.....	34
2.3.2.1. Civil demarcation	35
2.3.2.2. Religious demarcation.....	35
2.3.2.3. Other	36
2.4. Ecological demarcation	36
2.4.1. Sedentary lifestyle	37
2.4.1.1. Sedentary lifestyle without noticeable migratory movement	37
2.4.1.2. Sedentary lifestyle with migratory movement	38
2.4.2. Mobile lifestyle.....	39
2.4.3. Urban/rural dichotomy	40
2.4.4. <i>Ager/saltus</i> dichotomy.....	40
2.5. Socio-functional position.....	41
2.5.1. Domain	41
2.5.2. Role relationships	45
2.5.3. Language status	47
3. General structure of sociolinguistic classification	49
3.1. The dimensions of SHB: an overall perspective.....	50
3.1.1. Dimension A: language use	51
3.1.2. Dimension B: language competence	52
3.1.3. Dimension C: language structure	54

3.1.4. Dimension D: societal features.....	55
3.1.5. Dimension E: language opinions, attitudes and behaviours..	57
3.1.6. Summary of the dimensions	61
3.2. SHB's analytical parameters: overview	61
3.2.1. The descriptive (or first) analytical parameter.....	61
3.2.2. The kinetic (or second) analytical parameter	62
3.2.3. The dynamic (or third) analytical parameter	63
3.2.4. The prospective (or fourth) analytical parameter	64
3.2.5. The contrastive (or fifth) analytical parameter	64
3.2.6. The prescriptive (or sixth) analytical parameter.....	65
3.2.7. Summary of the analytical parameters	66
3.3. SHB's matrix or explanatory scheme	67
3.3.1. The limits of the matrix	70
3.3.1.1. Systemic complexity	70
3.3.1.2. The complexity paradigm and the SHB matrix.....	72
4. Descriptive parameter	75
4.1. 1A - Describing language use	76
4.1.1. General, undetermined (along with language behaviour)	81
4.1.2. Describing language use without language contact.....	85
4.1.3. Describing language use with some kind of language contact.	86
4.1.3.1. Extent of stability of language contact situation	87
4.1.3.2. Diglossia.....	87
4.1.3.3. Language conflict	88
4.1.4. Language use related dominance configuration table.....	91
4.1.5. Reason for 1A.....	94
4.1.6. Summary of terms	94
4.2. 1B - Describing language competence	95
4.2.1. Speaker's linguistic repertoire.....	95
4.2.2. Level of language competence in Basque and other languages...	96
4.2.3. Language competence related dominance configuration table...	99
4.2.4. Language competence acquisition mode in Basque and other languages	100
4.2.5. Language competence loss mode in Basque or other languages	102
4.2.6. Reason for 1B	102
4.3. 1C - Describing language structure	103
4.3.1. Data derived from language structure	104
4.3.1.1. Global description	104
4.3.1.2. Result of language contact	105
4.3.1.3. Internal uniformity of language.....	107
4.3.1.4. Power and solidarity indices.....	108

4.3.1.5. Significant source (onomastics, paremiology and etymology)	108
4.3.1.6. Other	109
4.3.2. Reason for 1C	109
4.4. 1D - Describing societal features.....	109
4.4.1. Data relating to societal features	109
4.4.1.1. General, undetermined	110
4.4.1.2. Demographic features.....	110
4.4.1.3. Econotechnical features.....	111
4.4.1.4. Political-operative features.....	111
4.4.1.5. Psychosocial and sociocultural features	112
4.4.2. Reason for 1D.....	114
4.5. 1E - Describing language attitudes.....	114
4.5.1. Attitude about what?.....	115
4.5.1.1. Language use: A	115
4.5.1.2. Speakers and their language competence: B	115
4.5.1.3. Languages: C	115
4.5.1.4. Ethnicity: D	116
4.5.1.5. Language attitudes: E	116
4.5.1.6. Other	116
4.5.2. Reason for 1E	116
5. Kinetic parameter.....	117
5.1. 2A - Change in language use	118
5.1.1. Type of comparison	124
5.1.2. Evolution of language use	125
5.1.2.1. Death of language other than Basque.....	126
5.1.2.2. Increase of the use of Basque	126
5.1.2.3. Maintenance of the (non) use of Basque	126
5.1.2.4. Decline in the use of Basque	126
5.1.2.5. Death of Basque	127
5.1.2.6. Evolution of language use among languages other than Basque	127
5.1.3. Diglossia	127
5.1.4. Evolution of language use related dominance configuration table	127
5.2. 2B - Change in language competence	128
5.2.1. Type of comparison	128
5.2.2. Evolution in the speaker's linguistic repertoire.....	128
5.2.3. Evolution of language competence.....	128
5.2.3.1. Improving language competence.....	129
5.2.3.2. Maintaining language competence.....	129

