UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Multilingualism and Language Ideologies in the Rumanian Banat

A Licentiate Thesis
by
Petteri Laihonen

HUNGARIAN STUDIES

2005

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
HUNGAROLOGIA

Petteri Laihonen
MULTILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES
IN THE RUMANIAN BANAT
Lisensiaatintyö   Yhteenveto (69 sivua) ja liitteenä 3 artikkelia
Helmikuu 2005

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Tutkimus käsittelee Romanian Baanaatin monikielisyyttä kieli-ideologioiden näkökulmasta. *Kieli-ideologiat* määritellään kieltä koskeviksi käsityksiksi tai uskomuksiksi, joita niin tavallisilla ihmisillä kuin asiantuntijoillakin on. Kieli-ideologioiden tutkimus pyrkii erittelemään kieltä koskevien käsitysten yhteyksiä valtaan ja sosiaaliseen asemaan.

Tutkijan näkökulma alueeseen on ulkopuolisen näkökulma, jonka hyötynä on kiinnostus arkipäiväisiä ja kulttuurin jäsenen näkökulmasta itsestään selviä asioita kohtaan. Lisäksi aiempi tutkimus keskittyy usein vain yhteen kansalliseen ryhmään, joka on myös näkynyt sen perusolettamuksissa. Tämä tutkimus keskittyy alueen monikielisiin ja monikulttuurisiin piirteisiin.

Aineistona toimii kenttätyöprojektin yhteydessä kerätyt haastattelut ja viimeaikainen aluetta koskeva tieteellinen kirjoittelu. Aineisto rajoittuu pohjoiseen Romanian Baanaattiin ja siellä eläviin saksalaisiin ja unkarilaisiin. Tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on selvittää miten Baanaatin monikielisyys esitetään toisaalta kirjoittavan eliitin teksteissä ja toisaalta paikallisten tavallisten ihmisten haastatteluissa. Tutkimuksen empiirinen osa koostuu kolmesta artikkelista (liitteenä). Yhteenveto tarjoaa teoreettisen kehyksen näille artikkeleille ja antaa suuntaa tulevalle väitöstyölle.

Kieli-ideologioiden tutkimuksella ei ole yhtenäistä metodiikkaa, vaan siihen sovelletaan monia kielen käytön tutkimuksen kvalitatiivisia menetelmiä. Artikkeleissa on tehty perusselvitys aineistossa esiintyvistä kieli-ideologiosta. Niiden kirjo ja vaihtelu on pyritty tuomaan esiin. Analyysit artikkeleissa ovat kiinnittäneet erityistä huomiota myös kieli-ideologioden paradoksaalisiin piirteisiin. Väitöstyötä varten on tarve kehittää metodologisia työkaluja kieli-ideologioden ilmentymien kielellisten piirteiden tarkasteluun.

Artikkelien perusteella voidaan sanoa, että Baanaattia koskeva aiempi tutkimuskirjallisuus keskittyy kuvaamaan Baanaatin ryhmiä toisistaan eristyksissä. Kenttätyömatkoilla kerättyjen haastattelujen perusteella Baanaatin asukkaat esittävät kuitenkin monikielisyyden tärkeänä osana positiivista alueellista identiteettiä, omaa äidinkieltä ei pidetä niin keskeisenä kun yleensä itäisessä Keski-Euroopassa on tapana. Paikallisen eliitin kirjoittelu taas on näiden väliltä. Siinä huomiodaan alueella yleiset käsitykset kielestä, mutta myös pohditaan niiden ristiriitaisuuksia ja yhteyksiä vallitseviin kansallisiin ideologioihin.

Asiasanat: Rumanian Banat, Multilingualism, Language Ideologies

Magyar nyelvű összefoglaló

Petteri Laihonen: Többnyelvűség és nyelvi ideológiák a romániai Bánátban
Licenciátusi munka

Kutatásom témája a romániai Bánát többnyelvűsége a nyelvi ideológiák tükrében. A *nyelvi ideológia* terminus nyelvről szóló megfogalmazásokat, véleményeket vagy hiedelmeket foglal magában, melyeket mindennapi emberek, illetve szakemberek egyaránt megfogalmazhatnak. A nyelvi ideológiák kutatásának célja annak feltárása, hogy a nyelvet érintő megfogalmazások milyen kapcsolatban állnak a hatalommal, illetve a társadalmi pozíciókkal.

Kutatásomat külső megfigyelőként végeztem. Ennek a szemléletnek az előnye az, hogy a kutató figyelmét a mindennapi, a kérdéses kultúra tagjai számára magától értetődő dolgok is felkeltik. Ezen kívül a korábbi kutatások csak egyetlen népcsoport bemutatásával foglalkoztak, ami a kutatások alapfeltevéseire is érezhetően hatással volt. Jelen kutatás a bánáti többnyelvűségre és a különféle kultúrák egymás mellett élésének jellemzésére koncentrál.

A licenciátusi munka anyagául egyrészt terepmunka során gyüjtött interjúk, másrészt a területet tárgyaló legfrisebb tudományos írások szolgáltak. Az anyaggyűjtés a romániai Bánát északi részére és az ott élő német és magyar népcsoportra korlátozódott. Kutatásom célja annak feltárása volt, hogy milyen formában kerül bemutatásra a bánáti többnyelvűség egyrészt az elit írásaiban, másrészt a területen élő egyszerű emberekkel készített interjúkban. A kutatás empirikus része három cikkből áll (lásd a mellékletet). A dolgozat bevezető részében a kutatás elméleti hátterére összpontosítok, illetve az elkövetkező disszertációm lehetséges irányvonalait részletezem.

A nyelvi ideológiák kutatásának nincs egységes módszertana, hanem több, a nyelvhasználat kutatásában szokásos kvalitatív módszer alkalmazható erre a célra. A cikkekben a kutatás anyagában előforduló nyelvi ideológiák kerülnek bemutatásra. Célom a nyevi ideológiák sokszínűségének és változatosságának bemutatása volt, ugyanakkor az elemzés során igyekeztem előtérbe állítani azok ellentmondásos vonásait is. Elkövetkező disszertációmhoz szükség van új módszertani eszközök kidolgozására, amelyek segítséget nyújhatanak a nyelvi ideológiák nyelvi jellemzőinek elemzésében.

A cikkek alapján megállapítható, hogy a Bánátot bemutató korábbi források a területen élő népcsoportokat egymástól izoláltan ábrázolják. A terepmunka során gyűjtött interjúk ezzel szemben arról tanúskodnak, hogy a Bánátban élők a többnyelvűséget területi identitásuk pozitív jellemzőjének tartják, továbbá anyanyelvükre nem helyeznek olyan hangsúlyt, mint ahogy ez Kelet-Közép-Európában szokásos. A helyi elit írásai viszont e két szemlélet között foglalnak helyet. Ezen írások egyrészt a területen fellelhető, általános, nyelvről szóló megfogalmazásokat mutatják be, másrészt elemzik ezek ellentmondásos vonásait, illetve kapcsolatait a fennálló nemzeti ideológiákkal.

CONTENTS

1 Introduction

The aim of my licentiate thesis is to illuminate multilingualism in the Rumanian Banat through the examination of linguistic ideologies. My basic approach is to contrast the views from below, the local inhabitants, with the views of the writing, educated elite. My focus is on the contemporary Banat. The views of the ordinary people are presented through interviews, whereas the views of the elite in the light of contemporary academic publications. My goal is not so much to give an "objective" inventory of multilingualism in the Banat, but to analyse the interpretations that have been made about it.

My research was initiated by a joint Finnish-Hungarian fieldwork project, carried out between 1997 and 2000, concentrating on the Hungarian and German minorities in the northern Rumanian Banat (the area between Arad, Timişoara [G: Temeswar, H: Temesvár] and Lipova [G,H: Lippa]). The main aim of the project was to carry out interviews on culture, language, religion, history, power and ethnic relationships among these groups. This amounted to 90 interviews by the Finish team and about 100 interviews by the Hungarian team. For the articles I have examined 12 interviews carried out by myself and 57 interviews conducted by the rest of the Finnish fieldwork team. Furthermore, as data on the elite views about language, I use contemporary academic publications from Rumania, Hungary and Germany. Due to the limitations of the data, the scope of my study is narrowed to the Hungarian and German inhabitants (which are the historically largest minorities in the region) in the northern part of the Banat.

In the fieldwork group, my task was to conduct research from the viewpoint of linguistics (other participants are involved in ethnology,

folklore and history). Thus during fieldwork I concentrated on everything that seemed to be connected with language(s). Right from the beginning it seemed quintessential that the Banat is characterized through widespread individual and social multilingualism. In the interviews this multilingualism is described as a natural, fundamentally positive phenomenon. Furthermore, it is often referred to as a symbol for tolerance, depicted as the most significant determining element of the region. However, most of the previous research on the Banat is concentrated on the isolation of a given language and ethnic group. Furthermore, in these academic writings, other language groups are described in negative terms. Thus, in the writings an image of the Banat as an arena for languages in competition is constructed.

This discrepancy struck me as I went through previous research literature on the Banat after the fieldwork trips. On the one hand, it seemed astonishing how natural and positive individual multilingualism was depicted by the local inhabitants.[1] On the other hand, it seemed likewise astonishing how little attention most books and articles on the Banat gave this matter. This experience turned my attention towards the study of *language ideologies*[2] through two different types of data, the interviews and the academic writings. According to Susan Gal (2002:197):

> Linguistic ideologies are the culturally specific notions which participants and observers bring to language, the ideas they have about what language is good for, what linguistic differences mean about the speakers who use them, why there are linguistic differences at all.

---

[1] This was surprising from my experiences of widespread monolingualism and the emphasis on mother tongue in general in Eastern Central Europe. See e.g. Laihonen 2002.
[2] I use "language ideologies" and "linguistic ideologies" interchangeably.

Finally, a part of the gist of the term *language ideologies* is to connect ideas, beliefs or theories about language with other issues in the social world, such as power and social position.

1.1 Approach

I have chosen the approach of language ideologies to deal with talk about language in the interviews, since I found it to fit best the data-driven set up of my project. I started with an interactionally oriented mind, stemming from my Master of Arts thesis in the field of conversation analysis. Even though bilingual issues have been studied through this method (Auer 1984, 1998), it seemed unfit for the characterisation of a region. In other words, I assumed that the characterisation of sequential structures would not suffice to illuminate the specific characters of multilingualism in the Banat (but see Gal 1987). Furthermore, interview data seemed not to be the best material to analyse such structures as code-switching. However, the practices of conversation analysis were not totally abandoned. Among others, the presentation of large amounts of data in the articles stems from this orientation.