5.2.3.3. Decrease in language competence.....	129
5.2.3.4. Complete loss of language competence	129
5.2.4. Evolution of route to acquiring language competence	129
5.2.5. Evolution of route to loss of language competence.....	130
5.2.6. Evolution of language competence related dominance con- figuration table.....	130
5.3. 2C - Change in language structure.....	131
5.3.1. Data derived from evolution (occurring) in language structure ...	131
5.4. 2D - Change in societal features	131
5.4.1. Evolution in societal features	132
5.5. 2E - Change in language attitudes	132
6. Dynamic parameter.....	133
6.0. Relationships between language and society.....	133
6.0.1. Types of dislocation.....	134
6.0.1.1. Physical and demographic dislocation	134
6.0.1.2. Social dislocation	136
6.0.1.3. Cultural dislocation	136
6.0.1.4. A phenomenon that involves more than one type of dislocation: urbanization	137
6.0.2. How SHB deals with the dynamic parameter.....	138
6.0.2.1. Basic explanation of cells on the dynamic parameter ..	139
6.0.2.2. Basic structure of cells on the dynamic parameter.....	141
6.0.2.3. How to assign relationships to cells	142
6.0.2.4. Detailed explanation of sources of change in the social matrix.....	146
6.1. 3A - Dynamics of change in language use.....	147
6.1.1. Relationship between dimensions	147
6.1.2. Detailed source of change - D	147
6.2. 3B - Dynamics of change in language competence.....	147
6.2.1. Relationship between dimensions	147
6.3. 3C - Dynamics of change in language structure, 3D - Dynamics of change in societal features, 3E - Dynamics of change in language attitudes.....	148
7. Prospective parameter.....	149
7.1. 4A - Expected future language use	150
7.2. 4B - Expected future language competence	150
7.3. 4C - Expected future language structure	151
7.4. 4D - Expected future societal features.....	151
7.5. 4E - Expected future language attitudes	152

8. Contrastive parameter	153
8.0. Measuring the contrast.....	153
8.0.1. Detailed points of contrast.....	153
8.0.2. Cells on the contrastive parameter.....	154
8.1. 5A, 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E. Structure of cells on the contrastive parameter.....	154
9. Prescriptive parameter	155
9.1. 6A - Language status planning	156
9.1.1. Socio-philosophical underpinnings	156
9.1.2. Degree of overtness	157
9.1.3. Goal of language planning.....	159
9.1.4. Stage of language planning.....	159
9.1.5. Actor	162
9.1.6. Directionality: top-down/bottom-up.....	162
9.1.7. Target group.....	162
9.1.8. Opinion on status planning.....	163
9.1.9. Reason for 6A.....	163
9.2. 6B - Language acquisition planning.....	163
9.2.1. Goal of language planning.....	164
9.2.1.1. Planning of speaker's linguistic repertoire.....	165
9.2.1.2. Language proficiency requirement.....	165
9.2.1.3. Language acquisition planning.....	165
9.3. 6C - Language corpus planning.....	165
9.3.1. Socio-philosophical underpinnings	167
9.3.2. Goal of language planning.....	167
9.3.2.1. Purifying language	167
9.3.2.2. Naturalising interference	168
9.3.2.3. Standardising language.....	168
9.3.2.4. Language codification	168
9.3.2.5. Developing intertranslatability	169
9.3.2.6. Language cultivation	169
9.3.2.7. Abstand/Ausbau.....	170
9.4. 6D - Planning for societal features	170
9.5. 6E - Planning for language attitudes.....	170
10. Data strength, reliability and other features of quotations.....	173
10.1. Data strength.....	173
10.1.0. General statements.....	173
10.1.0.1. Explicit data yes/no	174
10.1.0.2. Breadth of applicability	175
10.1.0.3. Is data conditioned to the writer's interests?	176

10.1.0.4. Is the source original?.....	176
10.1.0.5. To what extent can data be checked?	176
10.1.0.6. Has the data been useful?	176
10.1.0.7. Option adopted by SHB	177
10.1.1. Closeness to source.....	177
10.1.2. Strength of evidence	179
10.1.3. Relevance to research	180
10.2. Features of quotation	180
10.2.1. Monograph.....	180
10.2.2. Nature of quotation.....	180
10.2.3. Language mentioned in quotation	180
10.2.4. Language of quotation.....	181
11. SHB's sources	183
11.1. Sources for historical sociolinguistics	183
11.2. Dealing with archive materials	186
11.2.1. Collecting Basque texts in archives.....	187
11.2.2. Collecting indirect testimony.....	188
11.2.3. A practical example: archive information about Zestoa	188
Conclusion	193
Bibliography	195
Appendix: Taxonomy for the Social History of Basque - list of concepts ..	245

1. THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF BASQUE: SHB IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

As we have seen in another work (Zalbide, Joly, Gardner 2015), there are many ways of doing historical sociolinguistics and some approaches are very different from others. Having different objectives, the theoretical and methodological bases used are also different, to a large extent, despite occasionally complementing each other in some specific cases. In this section, we are going to place our project, the SHB project (Social History of Basque), in that international epistemological context.

First, we must mention a fundamental point: SHB's perspective and its sociolinguistic taxonomy is not exclusionary: an attempt has been made to include all perspectives. Nevertheless, it must be said that at the same time our methodological proposal is noticeably closer to the sociology of language than to variationism. The object to be described is not change in the language's internal configuration but, rather, the nature, evolution and, if possible, reasons for the evolution of the sociolinguistic situation. By sociolinguistic situation, we mean the explanation of parameters which the sociology of language habitually examines: language use, language competence, opinions/attitudes, language planning, etc. As our proposal gives substantial space to defining the socio-historical context, it is also close to social history and, finally, as it offers a whole line of research into language, it also takes external language history and variationist sociolinguistics into account. Our team has used the contributions of various branches of historical and synchronic sociolinguistics to establish its own model, not only in respect of its goals, but also in terms of the methodology used and the taxonomy we created. Contributions from the sociology of language have often been used as, to a lesser extent, those of variationism. Occasional contributions from other branches have also been used, as will be seen in detail in the following chapters.

SHB's methodology has tried to make use of these scientific bases, but this methodology, taken as a whole, is completely new. We have considered the creation of a whole new methodology framework to be indispensable. As we have seen (Zalbide, Joly, Gardner 2015), there is no generally accepted methodology for research in historical sociolinguistics, except in historical variationism. Usually, each author adapts and uses theoretical-methodological bases appropriate for their own partial objective. SHB's objective goes beyond that,

as it aims to reflect and present the most complete methodology possible. For the moment, this book is a first step: we are well aware that any model, however sophisticated, must be completed and adapted over time.

The model which will be presented in the following chapters is not completely universal. We have taken our starting point from international experiences and research to create a general methodology, but the resultant construct is particularly adapted to Basque: researching the social history of Basque is our main objective. We are convinced, though, that this model is valid for researching many other historical contexts involving language contact situations, once the necessary adaptations have been carried out.

The project's objective being to clarify the social history of Basque, two main tasks were contemplated from the beginning. On the one hand, creating a database on the lines of the giant databases which have been becoming common internationally in recent years, to appropriately classify data that may be of use in clarifying the social history of Basque. Secondly, putting forward a *grille de lecture* to use and examine that data, in order to ensure a homogeneous perspective in the monographs to be published within its framework. The taxonomy was created to classify the sociolinguistic information taking into account the most usual variables that arise in the international bibliography linked to the sociology of language.

1.1. SHB: THE DATABASE

More and more giant databases are being set up and used in linguistics. The latest technological innovations have strengthened this tendency considerably. These databases have brought enormous advantages to the fields of linguistics and historical sociolinguistics: they guarantee reliability and offer new ways of carrying out research (Conde 2007: 47). These databases also provide the opportunity to work with all the texts available for a given period. Thanks to this, new research parameters can be taken into account (Conde 2007: 48). However, the contribution of these databases to historical sociolinguistics is limited because they do not make the external variables affecting language use and behaviour explicit in a wholly reliable way (Conde 2007: 51).