To put it simply, the articles that form the core of this study consist of the comparative study of ideas, beliefs or (folk/elite) theories about language (e.g. Gal 1993, 1998:318) as manifested in the two types of data. I examine such utterances as the following:

You see here in the Banat you should know at least three languages (Hungarian woman, 54)
Those people aren't even willing to learn Hungarian (Hungarian man, 34)
Hungarian, yes I know it, perfect Hungarian and I understand Rumanian that is normal here (German woman, 64)
Everything was German (German woman, 76)

What would the Banat had been without its German inhabitants? (Greffner 1996:3)

The Germans lived only for frugality and hard work, which made the others laugh at them. (Ács 1996:107)
Linguistic islands are enclaves separated from their own language community by foreign languages and cultures. (Protze 1995:55)
The Rumanians have not assimilated minorities. (Cretan 1997:133)

(Translated from the originals in Hungarian or German)

These utterances can be seen as examples of language ideologies on the surface of my data. In the articles these utterances are always presented and examined in their interactional/textual context. The examples above are rather transparent since they contain reference to language or an ethnic group or culture. I have included reference to ethnicity and nationality[3], since I subscribe to the basic assumption, that "all languages and linguistic features are indexes of the people who use those forms." (Gal 2002:200). Finally, all of these examples position language (or nationality) in a claim, theory, evaluation, view, belief or idea.

What I have here labelled as ideas, beliefs or theories about language are not a new phenomenon to investigate. Researchers from different disciplines have long treated them as significant and developed different methods to analyse them. To begin with, in applied linguistics ideas or beliefs about language have been traditionally studied as *attitudes* from a social psychological framework (see Baker 1992). The study of language attitudes has largely been quantitative and hypothesis driven (but see Kalaja 1999). Thus it can be considered reductive because of the need to operationalize the variables.

Dufva, Lähteenmäki and Isoherranen (1996) have studied ordinary people's talk about language as "everyday knowledge of language". Here the focus has been on the mental processes. Even though

---

[3] 'Nationality' is used in my study to mean membership of a culture or language group, not citizenship.

the approach has been dialogical, the instances of talk are analysed in isolation from their interactional context. Similarly in some sociolinguistic work the analysis has centred around examining the cognitive processes behind the informants' accounts (e.g. Langman & Lanstyák 2000).[4] Finally, citations from interviews have been used to demonstrate some general identity category first constructed through a survey (see Iskanius 2004).

A more conversational, situational and socially grounded method has been offered by the approach of *folk-linguistics* (Niedzielski & Preston 2000). It presents an exploratory framework for the qualitative analysis of talk about language which is similar to my approach in that it pays attention to the interactional characteristics as well. However, I do not share its concern of contextualizing the investigation of folk theories with psycholinguistic theories. Furthermore, the categories of discussion and analysis have been preset (see Niedzielski & Preston 2000: 35), rather than data-driven.

The benefits of the language ideologies approach in comparison with other approaches can be summarized as follows. First, it is an open, general approach. It is thus suitable for both interactional and text analysis. Secondly, it is not committed to a mental explanation of ideas about language, rather focusing on the socio-cultural dimensions. Thirdly, it enables the data-driven investigation of the interviews, not imposing some standard categories on it. Fourthly, and most importantly, through the notion of *ideology* it focuses on the connections of the ideas of language with social positions and power.

Finally, Gal's definition of language ideologies and their study (cited in page 2) is concluded as follows:

---

[4] In this case a goal can be for instance "to examine the extent to which subjects have internalized [a] myth." (Langman & Lanstyák 2000:64).

> Both ordinary people and social scientists – linguists, sociologists, anthropologists – hold language ideologies. We can only hope to describe and understand some of these, and not always our own.
> (Gal 2002:197)

That is, the study of language ideologies is aimed at the analysis of both the notions by the ordinary people and those of the experts. Thus it serves well my purpose to compare the interviews with the academic writings.

1.2 Research questions and goals

The approach of language ideologies has enabled me to pose the following research questions around multilingualism in the Banat in the articles:

> 1) What kind of language ideologies are typical for the interviews?
>
> 2) What kind of language ideologies are represented and constructed in the academic writings about the Banat?

A further question to be examined in my doctoral dissertation will be how these language ideologies are discursively (linguistically and sequentially) constructed in the data.

Next, I will briefly discuss why I find it important to study the Banat as a case of diverse and sometimes conflicting language ideologies. To begin with, the Banat seems to present a special case of regionalism, identity construction, language politics and ethnic history in Eastern Central Europe (e.g. Bodó 1994, 2003, 2004; Neumann 1996; Chelchea 1999; Batt 2001). The characteristics of the Banat are of course under dispute. However, among the researchers there seems to be a consensus that there is an essential difference between the Banat and other regions in Rumania

or in Central Europe in general.[5] This difference seems to revolve around multilingual history and the interpretations around it, which constitute typical language ideologies. In brief, the characterisation of the Banat region is bound with the description of language ideologies.

My data is not suited for technical estimates on the factors of, for instance, language shift of the Hungarian population in the region. Furthermore, my goal is not to evaluate the diverse ideas about multilingualism as 'right' or 'wrong'. In sum, my aim is not so much to give an "objective" inventory of multilingualism in the Banat[6], but to analyse the interpretations that have been made about it.

Language ideologies are never only about language (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994:55-56, Woolard 1998:3). For instance, according to Spitulnik (1998:164) they can be about "the production of social relations of sameness and difference, and the creation of cultural stereotypes". From the point of view of constructing sameness and difference, and the role of language in it, my data on the Banat presents an ideal case for study. For example, cultural stereotypes for both monolingual and multilingual persons can be examined on the basis of my data.

Language ideologies are closely tied to positions of power. It is an import goal to specify the social location and historical context of the

---

[5] However, this notion seems to require first hand knowledge of the area, since scholars doing research on minorities in other parts of Rumania often assume homogeneity of e.g. "German identity in Rumania", thus emphasizing a state centred view instead of a regional one (as in Verdery 1985: footnote 81). Also in international contexts a unified, a state based view is overwhelmingly dominant (cf. Bodó 2004). In general, my experience is similar to Stevenson (1997:193-194) that minority research is burdened by a general reductionism. In his words (1997:194) a basic problem is that, "minority groups are conceptualised as homogenous and internally cohesive 'communities' and they are situated accordingly within the larger context of the state which they inhabit".

[6] It should be noticed that some basic 'facts' about the demographic, social, historical, legal etc. characteristics of multilingualism in the Banat have to be charted in this study too. All three articles contain introductory sections or paragraphs which give the reader a general picture of the Banat. However, it is not the final or primary goal to diagnose the region or language groups from such an approach.

different linguistic views (Gal & Woolard 1995:131). In my case the interviews represent the ordinary inhabitants of the Banat. Even though people with different social and educational background are included, the homogeneity of these folk views about language is surprising. The writings are much more heterogeneous and show that the representations and constructions of the linguistic situation (in whatever form) is itself conditioned by a region's position in worldwide processes. In the case of the Banat, the discourses about its linguistic situation or multilingualism are largely guided by the general discourse on language in Central Europe. Many of the publications, analysed in the articles 1 and 3, are published in for instance Hungary or Germany. Furthermore, local intellectuals participate in this debate, too. These accounts are examined in article 2.

Since the fall of communism in Eastern Central Europe a lot of attention has been given to the minorities issue in the form of research, polemics and political decisions. For instance, the Hungarian minority in Rumania has been the frequent subject of acts, memoranda and reports by the European Union, Hungary and Rumania in the recent years (see Laihonen & Nyyssönen 2002). Furthermore, the decisions made in Bucharest, Hungary, Germany or the European Union, have a great effect on the lives of the inhabitants of the Banat. One central question is the definition and codification of a state language and its relationship to minority languages and their categorization. These decisions are typically guided by language ideologies, which thus have very real effects (cf. Gal & Woolard 1995:131).

As Woolard (1998:16) stresses, language ideologies also serve as an interpretative filter to the effect that political and social events have for instance on language maintenance or shift. Their effect on the local level is however not straightforward. For instance as the work of Gal (e.g. 1993) has shown, the contestation of dominant language ideologies is a

possible response by the linguistic minorities against the acts of power imposed on them.

The goals of my articles can be summarized as follows:

1) To examine multilingualism in the Banat.
2) To provide an inventory of language ideologies manifested in my data.
3) To discuss the role of social position and power in the construction of these language ideologies.

In the articles the two sources of data, the interviews and the written texts, represent two perspectives to these questions. The elite (academic, national) perspective is presented by the writings and everyday (folk, local) views are presented by the interviews. In the articles my basic approach is to compare these two perspectives. In the dissertation to follow this comparison is extended to the linguistic devices used in them.

These research questions and goals are to be found in the articles, which are summarized in chapter 5. Here a brief summary of their goals is given. The aim of articles 1 and 3 is to provide a general inventory of views about different languages and about multi- and monolingualism among the interviewed Hungarians (article 1) and Germans (article 3). These are contrasted with national (Hungarian/German/Rumanian) elite descriptions of the history of the Banat. Furthermore, the different social positions of the informants and the elite are discussed. The goal of article 2 is to discuss the diversity of local language ideologies around multi- and monolingualism. Folk theories of multi- and monolingualism are described on the basis of the interviews among the Hungarians and some paradox features are discussed. This discussion is contrasted with writings

of the local elite. Here the focus is on the illumination of different interpretations of ideology (e.g. different views about cultural and linguistic tolerance) connected to the different social positions of the informants and the writing local elite.

A future goal to be explored in my dissertation is to analyse the linguistic devices and structures that are involved in the construction of language ideologies. This requires the use of some additional methodological tools. In order to explicate the interactional structures involved in the talk about language, an application of Conversation Analysis will be used. For the analysis of linguistic patterns in the text, a version of Critical Discourse Analysis will be applied in the dissertation thesis. These methodological tools will be briefly introduced in 4.4**.**

1.3 The goal and structure of this summary

The Licentiate thesis consists of this summary and three articles attached in the Appendix. The goal of this summary is to show the current state of my research and to point to some future directions for the dissertation thesis. The articles are largely empirical in character, thus the focus of this summary is on the theoretical grounding of my research. Furthermore, other important aspects of my research that have not been discussed systematically in the articles are included in the summary.

The formulation of research questions and goals has been borne out of examination of the data, not as hypotheses prior to it. The data originates from a fieldwork project, which will be described in chapter 2. Here, I will briefly discuss the question of the outsider's view applied in my research. Furthermore, I will explicate some of the restrictions of the data which limit the validity of my research.

Previous studies on the contemporary Banat will be reviewed in chapter 3. Here the focus will be on comparing my approach with the

methodology applied in other studies. Furthermore, research questions and goals have been influenced by the theory and practice in the study of language ideologies, which will be discussed in more depth in chapter 4. The results of the articles will be summarized in chapter 5. Finally, conclusions are presented in chapter 6.

2 Fieldwork and Data

This study was initiated by fieldwork. That is, the research began with an exploratory fieldwork project in a relatively unknown region. The articles, as well as plans for further research, consist of attempts to deal with the data gathered in this project. Even though the Finnish research group has carried out altogether 90 interviews, the data still has its limitations in space, time, religion, ethnicity and language. These restrictions will be discussed in some detail (subchapter 2.1) since they are significant limitations of the validity of my research. Following this, the interview and transcription practices are briefly described (subchapter 2.2).

According to Woolard (1998:26-27), it is a fundamental requirement to recognize, describe and reflect upon the researcher's previous knowledge and personal history in relation to a research topic. In anthropology this task has long been taken seriously.[1] Nevertheless, numerous fields of linguistics still leave the question of researcher position unnoticed. As a protest to this authoritative, privileged view, among others linguistic anthropology (e.g. Duranti 1997:91), many branches of sociolinguistics (e.g. Sarangi & Candlin 2001:383) and critical discourse analysis (e.g. Fairclough 1989:5) stress that it is no longer tenable to assume that the researcher can be a totally objective observer and analyst. In order to illuminate my relationship with the research topic, I will dedicate subchapter 2.3 for a discussion of the *outsider's view*. That is, due to the academic and personal backgrounds, the Finnish participants were outsiders to this region, which has some consequences for my research

---

[1] For instance, Anttonen (1999) begins her dissertation thesis with a 50 page discussion on her personal history and relationship with the field.

design in comparison with the insider's perspective. Finally, ethical questions are described briefly (subchapter 2.4).

2.1 Project and data

My research on the Rumanian Banat began from a joint fieldwork project of the Universities of Jyväskylä and Szeged (Hungary). During the first year, 1997, the focus of the project was on ethnology[2], for the remaining three years the Finnish team was joined by myself, a linguist and by prof. Anssi Halmesvirta, a historian. Our fieldwork concentrated on the Hungarian and German minorities living in the region. Beyond my own research, as an undergraduate student at that time, my task was to give Hungarian language assistance to prof. Halmesvirta in his interviews with the local Hungarian political and cultural elite.[3]

The fieldwork consisted of three trips, lasting for ten days each, to the region between the towns Arad, Lipova and Timişoara. We rented a car from Szeged, Hungary, and drove it through the region. We were lodged at the premises of the *Caritas* organization of the Catholic Church in Lipova. Its staff provided help to find the local Germans and Hungarians. This help was especially valuable in the villages where the number of Germans and Hungarians is low. This resulted also in better knowledge of the catholic population, which is mainly Hungarian and/or German speaking. The Catholic church seems to be the organisation which has most grass-root connections to the local inhabitants. Thus, we were able to get into contact with ordinary people instead of intelligentsia and political activists. The local Hungarian elite, interviewed by Halmesvirta,

---

[2] Participants from the department of ethnology (University of Jyväskylä) included prof. Bo Lönnqvist (1997-2000), head of the project, MA Pasi Hannonen (1997-2000) and MA Pirkko Järvelä (1997). The Hungarian research group was headed by prof. Gábor Barna.

[3] For a brief description of the fieldwork of the Hungarian research group, see Barna 2001:107-108. The fieldwork and data of the Hungarian group will not be discussed here since I have not examined their data in the articles.

was reached with the help of the Arad office of the political organization 'Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania'.

The Finnish fieldwork team conducted altogether 90 interviews. The interviews carried out by the project group are the main data for my research. I carried out 12 interviews with Hungarian speaking inhabitants mainly in the second and third year (1999-2000). Together with Halmesvirta we carried out 21 interviews with the local elite. The ethnologists carried out 57 interviews mainly with German speaking inhabitants.[4] Finally, the Hungarian research group carried out around 100 interviews.

In the articles, I examine the interviews carried out by myself (articles 1 and 2 in the Appendix) and a part of those carried out by the ethnologists (article 3). All in all, only a preliminary analysis of the materials has been carried out by the research group. Thus, a wealth of untouched data is available for my use in the further analysis to be carried out for the completion of my dissertation.

Our aim was to find informants from all age groups and educational/social groups. Our success was at least partial, for instance my 12 interviewees were between 19 and 80. In the case of German speaking inhabitants it was almost impossible to find young informants (only 2 persons of the interviewed 38 Germans were less than 50 years old, see Hannonen 2001:49). In general female informants were in slight majority, however the 21 interviewed persons from the Hungarian elite were solely men. With regard to education even high-school level was rare in the case of villages. For instance, one of my informants told me that he spent altogether two years at school. However, in towns we found informants

---

[4] According to Hannonen (2001:49), the exact numbers for the distribution of nationalities (or ethnic groups) in the interviews carried out by the ethnologists are: 38 Germans, 17 Hungarians and 2 others. The category of nationality is used by the research group according to local definitions. That is, through self-categorization by the informant or through (unchallenged) categorization by a local contact person.

with secondary and university level education. A majority of the interviewed can be considered as members of the working class (excluding those interviewed by Halmesvirta). Most informants in the villages had worked in the collective farm. In the towns, factory workers, gardeners and drivers could be given as examples of typical occupations. The few 'white-collar' informants, interviewed by the ethnologists, were a teacher, a doctor of medicine, an engineer and a former mayor. [5]

Beyond the data analysed so far in the articles, the interviews among the Hungarian speaking elite (politicians, teachers, cultural persons and priests) with Halmesvirta gave me an overall picture of the political, educational, cultural and religious situation of the Hungarian minority in the Banat. This overall picture was complemented – sometimes confronted – with the interviews among ordinary people, not involved in community leadership. Even though the interviews with the elite were focused on other matters than language, language issues were included *in passim*. For instance, different issues of language politics were discussed frequently. Thus, these interviews with the elite serve as contextual material. During the fieldwork they served me as a perspective to various political macro-issues in the area, such as the organization of minority schools or the situation of the Hungarian cultural associations in the area.[6]

Beyond the interviews other ethnographic data was collected as well. During the fieldwork trips I kept a diary about places and people we visited and on the conversations the research group had, especially in the evenings after a day of interviewing. Some notes from my diary have been involved in the articles. For instance, the description of the visual use

[5] For more information on the interviews carried out by the ethnologists, see Hannonen 2001:47-51.

[6] The themes of these interviews are analysed in Halmesvirta 2001.

15

of different languages in the public (e.g. signs, street names) is based on my diary. Furthermore, all kinds of available materials, mainly newspapers and leaflets were collected by the research group (and analysed by Halmesvirta 2001). Also many photos of landscapes, buildings, streets, cemeteries and people were taken. Finally, correspondence (by letter and e-mail) with some informants is taking place even today.

The data is restricted in space, time, religion, ethnicity, language and so on. To begin with, we have not interviewed people in all parts of the Rumanian Banat. Most of our interviews were carried out in the area between Timişoara, Arad and Lipova, which is the northern part of the Banat (see the map in Appendix). Therefore, the findings of our research cannot be generalised to the whole historical Banat, including the parts in Hungary (1%) and Serbia (33%). From the Rumanian Banat we have interviewed people only from 4 towns (including Arad, Timişoara, Lipova and Pecica [H: Ópécska, G: Petschka]) and about 10 villages. Furthermore, our data was gathered through brief visits to the informants' homes. Thus some issues, such as social networks (see e.g. Gal 1979: chapter 5) cannot be analysed through this data. Their study would require participant observation and a longer stay in the area.

Most of our informants are members of the Catholic church. According to the 2002 census (see www.recensamant.ro) about 11 percent of the total population of the investigated counties (Arad, Timiş) belong to the Roman Catholic Church, most of which are Hungarians and Germans. Thus, the narrowing of the scope of the informants to German and Hungarian speakers is intertwined with an emphasis on the Catholic population.

A significant restriction of the data is that it includes only speakers of Hungarian and/or German language. Thus the representatives of the majority, Rumanians have largely been left out from the scope of

project.[7] Other significant groups left out from the data include the Roma and Serbians.[8] A basic reason for these restrictions was the lack of contact resources and language competence.

Finally, due to the focus on the Hungarian and German minorities, practically all our informants are bi/multilingual. Thus, the results of my research are valid only about the bi/multilingual population. It has to be noticed, that language ideologies of the monolingual inhabitants of the Banat would probably be different from those of the interviewed.

To sum up the scope of my interview data:

i) It consists of 90 interviews by the Finnish research group: 12 interviews carried out by myself (analysed in articles 1 and 2), 57 interviews carried out by the ethnologists (analysed in article 3), and 21 interviews carried out by Halmesvirta. The about 100 interviews by the Hungarian research group are available for use, too.

ii) It is territorially limited to the northern Rumanian Banat.

iii) It consists of interviews carried out during brief visits to the homes of the informants'.

iv) It focuses on the Roman Catholic population.

v) It focuses on the Hungarian and German population.

vi) It includes only bi/multilingual persons.

In spite of its limitations, the data is sufficient for the purpose of this study, which is the qualitative analysis of talk about language. The interviews contain a wealth of folk theories, beliefs and ideas about language. Among others, almost all interviews include discussions about first language, multilingualism and monolingualism. Only a part of the data has been analysed in the articles. The range and diversity of language ideologies already in this part of the data has been abundant (see chapter 5). The limitations of space, time, religion, ethnicity and language are

---

[7] Nevertheless, there are some interviews where a Rumanian family member is involved, sometimes with the help of interpretation. Further, two interviews with people categorized as Rumanians were carried out in Hungarian.

[8] For census statistics, see the appendix to article 3.

significant for the validity of my research. However, at the same time these limitations serve as a practical narrowing of the scope and complexity of the discussed issues. My focus is on the two most significant minority groups, the Hungarians and the Germans. Furthermore, a reasonable overview of the groups is provided through the large number of interviews, which is sufficient to describe the scale of language ideologies among the population.

Finally, some words about the writings analysed in the articles. I have focused on contemporary academic texts on the Banat. Most of the analysed articles and books, published mainly in Rumania, Germany and Hungary, have been written after 1989. At times it is different to establish the line between popular texts and academic writing (for a discussion, see article 3). In 'academic' writing I have included texts which 1) contain systematic reference to sources, and 2) are written by professional researchers. Furthermore, most of them have been published in an academic context. Only some of the writings focus solely on the Banat. A number of them are general reference volumes for Rumania or historical Hungary.

In article 1 I examine different descriptions of the history of the Banat on the basis of Hungarian, German and Rumanian general sources. In article 2, my written data consists mainly of writings by intellectuals active in the Banat (e.g. Bodó, Neumann, Chelcea). Finally, the focus of article 3 is on the German writings.

2.3 Interview methods

Next, I will briefly describe the way the interviews were planned and carried out. Due to lack of previous knowledge on the area, there was little to begin with in the first fieldwork trip (1998). Thus I followed the practice

of the other members of the group to collect local life-stories without interruptive questions.