There is a substantial difference between the database SHB has set up in comparison with databases deriving from linguistics. In addition to collecting texts, SHB also collects and classifies pertinent sociolinguistic information in particular passages of text ("quotations" in our technoelect). The SHB database has been designed specifically and directly for the analysis of the social history of language. The aim, therefore, is to classify all the sociolinguistic information

about a particular period in the database using a taxonomy that includes the different parameters raised by the sociology of language. In order to establish categories, as we will see in the following chapters, we have tried to take into account the most important variables and parameters commonly used in the sociology of language and sociolinguistics. Thanks to this, the SHB database is a fairly structured collection of information in conceptual terms: on the one hand, the aim is to guarantee the reliability of the data due to its abundance; on the other, a *grille de lecture* is provided to facilitate sociolinguistic analysis and, to an extent, to permit the systematic analysis of correlations between external variables and sociolinguistic events. Thanks to this, and to the quotations collected, the SHB database will be of use in several fields, primarily in the sociolinguistic history of languages, but also for historians, linguists, geographers, for people working in the sociology of language and, in particular, in language planning, sociologists, anthropologists, social psychologists, textbook writers and so on.

1.2. SHB: TAXONOMY PROPOSAL FOR THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF BASQUE AND MINORITY LANGUAGES

The aim is to collect and organize information in the SHB database on the sociolinguistic situation of Basque in particular epochs, periods or moments. SHB has developed a methodological model for organizing information, a *grille de lecture*, which constitutes a taxonomy for historical sociolinguistics, especially from the point of view of the sociology of language. No such tool was previously available. During the first meetings of researchers on how to write a social history of the languages of France (*Histoire Sociale des Langues de France*), for instance, this same shortcoming was encountered. There was a need for a template to define the book: temporal and spatial limits had to be designated, topics of research delineated (treatment of other languages in the area where the language is spoken, emigration and immigration, ... – see Kremnitz 2004) and a methodological framework developed. But there were no frameworks available worldwide for the sociolinguistic history of languages. In the proceedings of the conference held by the authors in Paris to prepare the publication, one can detect two types of concern: the authors point to the need to determine the object of the research with precision, and they stressed that, even if that were done, the research methodology was lacking.

To create that methodology, we have examined methodological findings since the foundation of sociolinguistics and the tools it has developed, as well as its main theoretical concepts and, bearing our task in mind, we have tried to put together a wide-ranging, flexible and detailed methodology. SHB's ob-

jective has been to put forward a methodological framework for the Basque case. As we will see later on, the construct is flexible and, at the same time, precise. It is flexible enough to apply to other languages after making some adjustments. It is also precise in the sense that it fully reflects the methodological contributions of the sociology of language to facilitate a systematic description of the social history of languages.

So we did not start from scratch when creating this taxonomy. Even though sociology of language is a fairly new discipline, a number of its main authors have defined solid theoretical bases and concepts that we have tried to put together in our model, which led us to the consecution of a global and international sociolinguistic taxonomy. In addition, there has also been in-depth work in the historical sociolinguistics field. It would have been a serious mistake to have gone ahead as if there were no precedents. They have learnt that lesson thoroughly in the natural sciences: when an unknown species is found, a new classification is not created; firstly, already existing categories are used and, if the species does not fit the model, the latter is modified and improved. So SHB's model is a taxonomic proposal for the social history of languages (in this case, that of Basque): a structured listing of all the most important sociolinguistic concepts that leads to a taxonomy in which new findings of information in sociolinguistic theory can be accumulated scientifically. Starting from the extensive heritage of concepts and terms, we have tried to draw up an appropriate methodological framework for our task.

We have created a model for Basque in Basque. We will have to continue to keep in touch with other researchers in the field of historical sociolinguistics; however, to exchange ideas and improve the model itself, this book in English is another step down this path. Several international experts (B. Jernudd, B. Spolsky and C. H. Williams) took part in the first seminar organized by SHB and, before the release of this book, international experts gave their commentary on the reading, such as J. Darquennes and W. Vandenbussche.

In fact, communication between experts in the field sometimes needs to be improved; as Willemyns and Vandenbussche (2006: 158) have already mentioned, communication between researchers has been promoted less than it should be in our field: "As such, even as of today, European historical sociolinguistics still overwhelmingly tends to concentrate on one language at a time. Certain scholars, however, have repeatedly claimed that 'true' historical sociolinguistics needs intense international and cross-linguistic collaboration." Further on, Willemyns and Vandenbussche state (2006: 159): "Also, although there is an extensive and very successful historical-sociolinguistic tradition in German linguistics, its findings are hardly ever mentioned in English language

sociolinguistics, mainly because there [sic] are always published exclusively in German. One practical example: between 1987 and 2004 there have been seven conferences on ‘Historische Soziolinguistik des Deutschen’ (Historical Sociolinguistics of German) in Rostock”.