For my interviews from the second fieldwork trip (1999) on I had list of questions to put forward in order to keep the conversation going and to direct the conversation towards language use. I planned to begin the interview with basic questions on demographic background of the interviewee (age, place of birth, occupation, education). Then I planned to ask about their history of language use (what languages they speak, what was spoken at home as a child etc.). Further, I planned to turn the topic towards current language use and finally make some provocative questions (e.g. "have you ever been told not to speak Hungarian?").[9] In practice the interviewees were so talkative that the list was impossible to follow, certain things from the end of the list came often already spontaneously in the beginning of the interview. Thus, the list was mainly used as a reminder for possible questions when the conversation lapsed. The interviews were carried out mostly at peoples homes, thus often more than one person was present, and involved in the discussion. Furthermore, some interviews involved more people from our research group. This resulted in a more conversational atmosphere, where it was typical that also the interviewed asked questions (typically about the background of the researcher).

In sum, the interviews were unstructured, open-ended and conversation like. Thus, the interviewer can be seen to contribute as much as the interviewee and they should be treated as a piece of social interaction in their own right (Whetherel & Potter 1992:99). Therefore, I have paid attention to the sequential locations of informant talk in the

---

[9] However, no provocative counter arguments or questioning of the interviewees position were made. This was part of the practice by Whetherel and Potter (1992:99) for interviewing former civil servants. In our case, interviewing ordinary 'folk' it was deemed too offensive.

articles (for instance, whether a certain statement is produced as a summary to previous talk or as an answer to the interviewer's question).

All the interviews by the project were transcribed. However, in general only a raw draft was prepared by the Finnish group containing information on the matters the researcher in question held important. In my case an interview made about 5 to 6 pages of raw transcription, which includes more detailed excerpts dealing with language issues. These excerpts are modestly coded including pauses, changes of voice, repair and some intonation. The Hungarian research group has prepared a full raw transcription of their interviews, which, together with some tape recordings, are also available for me to analyse. Reading their transcripts and listening to some of the tapes has helped me to see what is typical in larger amount of data. However, I have not included the interviews by the Hungarians as data in the articles.

2.4 The outsider's view

Before my first fieldwork trip to the Banat I had virtually no knowledge of the area. Thus, my approach is in the first place an outsider's view. The person in charge of the Finnish fieldwork team, Prof. Bo Lönnqvist has described his impressions of being a researcher in the Banat as well. In Norway he studied the routines of "Norwegian" everyday life from the outsider's view (see Lönnqvist 1995). He worked with the method of writing a diary on the features that struck him as different at the homes of the people, at public transportation, at the University cafeteria and so on. As a reflective basis Lönnqvist used his own background which was rather similar but still different to the observed culture (a Finnish person with Swedish mother tongue living in Helsinki). In comparison to Norway, the Banat presented a different world. Lönnqvist (2000:147) describes his relationship to the region as that of a *traveller*, rather than

that of a participant observer. That is, here the differences are not concealed underneath the conformity of an apparently similar society (cf. Lönnqvist 1995:56). Furthermore, through fieldwork in the Banat previous – theoretical and subjective – schemes of identity became questioned rather than served as comparative basis (Lönnqvist 2000:147).

In my case the proximity to the field was less. Educated in linguistics and Hungarian studies, I had previous experience from Hungary, which however proved superfluous. All I knew about Rumania, or minorities in Rumania were based on second hand knowledge on Hungarians and Saxons in Transylvania from my visits to Hungary and Germany. This information was mainly about Rumanian-Hungarian conflicts and the emigration of Saxons to Germany.[10] The handbooks and introductory works to bilingualism pay hardly any attention to Rumania – even less notice is given to the Banat region – thus my intellectual background upon arrival in the Banat was practically a *tabula rasa*. During the first trip it became clear to me that the complex nature of the linguistic situation in the Banat cannot be understood from the basis of information on other circum-Hungarian regions. My first impressions of the Banat were that I had arrived to a place, of which I had no previous knowledge.

From this background, a quantitative hypothesis based research design has been out of the question. Moreover, an empiricist, qualitative attitude is emphasized in the articles, in order to base the findings mainly on the interviews and experiences from the fieldwork. However, some basic historical and demographic background has to be provided, in order to give the reader some sort of understanding of this largely unknown region. Thus, the articles all include some sort of

---

[10] The Germans living in the Banat are named *Banater Schwaben* (Swabians of the Banat). They contrast sharply with the Saxons (of Transylvania) due to historical, social, occupational and congregational differences. Among others, Swabians are usually Catholics, whereas most Saxons are Lutherans.

language ecologies (demographic data, historical description, language rights situation, education etc.).

In connection to the outsider's view, the research has been initiated through scientific curiosity towards this neglected but significant region. In comparison, from the insider's view, two kinds of quasi-political motives are quite common in the writings on linguistic minorities, at least in the context of Eastern Central Europe. First, the approach of linguistic rights, from this point of view linguistic diversity and equality is typically promoted by describing violations of the rights to use a language in certain situations (in education, administration, court, media, church and so on, see e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 2002). Secondly, there seems to be a more traditional motive to foster a language and a culture through documenting and studying it. In a similar manner, a typical research problem for the previous research on the contemporary Banat (which is reviewed in chapter 3) seems to be whether the investigated people (Germans or Hungarians) are maintaining their assumed separate identity and/or mother tongue (see e.g. Toma 1998:59; Kupó 2002:99).

The few studies on the Eastern Central European minorities from the outsider's view, seem to pay more attention to multicultural and multilingual characteristics (cf. Gal 2002:203-204). For instance, Langman (1998) concludes her case study on a young Hungarian minority activist in Slovakia by underlining her informant's knowledge of Slovakian as a fundamental factor of his identity. Gal (2002:203-04) in turn has accused German and Hungarian linguists of widely neglecting the study of bilingualism of Hungarian and German minorities in Eastern Central Europe. Rather, she argues, these minorities have been depicted as linguistic enclaves and the focus has been on their ability to "maintain" archaic features of language and culture.

A definite benefit of the insider's view is that the cultural codes are familiar. For the outsider, some sort of competence in the culture(s) and language(s) in question is required if the researcher is not to become a member of the community himself, as in our case. General issues, such as data on history, demography and language politics, which serve as basic introductory sections in the articles, have been constructed through secondary sources. Everything else is based on the fieldwork. Due to my studies in Hungarian Studies and German philology, I have partial resources to understand these cultural codes.

Being a "true insider" to the study of multilingualism in the Banat would require competence in at least four languages. My competence of the languages spoken in the area include Hungarian and German. This is deficient in some way, competence in Rumanian would be helpful. Furthermore, a proper study for example on language contacts in the Banat would require fluency in at least 4 languages (Rumanian, German, Hungarian, Serbian). In practice, however, at least in the Central European context, most researchers master only two languages spoken in multilingual areas. Furthermore, most previous research (see chapter 3) has focused on a one language group.

As a partial solution, I have attempted to find studies that present the otherwise neglected views (e.g. on the views of the Rumanians see Cretan 1997, Cristea, Lațea & Chelcea 1997, Chelcea 1999). Furthermore, my focus on Hungarian and German minorities (which are also the historically largest minorities in the region) serves as a practical narrowing of the scope of the enormous ethnic and linguistic complexity of the region. A complete picture of a theme around the Banat's linguistic mosaic could be charted only by a large research programme with multilingual researchers.

In closer scrutiny the terms *insider* and *outsider* appear vague. The borders of culture and language are under constant dispute in Eastern Central Europe. For instance, are Hungarian researchers from Hungary insiders to the culture of Hungarians living in the surrounding countries? In any case, at times there is a definite difference in their writings when compared to the local Hungarian researchers (as demonstrated in article 2). From this point of view, there appear to be various categories of researchers. For instance, local researchers of their own culture, researchers from the 'home' state, researchers from foreign cultures abroad, researchers from the majority of the state and so on.[11] From these positions, ours (researchers from foreign cultures abroad) seems to be the least interest laden.

Furthermore, it has been noticed that often for instance sociolinguists cannot be insiders to the non-standard language they study since they are mostly standard language users themselves (Wilson 2001:334). The insider's view seems to have a similar problem in Eastern Central Europe. When the research is carried out among the people, then the elite is often over-represented (e.g. Gereben 1999, Bodó 2003). For instance, Langman and Lanstyák (2000:60) justify having such a sample as follows: " [the sample is] one in which we might expect to find a greater degree of self-awareness in terms of language and its relationships to social issues". This justification is not based on empirical evidence, but on

---

[11] Péntek (2002) provides an extensive review of recent (1990-2002) research on the Hungarian language in Rumania (Transylvania). According to this review most researchers are Hungarians living in Rumania or Hungary. Furthermore two studies by Rumanian researchers are mentioned (p. 25). There are some studies by Germans (published both in Rumania and Germany), too. Finally, the only study by a researcher from a foreign culture in the review is my article from 2001 (article 1).

the sole preconception of the role of education. My research shows this preconception overrated at least in the case of the Banat.[12]

To conclude, a gain of the outsider's view is the need and motivation to empirically investigate phenomena which are taken for granted by the insider's view. For example, in interview situations, it enabled us to ask questions on the details of everyday life that would have been considered impolite if posed by local researchers since they would be assumed to already know the answers. Finally, the outsider's view enables us to discover and analyse paradoxical dimensions of culture, which seems to be a looming characteristic of language ideologies in the Banat.

2.4 Ethical questions

As researchers we have a responsibility towards the people we study. The questions of ethics of fieldwork and publication should be acknowledged by modern research (Duranti 1998:119-121). In our case permission for interviewing and tape recording was always asked before each interview. Only once was permission denied for tape recording and note taking (not for interviewing!). This was remarkable in a country where before 1990 all contacts with foreigners were controlled. Moreover, most people were happy to be interviewed, and some people told us that they had been disappointed that they had not been interviewed already the previous year.

In the articles all effort has been taken to hide the identity of the informants. To begin with, no names, or reference to names have been used. Furthermore, I have avoided giving specific cross reference to information such as profession and place (e.g. "a German teacher from Lipova"), since such information would make the informants easy to trace.

---

[12] A possible future examination of the interviews carried out among the Hungarian elite (see 2.2) could provide empirical insights to the role of education (or class) in the construction of language ideologies.

Unfortunately, not all studies on the Banat have followed this practice and it has been far too easy for me to recognize some of the informants in other studies.[13] In spite of all the effort, I guess with some luck some of my informants could be traceable, too. This cannot be totally avoided if excerpts of data are presented. However, it is very unlikely and no very sensitive materials have been presented.

Finally, issues of ethics are more complex than that. One difficult question is how do the informants see the research and how does the research affect their lives? Even though we were at pains to explain that our research had no political goals, this was hard to believe for the local inhabitants. One Rumanian research group (Cristea, Latea & Chelcea 1997) carrying out interviews with the local Roma write the following (p. 56, translated from Hungarian): "We meant something different for the locals. We came "from Bucharest", that is from where a law or an act by the government would change their lives (or so they hoped)." In our case some informants posed hopes for a change in the policies of international aid for the region (e.g. "next time they send help from Hungary/Germany…"). Of course, in both cases the hopes were in vain.

The effect of my research on the subjects of research can be evaluated together with the impact of my research. A basic impact of this research is making the Banat better known for the scientific community. Since I am studying and presenting folk views about multilingualism, the voice of the informants can be seen to represent the local Hungarians and Germans. From this viewpoint, the local views are no longer totally ignored in the scientific discourse. This information is available for decision makers in the European and Eastern Central European level, too.

For the international scientific community my articles can be seen to present new information in the form of local language ideologies.

---

[13] To give a reference here would probably be unethical!

For the Hungarian or German readers, my articles provide a new perspective on the study of the Hungarians and Germans in the Banat. Instead of examining these groups largely in isolation, I pay attention to their multilingual and interethnic characteristics. Finally, the framework of language ideologies presents a new, refreshing and fruitful approach to the study of the Banat (cf. Felföldi 2002:73-75).

3 Previous Research on the Banat

Next I will briefly discuss other alternatives to study the Banat. Here I will review studies dealing with the contemporary (carried out after the 1989 'revolution') Rumanian Banat.[1] I will review most of the studies available that include empirical research, and refer to some examples of essayistic writings.[2] The body of empirical research on the contemporary Banat is not large, if for instance compared to northern Transylvania. However, the area is attracting growing attention, as the number of recent projects (e.g. those of Bodó 2003, Kupó 2002, Felföldi 2002, Chelcea 1999) show. My main aim is to illuminate some relevant aspects around the give and take of different methods of fieldwork, data gathering, informant selection and interpretation of results. This review is partially aimed at exploring the gaps of previous research in these areas.

I will not provide a complete inventory of results in the reviewed works, since the studies have focused on largely other matters than language. However, due to the ubiquitous nature of language ideologies, they all contain descriptions of language issues and their interpretations. The 'technical facts' around language in these writings have been included in the background sections of my articles. Furthermore, the interpretations of these facts in these works are analysed

---

[1] For the communist period, the freedom to do research on the area was most likely restricted (but see Weber-Kellerman 1978).

[2] I will not review the research by the Hungarian partner research group, since the analysis of the interviews is still in progress. For the aims of the Hungarian research group, see Barna 2001:108-109.

A great number of the academic writings analysed in my articles were not included here, either. Even though they have been published recently (after 1989), most of them do not focus on the contemporary Banat. In the contrary they discuss the history of the Banat, in particular those analysed in articles 1 and 3. Furthermore, some of the writings analysed in the articles are syntheses from general handbooks, which do not contain empirical parts.

as language ideologies in my articles (especially article 2). Finally, this chapter can be seen as an extension of the discussion on the outsider's view in the previous chapter (2.3). All the studies included here can be considered as examples of the insider's view, at least if we accept a broader definition of the 'insider', including for instance German and Hungarian researchers from Germany and Hungary (cf. Anttonen 2003:483-484).

Quantitative methods of data collection have been used in various contemporary studies on the Banat (see e.g. Toma 1998; Bakk & Bodó 1999; Gereben 1999; Kupó 2002). The most comprehensive study on linguistic issues is Alina Toma´s sociolinguistic article "Borders and Perspectives of a Language and Culture – The State of German in the Rumanian Banat"[3]. Her study is based on questionnaire, which is built on historical and demographic background knowledge and it carries many hypotheses and assumptions. One such starting point, a positive attitude by speakers of other languages towards the German language in the Banat is assumed by Toma (1998:46). She has found her informants with the help of the political organ "Democratic Forum of Germans in Rumania"[4]. They include German members and supporters of the party as well as persons from other language groups that are "interested in German language and culture" (Toma 1998:66).

The study design and methodology is bound to effect probable results and general image of the study. The choice of having only politically active informants is bound to influence the answers, too. In general a questionnaire based study has pre-planned, well restricted scope and limited range of viewpoints. In Toma's case many traditional issues of

---

[3] Translated from the German title: "Grenzen und Perspektiven einer Sprache und Kultur – Die Lage der deutschen im Rumänischen Banat."

[4] Translated from: "Demokratischen Forums der Deutschen Rumäniens"

quantitative bilingual studies were charted, such as the domains of minority language use and the significance of settlement type, age, sex, education and so on. However, Toma's focus is solely on the German language, multilingualism as such is not investigated in depth and in its own right, which seems to be a general problem in quantitative bilingual studies (see Baker 1992:76-78).

I have discussed some of Toma's results in my articles in some depth. Among others, article 3 has a section on her findings, which are useful for me as general background data on the German language in the Banat. Furthermore, some of her evaluations, statements and claims, such as labelling the Banat as a German 'linguistic enclave' (*Sprachinsel),* are analysed as language ideologies (see especially article 3). In brief, I have used some of the 'technical data' provided by his study as a background source, whereas I have examined her interpretations on the same data as language ideologies.

Two Hungarian researchers from Timişoara, Miklós Bakk and Barna Bodó (1999) have conducted a quantitative study on the Hungarian elite in the style of traditional sociology. Their goal is to investigate the basic characteristics of the contemporary (after 1989) local Hungarian elite. Their basic research question is whether the elite would like to present itself as a Hungarian elite or rather as a part of the general elite. Their study is based on a questionnaire, which includes questions on personal background, beliefs and evaluations of the economic and cultural situation of the Banat and of the situation of Hungarians in the Banat.

The interpretation of the statistics is done mainly on the basis of the researchers' membership knowledge. From a methodological point of view this set up has some restrictions. For instance, no concrete cases, or possible individual identities can be reached. Furthermore, the interpretation of the data is restricted largely by the researchers'

presumptions. Among others, if the statistics do not support the (unspecified) set of presumptions for consistent responses, it is stated that results are difficult to interpret. For instance, according to the filled questionnaires, the majority of the local Hungarian elite find "the knowledge of a non-majority mother tongue" as "an advantage in the public life". This is commented as "difficult to interpret in the light that two thirds of Hungarian children do not attend Hungarian schools in the Banat, and the Rumanian school is a popular choice among the elite, too." (Bakk & Bodó 1999[5]). In this manner, there seems to be a static, one-to-one attitude towards dealing with results combined with unwillingness to deal with paradoxical dimensions of people's views. However, such paradoxes, diversity and countering views seem to be typical to the talk about language in the Banat, which is an issue my study aims to deal with (see especially article 2).

Jenő Kupó (2002) has been involved in an ethnological quantitative study on the Hungarian communities in the Banat. Through quantitative analysis his study focuses on the vitality of Hungarian group identity and community life. Kupó recognizes the limits of using a questionnaire. That is, group orientations and frequency of ethnic contact can be charted through a standardised questionnaire, however the actual individual attitudes, motivations and orientations can not be reached (Kupó 2002:100). As a remedy, Kupó (2002:106) suggests the inclusion of life stories in order to complement and control the quantitative data. Here he examines interviews with priests. However, if the results reached through quantitative research are to serve as the core for further data collection and analysis, new points of view are unlikely to be taken into discussion.

---

[5] I use the Internet version which does not have page numbering. Here I cite subchapter II.7.

To sum up, the quantitative studies all show a professional sociological design and use a well planned questionnaire. They provide a wealth of useful background information (demographic data, frequency of different ethnic contacts, competence of different languages etc.) which is of use for my study, too. However, some general problems persist: first, the sample of informants is at times biased, as in the case of Toma (1998) who has studied only politically or culturally active persons. Secondly, the framework of research questions is directed to studying only one language or one ethnic group. A typical research problem seems to be whether the investigated people (Germans or Hungarians) are maintaining their assumed separate identity and/or mother tongue (see e.g. Toma 1998:59; Kupó 2002:99). Finally, the interpretation of the data is largely affected by subjective or authoritative elements. That is, certain viewpoints are emphasized, others neglected without clear justification. In general, new viewpoints hardly emerge from these studies, even though they sometimes find it impossible to interpret the statistical findings. Thus, there is a clear need for qualitative research in order to describe and explain some of the highly complex features of multilingualism and multiculturalism in the Banat. My articles aim at filling this gap through the open minded, empiricist, qualitative investigation of language ideologies among the ordinary Hungarian and German inhabitants of the Banat. Furthermore, I have no commitment to a Hungarian or a German view, rather more attention is given to the multilingual and interethnic characteristics of these fundamentally bi/multilingual language groups.

Anthropological and ethnological approaches to the study of the Banat use mostly qualitative data. So far, I have found few studies using participant observation (but see Weber-Kellerman 1978), interviews seem to be the more convenient way to collect materials. Cristea, Latea and Chelcea (1997) have studied group stigmatization in a community of

Rumanians, Germans and Roma. The aspects of collective identities are investigated through interviews from all major involved groups (old inhabitants, newcomers, representatives of different religions etc.) of Rumanians and Roma. Among others their study illuminates the important difference between the newcomers (the 'colonists') and old inhabitants (the 'locals') in the way it is described by the informants themselves. Already this important local category has largely been neglected by quantitative studies (but see Bakk & Bodó 1999).

Finally, there are studies on the Banat, which use no empirical data gathered through fieldwork. These essayistic 'armchair studies' consist of discussions based on second hand sources (e.g. books, newspapers and personal communication). The viewpoints include 'the concept of multiculturalism and collective memory in the Banat' (Chelcea 1999) or 'the Banat as an example of a multi-ethnic border region for the European Union' (Batt 2001) or 'the concept of tolerance and ethnic discourses in the Banat' (Bodó 1994). All essayistic accounts presume – but fail to specify – personal experience, attained through living in the Banat or visiting it. Furthermore, they all presume competence in some of the languages spoken in the Banat. The aim of these writings is to discuss the conceptual question of characterising the Banat from a certain socio-political/historical point of view. These writings serve as a basis for possible comparative viewpoints on conclusions based on empirical data. However, they represent clearly an elite perspective, among others they refer solely to 'learned' (researchers, politicians, priests, journalists) opinions. Thus, I have used them also as sources for the study of the language ideologies of the elite, especially in article 2.

4 Approach and methodology

4.1 Approach: language ideologies

The theoretical approach of the thesis, guiding research questions and goals, is the study of *language ideologies*. A preliminary introduction of the study of language ideologies was already provided in the introductory chapter, here I will give a more general summary to the characteristics of this field. The focus of the scholarship in the field of language ideologies has so far been theoretical or case oriented. I will briefly discuss both orientations highlighting the characteristics important for this study. Then practical methodological solutions concerning the articles and fieldwork are described. Finally, some future plans for the methodological development of my research are proposed.

The study of language ideologies is practised mainly by American researchers involved in linguistic anthropology. Among others Michael Silverstein, Kathryn Woolard, Bambi Schieffelin and Susan Gal have been central figures promoting this area and coordinating this otherwise heterogeneous field in introductory articles (e.g. Woolard & Schieffelin 1994; Gal & Woolard 1995; Woolard 1998; Silvestein 1998, Gal 1998, 2002). [1] The term *language ideologies* does not aim to designate new, rigid, or even a homogenous set of phenomena. Rather as Gal (1998:317, cf. Woolard & Schieffelin 1994:58) stresses, the various phenomena covered by language ideologies have already been noticed before by anthropologists, linguists and historians. However, bringing together various, so far taken as unrelated or even marginal phenomena under the

---

[1] There are numerous references to early predecessors. To mention only one, Valentin Voloshinov (1990 [1929]) argued that there are no neutral uses or descriptions of language. Every description of language is ideological.

umbrella of language ideologies will allow us to study neglected topics, such as cultural conceptions of the role of language in social life, the role and character of metalanguage, the connection of language choice to commonsense convictions about the linkage of language and identity and the historical impact of linguistic theories on social movements, to mention just a few.

4.1.1 What is ideology?

In her attempt to theoretically scrutinize the term *language ideologies*, Woolard (1998:5-9, cf. Silverstein 1998) connects the term *ideology* to four traditions:

> 1) Ideology as representations, beliefs, conceptions and ideas
> 2) Ideology as connected to a particular social position
> 3) Ideology as discourse patterns in the service of maintaining and acquiring power
> 4) Ideology as distortions of reality

Among these approaches to ideology, there are some basic differences from a largely neutral view in the first interpretation towards a more critical stance represented in the latter three versions. To begin with the notion of *ideology[1]* there is no agreement whether e.g. beliefs and representations are primarily subjective and mental phenomena or rather situational practises of signification. Furthermore, it is disputed whether they should be considered basically coherent or typically internally contradictory (Woolard 1998:5-6.). For the purposes of this study, I would argue for the latter versions.

In the study of language ideologies it is a basic assumption that no idea or view about language comes from nowhere or is "neutral or only scientific" (Gal 2002:198). That is, the examination of ideas about language (*ideology[1]*) should always be combined with other interpretation(s) of the term ideology (*ideology[2,3,4]*). In this study the first

three interpretations get more attention. The fourth perspective (ideology as distortion) is close to critical discourse analysis (see e.g. Reisigl & Wodak 2001: 32-33). However, at least for analytical purposes, it is unclear whether a privileged concept of reality that is free of distortions exists. In a similar manner, Silverstein, who has first introduced the term language ideologies in the late 1970's, underlines that:

> We might consider our descriptive analytic perspective […] as a species of social-constructionist realism or naturalism about language and its matrix in the sociocultural realm: it recognizes the reflexive entailments for its own praxis, that it will find no absolute Archimedian place to stand – not in absolute "Truth", nor in absolute "Reality" nor even in absolute deterministic or computable mental or social "Functional Process". Analysis of ideological factuality is, perforce, relativistic in the best scientific (not scientistic) sense.
> (Silverstein 1998:124)

That is, the study of language ideologies, as understood by Silverstein and this study, is critical in a descriptive way, not in a normative way as other critical fields of study may be. In other words, the point is to make ideologies – which are often naturalized and taken for granted – transparent, not to discredit or correct them (cf. Gal & Woolard 1995:131).[2]

4.1.2 Language and ideology

According to Woolard (1998:4), a main argument for the investigation of ideology and language intertwined is the argument that ideology of language should not be distinguished from ideology in other domains of human activity. Furthermore, the significance of the, sometimes unavoidable and inherent, ideological dimension of language use and linguistic phenomena in general should be given deserved attention.

---

[2] However, not all proponents of language ideologies agree with this line of reasoning. For example Blommaert (1996) argues for a critical stance which unmasks ideological distortions of the scientific basis of (in his case) language planning and gives suggestions to an alternative approach.

Finally, the disciplinary goal, she argues, is to provide a firmer linguistic ground for the study of ideology and discourse in general.

How is *language* understood and connected to ideology in the theoretical writings? In Woolard's words (1998:9, emphasis as original): "Ideology is variously discovered in linguistic practice itself; in explicit talk about language, that is, metalinguistic or metapragmatic *discourse*; and the regimentation of language use through more implicit metapragmatics.". From these different interpretations, the concept of implicit metapragmatics and language structure being inherently ideological (see especially Lucy 1993), have been interpreted as a contemporary extension of the linguistic relativity (or "Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis") debate (Duranti 2001:15-17). However, more important to my study is the examination of explicit or implicit talk or discourse about language (or explicit metalanguage).

As a possible methodological framework, Gal (1998, 2002) proposes an application of Peirce's semiotic categories[3] for analysing the processes of how linguistic materials gain significance as representations of particular populations. In her view there are three typical semiotic processes that make language ideologies seem as self-evident, natural and difficult to discard:

1) *Indexical reference becomes iconic*, for instance sociolinguistic indicators (e.g. dialect indicators) are used as an image of the identity of the speakers.

2) *Fractal recursivity*, the contrast salient at some level is transferred onto some other level. For instance the image

---

[3] That is the distinction of three kinds of signs: symbolic, indexical and iconic signs (see Nieminen 2002:137-138). In the study of language ideologies indexical signs are considered most important (see Silverstein 1998). According to Gal (2002:200) indexical signs "are contiguous with, stand next to, metonyms of what they represent […] All languages and linguistic features are indexes of the people who use those forms.".

of a language is reproduced to characterise the image of loan words from that language.

3) *Erasure,* those features that do not fit an ideology are erased, for instance in the study of minorities those characteristics are erased that connect the minority with the majority.

Following Gal, these processes are typical for stereotype forming in the realm of language. In her view, both ordinary people and linguists routinely lean on these processes.

The theoretical accounts on discourse about language all find relevant the topic of languages in contact and the resulting ideologies of for instance "purism" and "standardization". A related line of inquiry examines the influence that linguistic theories and social movements have had on each other (e.g. Woolard 1998, Gal 2001). Here the aim is to specify the social location and historical context of different linguistic ideas (Gal & Woolard 1995:131). In my research, I focus on the contemporary discourses about languages and multilingualism in the Banat, the language ideologies of the past are given less attention.

To sum up, the theory of language ideologies centres around the notion of ideology embedded in language structure and use as well as linguistic phenomena in general. The term ideology contains the (explicit or implicit) beliefs, cultural ideas and representations of language and their connections to social positions and power. The goal of the study of language ideologies is to make such linkages transparent. One way to do so is to identify and deconstruct the typical semiotic processes involved in the construction of language ideologies.

Theoretical articles on language ideology give less, if any attention to practical method. That is, very little commentary is given to the selection or handling of empirical data or to the ways linguistic

ideologies should be recognised and analysed or deconstructed in linguistic structure, talk or discourse. That is the reason why I have chosen to use the label *approach* here. Next, under the rubric of *methodology* I will discuss the methodological practice of some studies in the field of Language Ideologies. Then I will describe the methodological solutions in my articles. Finally, I will argue for a methodological framework for the future development of my research.

4.2 Methodology

There is no homogenous method for the study of language ideologies. Case studies on language ideologies[4] use accounts of language structure combined with ethnographic studies of local conceptions of language use.[5] Beyond this, textual and interactional analysis of sociolinguistic interviews, newspaper articles and conversations is carried out. Finally also descriptions of language ideologies based on ethnographic observations or even quantitative data have been used. In brief, apparently many forms of data or previous empirical studies can be used to 1) describe linguistic structuring or a linguistic phenomenon *and/or* 2) to describe a (local, folk, elite, dominant, contradicted etc.) language ideology, which typically consists of ideas and representations about linguistic phenomena combined with dimensions of social position and power.

The main methodological contribution of the field of language ideologies is the comparison and linkage of so far largely unconnected

---

[4] See for instance the following compilations of articles: Woolard & Gal 1995; Schieffelin, Woolard & Kroskrity 1998

[5] For instance the grammaticalization of honorifics can thus be explained through the (historically changing) repertoire of language ideologies of the community, not causally through the existence of some institution such as the court or caste system. In other words, the ways the community itself (most often in a non-apparent manner) connects language with e.g. social position is crucial to the existence, formation, change and use of such a pragmatic feature. See Irvine 1998.

perspectives. In other words, what has previously been known about language structure or multilingualism is now connected to an explanatory or interpretative framework of ideology. The descriptions of linguistic phenomena or language ideologies are based mainly on research done with the methods of linguistic anthropology (see Duranti 1997, 2001). The studies lean on previous research or new fieldwork and analysis of linguistic phenomena and ideology. Nevertheless, the critical methodological discussions of the linguistic/ideological descriptions often play a marginal role, the innovation of comparing and connecting different perspectives gets the lion's share.

4.2.1 An example: a study in the field of language ideology

To give a concrete example of a possible methodological solution for a study in the field, I will briefly describe the methodological logic of the article "Diversity and contestation in linguistic ideologies: German speakers in Hungary" by Gal (1993) which has a design that is somewhat similar to my articles. The example of this study was highly influential for my initial choice of approach, too.

The basic idea of the article is to compare the historical development of dominant ideology towards the German minority (in this article interpreted as "official", elite or state ideology) with local ideas about language. The dominant views about language and identity are described through an analysis of linguistic censuses. Gal (1993:342) argues as follows:

> My point is not the problematic validity of linguistic censuses, which is a commonplace in the sociology of language. Rather, I suggest that these figures should be read *not* as a reflection of numbers of speakers, but as evidence of state policy toward German speakers in Hungary.

That is, the censuses are seen as a mirror of dominant language ideologies. The debates around them, such as the question of defining nationality or the interpretation of socialist policy towards language and identity, show diversity and ideological struggles within the dominant elite of then socialist Hungary (Gal 1993:342-347).

In the second part of her article, Gal describes results from her five months (in 1987 and 1990) of fieldwork consisting of participant observation and interviewing in the partly German speaking community of Bóly, Hungary. This part of her analysis she calls "ethnographic evidence for local linguistic ideologies" (1993:347). Here she first meticulously describes her encounters with local inhabitants. This is partly connected to the previous section of reviewing censuses: every formal, or "official" interviewing resulted in failure, due to the local resistance of "official policies and the dominant ideas on which they are based"(p. 348). This includes attempts to withhold information about issues of language and identity from outsiders (Gal 1993:348-349).

In the core analysis of her fieldwork, Gal (1993:350) focuses on the "explicit symbolic relations, constructed in discourse about language, which constitute conceptualizations about identity". Even though Gal acknowledges a situational model of identity, she chooses to concentrate here on "the range of folk theories or ideologies that people construct to justify their varying claims in different situations" (p. 350). In practice, she discusses the local descriptions of, among others, links between language and nationality, and the value of different languages. As evidence she uses a condensed version of the local informants' accounts. At times Gal gives examples of their original expression, but mostly the folk theories are summarized and paraphrased.

To sum up, Gal (1993) illuminates linguistic ideologies in a German-Hungarian town with the method of first analysing dominant,

"official" ideologies through the concrete institution of linguistic censuses. Findings are compared with language ideologies from below. These are visible in "local practises and talk about language" (p. 348) and captured through interviews and participant observation.

4.3 On methodological solutions in the articles

As already mentioned, the methodological decisions of my articles were largely influenced by Gal's work, which was carried out in a cultural and ideological milieu that resembles the Banat. First, the decision to include and examine both elite (dominant) language ideologies and local conceptions or "folk theories" was encouraged through her example. Secondly, the acknowledgment of the diversity, and sometimes even paradoxical nature, of both folk and elite views gave impetus to notice such features also in my materials. Thirdly, beyond methodological solutions, her practical interpretations about the nature and definition of central terms, such as *ideology* or *dominant ideology* have been adopted in this study.

In my articles I have however made my own interpretations of her methodological choices. To begin with, I have analysed academic works (especially historical descriptions) instead of censuses. There I have focused on the transparent evaluations[6], emphasis[7] and omissions[8] apparent in texts about ethnic and linguistic matters. Overall, I have aimed at the analysis of the textual construction of the elite ideologies. For instance, in article 3, I have included longer strips of text to analyse discursive patterns, such as use of evaluative terms in connection with

---

[6] Here I refer to expressions such as referring to the colonisation of the Banat as "one of the finest examples of Austrian-German cultural work in South-East Europe" (see Laihonen 2001:14).

[7] For instance, the overt reference to a single ethnic group in a multiethnic context.

[8] The erasure of a perspective or a feature.

language groups. Beyond the purposes of analysis, the inclusion of these excerpts makes the dialogical practices between the analyst and data more transparent for the reader. That is, my claims on ideology are thus anchored in specified textual fragments instead of simple paraphrase, interpretation and summary of the texts.[9]

The examination of interviews in my work is also carried out in a different manner. Many excerpts from the transcriptions are presented in order to give the reader a chance to evaluate my claims based on the interviews. Similar to Gal, my focus has been on the discourse on language. To be more specific, in the language on language, or metalanguage. However, I have been at pains to notify the importance of the sequential context, too. That is, I find it of importance whether a given interviewee turn presents, for instance, an answer to a question of some kind, a summary of our previous discussion, a story narrative or a question to the interviewer. This serves the basic need to ground the ideas about language in the situational social context, rather than in some mental category. Furthermore, the goal is to show how these statements are constructed for the needs of the interaction taking place in the interviews. For instance in article 2 (example 1) I explicate the sequential location of a statement: "so here in the Banat you should know at least three languages" as a conclusion to the preceding talk. Nevertheless, this kind of analysis of interaction remains more or less unelaborated in the articles, rather it will be a task for the dissertation thesis.

---

[9] Even though in a passing manner, Gal (1993:347) gives some attention to scholarly publications on minorities, too. She seemingly hints at the analytical possibility of such sources in the following passage: "The rhetorical conventions of these articles reveal a coded message that remained constant, regardless of the immediate topic of the publication" (p. 347). Nevertheless, "the rhetorical conventions" are interpreted here as the typical structuring of the articles, which, she argues, included a discussion on minorities in general and Hungary's internal minorities only as a pretext for the topic of the Hungarian minorities in the surrounding countries.

In sum, the method in my articles has been close to 'rough and ready'. To put it bluntly, I have made an inventory of the transparently language related talk and writing in the data. I have described the basic variation in the informants' accounts on languages and multi- and monolingualism. This repertoire has been compared with the repertoire of representations of language in the writings. Due to the notion that "all languages and linguistic features are indexes of the people who use those forms." (Gal 2002:200), I have included talk and writings on ethnicity and nationality in this inventory. Finally, a discussion on the role of social position and power in the construction of these ideas, beliefs or theories about language is included.

Finally, some last remarks on my method in the articles. First, no attempt has been made to present the language ideologies in the interviews as homogenous. Rather, I have attempted to show typical cases as well as contrary examples to them. Secondly, I have not left out apparently paradoxical views, rather they have been given special attention.

4.4 Future methodological plans

This kind of inventory and examination of the content of writings and talk about language added with their comparison serves well the purpose of establishing a starting point for illuminating language ideologies. However, a focused analysis on the situational (interactional/textual) linguistic characteristics of talk/writing about language related issues will provide a deeper understanding of the discursive/interactional construction of language ideologies. This will enable the investigation of linguistic devices in the discourses on multilingualism. For this purpose new, more specific, methodological tools should be used. Next a brief

introduction of future plans for the development of the methodological framework of my research project will be given.

As already mentioned, the study of language ideologies does not have a restricted method, rather various, mainly qualitative methods are applied for the analysis of discourse. Thus methodological tools have to be sought from other disciplines. In the case of interviews, I will focus on methodology based on the study of interaction, particularly on applications of conversation analysis that examine identity in interaction. Critical discourse analysis will provide deeper insights to the writings and their discursive construction.

4.4.1 An analytical framework for interaction

Conversation analysis (CA hereafter) focuses on the study of the characteristics of interaction through the empirical analysis of interaction in its own terms. In practice this means the qualitative analysis of sequential patterns of turn-formation, turn-taking, sequential patterns, timing and so on. Basic analytic questions include such as 'what is the participant doing in this turn and how'. A possible goal of the analysis is to find out how turn-formation, turn-taking or sequential patterns form the social roles, relationships and identities of the speakers. (see Laihonen 2000:chapter 2.)

The CA approach will enable me to focus on the linguistic means of bringing up ideologies (or discourses about language, i.e. metalanguage) and to analyse the focal interactional functions of such expressions or other more or less explicit manifestations of language ideologies in the data. Beyond this, a possible model for analysing language ideologies is the branch of CA involved in the study of identity. This branch has been dealing with similar phenomena central to language ideologies. That is, labelling, categorizing and identity work.

Research on identity based on CA (see Widdicombe & Woottif 1995; Antaki & Widdicombe 1998; Hester & Housley 2002) does not base its analysis on *a priori* categories of what identity consists of, or what counts as relevant for identity. Rather the significance of a feature for identity should always be proven to be of importance for the participants in interaction. In practice this means the microanalysis of interaction, through which identity is constructed (e.g. Widdicombe 1998:194-195).

In my study systematic attention will be paid to connect the content of an utterance to its interactional context. For instance, in what kind of sequential context is multi- or monolingualism discussed? How are speakers of different languages categorised in the interaction? In general how is the talk about languages structured in the interviews?

From the interactional point of view, for example language identity is analysed as a social phenomenon constructed, used, changed and possibly contested in interaction with other speakers. Thus, interviewees are not claimed to have only one, homogenous and constant language identity. Rather, identity is formed for the needs of the conversation in question and with interactional means available in that conversation. (e.g. Antaki & Widdicombe 1998:4-5)

One central tool for analysing interactional identity, is the recognition of *discourse identities*, such as teller or answerer (see Zimmerman 1998) which the speakers hold in interviews. If for instance the interviewer takes the initiative in the conversation (e.g. by posing a question), he will put forward a certain set of expectations, which the interviewee will confirm or contest in the next turn. Furthermore, the interviewee can also take an active discourse role through posing questions, telling apparently spontaneous stories and so on. Another useful notion for interactional analysis is *categorization* work in interaction. Hester and Housley (2002:9) stress the importance of examining how the

speakers themselves build and interpret different categories in interaction. This enables us to explore the situational character of labelling something as for instance Hungarian, German or Romanian (cf. Day 1998).

The insights from research on identity based on CA will enable me to recognize interactional manifestations of language ideologies in the stream of talk, furthermore to explicate their recurrent interactional patterns and functions.

4.4.2 An analytical framework for written texts

Conversation analysis and its applications are aimed at the analysis of talk in interaction. Thus, for the analysis of written texts, I will lean on an application of *critical discourse analysis* to the extent that it is in line with the field of language ideologies. That is, I will not follow its tradition to subscribe to an ethical, moral or political stance (see e.g. Reisigl & Wodak 2001:33). As noted earlier, the goal of my analysis is not to prove linguistic ideologies as 'wrong', 'right' or even as 'distortions' of reality. Rather, the goal is to deconstruct language ideologies and show their past and present effects (Gal & Woolard 1995:132-133).

The discourse analytic studies on racism and antisemitism (e.g. Whetherel & Potter 1992; Reisigl & Wodak 2001) offer analytical tools also for the examination of discourse on multilingualism. At the level of analytical practice this offers for instance the identification of strategies of reference, predication and argumentation as well as examination of the means for mitigation and emphasis (Reisigl & Wodak 2001:33ff). The analytical practice of the "context-sensitive, discourse-historical approach" by Reisigl and Wodak (2001:31) has an added advantage from my perspective, it has been developed for and applied to a Central European context.

Whetherel and Potter (1992:90-93) have in turn focused on the analysis of *interpretative repertoire*. That is, the taken-for-granted descriptions, images and evaluations used in the construction of arguments and contrasts. Furthermore, they emphasize the importance of analysing such constructions with respect to their sequential placement. In concrete analyses Whetherel and Potter (1992) focus mainly on narratives and argumentation, both in interviews and in texts. With this framework the textual organization of writings about multilingualism can be compared with the structure of descriptions of language in the interviews.

5 Results

Next, I will summarize the results of my research. The three articles attached to this summary form the empirical part of this thesis. However, they also include brief theoretical parts, which will not be dealt with here due to the overlaps with the other sections of this summary. The articles are written in three different languages, English, Hungarian and German. In order to give all readers a proper idea of the articles, their place of publication and overall structure is briefly stated, too.

5.1 Article 1

Laihonen, Petteri 2001. Multilingualism in the Banat: Elite and Everyday Language Ideologies. *Ethnic Minorities and Power*. Pasi Hannonen, Bo Lönnqvist & Gábor Barna (eds.). Helsinki: Fonda Publishing, 11-45.

The first article (Laihonen 2001) was published in a joint volume of the project. This paper was also presented in the 5th International Congress of Hungarian Studies, Jyväskylä. It was approved for presentation and publication by the project head Prof. Bo Lönnqvist. This article has received some attention, mainly in Hungary. It has been included in a bibliography for the study of bilingualism and language shift (Bartha 2002) and in a review of Transylvanian linguistics (Péntek 2002:27). Furthermore, the volume has been reviewed in an international academic journal (Anttonen 2003). Finally, my article has been referred to as giving a new theoretical impetus to the study of the Banat (Felföldi 2002).[1]

In this article, I present an inventory of the basic descriptions of multilingualism and the three historically dominant languages in the

---

[1] Felföldi (2002) extends my discussion of language ideologies in the Banat to ideologies related with dance traditions.

northern Romanian Banat: Hungarian, Romanian and German. I use two kinds of data. First, with the help of secondary sources, I present an overview of some elite conceptions (Hungarian – German – Romanian) of the linguistic history of the Banat. Secondly, I examine extracts from the interview data that contain talk about language(s) as evidence for everyday language ideologies.

In the different academic writings on the history of the Banat monolingualism is considered the norm and multilingualism is seen as a potential source of conflict. This view is clear in the practice of isolating a single ethnic group and its language for description. Such a description typically includes a positive and nostalgic element for the period of the "golden age", or age of hegemony. Other periods of time are depicted in a negative light. Furthermore, describing the history of the Banat often includes the monitoring and documentation of violations by the other groups. Violations by one's own group are less documented, by contrast, the policies of the own "golden age" are viewed as tolerant.

Language plays a fundamental role in descriptions of history. The spread, cultural success and share of power by an ethnic group all seem to culminate in the question of language. Finally, the brief review of historical representations of the Banat supports the idea that nationalism is an extremely tempting resource for the elite, which is represented here by a selection of academic scholars. In brief, also for the modern intellectual, the nation is the most obvious source of mission, power and identity.

In the second part of this study an attempt is made to review everyday folk representations of living in a multilingual society. The local ideas about languages as present in 10 interviews with the Hungarian inhabitants can be summarized as follows:

On the Hungarian language

- Hungarian is evaluated with positive, identificatory and emotional statements.
- Examples of attempts to hinder the use of Hungarian in everyday situations are known, but claimed to be rare. Being told not to speak Hungarian is evaluated very negatively.
- The informants evaluate their own variant of Hungarian as "bad" Hungarian.
- No instrumental value is ascribed to Hungarian. Nevertheless, sense of identity motivates some people to promoting the survival and spread of Hungarian in their family.

On the Rumanian language

- Learning Romanian is presented as a natural obligation.
- Using Romanian in official situations is described as compulsory.
- Romanian is given as the general language of communication.
- Monolingual Romanians are evaluated negatively; however in the case of family members learning Hungarian is seldom emphasised.

On the German language

- German is described as a high prestige language in the Banat.
- The use of German in everyday life is vanishing.

On multilingualism and monolingualism

- Linguistic diversity and multilingual linguistic repertoire are presented as natural and positive.
- Monolingualism is often described as a deliberate unwillingness to learn the language of other people.

In comparison with the elite views, reviewed in Part I of this article, the local informants describe multilingualism positively and they also represent learning more than one language as a natural phenomenon. The elite represents the Banat as an "arena for languages in competition". However, in the responses of local Hungarian inhabitants the Banat is in the first place a region of linguistic tolerance. Furthermore, as the interviews show, the northern Banat is not presented as an area of linguistic enclaves or totally separate communities; rather its multilingualism is described as social as well as individual.

5.2 Article 2

Laihonen, Petteri in press (2004/2005). A romániai bánsági (bánáti) tolerancia és többnyelvűség a nyelvi ideológiák tükrében. [Tolerance and Multilingualism in the Rumanian Banat Reflected by Language Ideologies]: *Tér és terep. Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből III. Az MTA etnikai-nemzeti kisebbségkutató intézetének évkönyve. [Space and Field. Studies on ethnicity and identity III.* The yearbook of Research Institute of the Ethnic and National Minorities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.] Edited by Kovács, Nóra, Anna Osvát & László Szarka. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

The second article is a manuscript in press for the 2004 yearbook of the Research Institute of the Ethnic and National Minorities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. This paper has been reviewed and approved for publication by the Institute (peer review).

In this article I discuss the conceptions of multilingualism and tolerance from the viewpoint of interviews with the local Hungarians compared with writings by the local intellectuals. First, however the previous Hungarian accounts on the Banat are briefly reviewed and an array of background information on the situation of Hungarians in the Banat is presented.

The Hungarian accounts in the general reference books have focused on (sometimes stereotypic) descriptions of "anti-Hungarian" acts by the German colonialist officers and the Rumanian elite. However, in recent years there have been attempts to pay attention to multiculturalism and multilingualism in various academic fields (e.g. ethnology, geography). In the international context, however, the situation of the Germans in the Banat is the most studied one. Demographic data and language politics concerning among others education, church and media are discussed briefly and compared to the overall situation in Rumania.

The folk ideas about multilingualism are positive. Multilingual persons are characterised as tolerant. Monolingualism is depicted as a negative feature. However in the concrete case of a monolingual person, this characterisation does not hold. The deliberate, malevolent monolingualism is described as a basic characterisation of the Rumanian newcomers (the 'colonists') to the Banat region. A positive regional identity, characterising the old inhabitants (the 'locals'), is depicted as the 'willingness' to be multilingual.

The local intellectuals have discussed the concept of multilingualism in their writings. These, in contrast to the writings by the national elites, acknowledge the local worldview and aim to explain it in more general terms. In line with the folk view, they connect multilingualism and tolerance with regional identity. As an explanation they stress the division between the region and centers of power (Bucharest in the first place). That is, the opposition to the centre provides a tolerant local identity.

The writings also deal with the paradox that the local political sphere does not support multilingual practices. In local politics monolingualism and the views of the majority are promoted, with similar language ideologies as in the writings of the national elites. The image of the region as 'tolerant' is nevertheless seen as a powerful hindrance to open ethnic conflict. In practice, they claim, ethnic problems are swept under the carpet. Finally, according to sociolinguistic theory, language activism has a positive affect on language maintenance. In a similar manner, the local Hungarian elite interpreters 'tolerance' as a precursor for language shift since it hinders activism.

5.3 Article 3

Laihonen, Petteri forthcoming. Die Banater Schwaben und Ideologien über die Mehrsprachigkeit. [The Swabians of the Banat and the Ideologies about Multilingualism]. Manuscript to appear in: *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* (Zeitschrift für interdisziplinäre Hungarologie, Ungarisches Institut, München), 28 (2005).

The third article has been approved by a reviewer for the *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* and is scheduled to be published in the 2005 volume. This article was also read as a conference paper at the 2004 Annual Conference of the Minority Studies Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest.

This study consists of two parts. In the first part I examine the construction of history and interethnic relations in the German sources on the Banat. These are briefly compared to Hungarian accounts. In the second part the local German conceptions of languages and multilingualism are examined through the analysis of interviews among the Germans.

The history of the Banat is constructed as follows in the German writings:

> The colonisation and resettlement of the Banat counts as the glamorous starting point. Later 'magyarisation' threatened the German institutions, e.g. church and education. The unity of the Banat was destroyed in the Peace treaty of 1920. However, the interwar period was a 'golden age' of Germans in the Rumanian Banat. Life after the Second World War is depicted as a plain tragedy. The 'German villages' have become devastated and empty. The last hope for the future of German culture lays in the co-operation with the majority.

The interethnic relations are in general neglected in the German writings. The descriptions of the other groups are characterised by political conflict. The Germans in the Banat are described as an isolated cultural enclave. This idea is also supported by linguistic theory of the language islands (or enclaves, in German: *Sprachinsel*) and its application to the study of the German language in the Banat. In turn, the Hungarian descriptions of the Germans give a stereotypic, negative image. In both

German and Hungarian descriptions of the other group the national level discourse dominates over the regional one.

The folk ideas about language in the interviews can be roughly divided into two categories according to the dichotomy town/village. The town settlement is here represented by Lippa (Lipova). In Lippa the relations to the local Hungarians are depicted as good. Many of the German informants claim competence in Hungarian and Rumanian, too. Multilingualism is viewed positively and as a guarantee for friendly neighbourly relations. The German culture from the past is depicted as a source of pride for the informants. The evaluations of the Hungarian culture are neutral. Rumanian culture is at times negatively assessed, among others due to the claimed monolingualism of the Rumanians. The Jews are presented as a group that is particularly talented in learning languages.

In the villages the folk theories about language are somewhat different and more diverse. In some of the villages a German culture was predominant in the past. In these villages the past is described as a positive, culturally vivid time. In contrast, the present is described as: "today there is nothing, only old people". The Germans in the villages are bilingual. Besides German they master the language of the state, today Rumanian, earlier Hungarian. The inhabitants of the "German villages" have less contacts with other ethnic minorities than Germans living in Lippa. However, the interethnic relationships are described as good also in the villages. The role of the mother tongue is not emphasized in either case, rather religion and good neighbourly relationships are depicted as important.

In sum, the academic texts aim at the construction of a distinct ethnic group. This is achieved through emphasizing everything German and interpreting everything from a 'German point of view'. The

interethnic relationships are generally neglected in the writings. The German informants give a different interpretation of the same facts. They stress the good everyday interethnic relationships. A kind of nostalgia towards the times when German was dominant exists in some of the villages. However, this nostalgia is not directed against the other ethnic groups. Multilingualism is characterized positively and it has been especially characteristic for the inhabitants of Lipova. The writings represent the Banat as an "arena for languages in competition", whereas in the interviews a pragmatic ideology is dominant which does not emphasize the role of German language.

5.4 General remarks on the diversity of language ideologies

Finally, I will make some general remarks on the diversity of language ideologies which go beyond one article. To begin with, the language ideologies among the Hungarian and German inhabitants show both unity and diversity. They are rather homogenous in their ideas about multilingualism and monolingualism. In the interviews multilingualism is described as a positive feature typical for the old inhabitants of the Banat (the 'locals'). Monolingualism is depicted as malevolent ignorance of other languages and cultures typical for the Rumanian newcomers to the region. Finally, little emphasis is given on the mother tongue in the interviews. This is notable, since a basic assumption in Eastern Central Europe is the quintessential importance of the mother tongue for identity (for Rumania, see e.g. Verdery 1985:67, Barna 2000).

The diversity in the local language ideologies is mainly visible in the difference between the folk theories presented by German villagers and town dwellers. That is the villagers display ideologies stressing the German past, whereas town dwellers stress multicultural and multilingual ideas. The interviewed Hungarians present a more homogenous group.

Here diversity is most apparent in the beliefs about mother tongue. Typically, the view about Hungarian language among the Hungarians is pragmatic, no special value is denoted to the mother tongue. However, some informants give Hungarian a special value, thus promoting it with all available means. A basic difference of the Hungarian and German informants is that for the Hungarians there is little nostalgia towards the Hungarian culture or institutions from the past. Rather, also among the Hungarians, German is presented as a high prestige language and culture.

Also the examined writings include variation. The basic underlying idea is however the same, to isolate and to describe a language group. A major divide can be seen between the writings of the local elite and the writings of the 'national' elites. The writings by the local elite provide a mediating role by explaining the local conceptions of multilingualism in comparison with the ideas presented in the writings by scholars active in Hungary or Germany.

6 Conclusions

My research has come to a point where a basic inventory of language ideologies in the data has been carried out. So far I have ploughed through more than 100 interviews and included about 70 of them in my articles, where I have examined about 50 excerpts from them. Furthermore, I have gone through about 30 academic writings on the Banat and compared their language ideologies with those of my informants. All this has contributed to a first overview of the characteristics of multilingualism and linguistic ideologies in the Rumanian Banat. As my brief last words, I will indicate some areas for future research.

The amount of the data examined so far has been sufficient to get a general picture of the characteristics of talk and writing on language. That is, I consider it enough to be able to say what is typical in the data, what is exceptional and so on. A possible future analysis could be carried out on the interviews with the local Hungarian elite. This analysis would enable a new comparison of the elite and ordinary people, now on the basis of interviews with both groups. Furthermore, this investigation would enable an empirical discussion on the differences of elite talk and text in the light of constructing language ideologies. Finally, the data gathered by the Hungarian research group could be analysed from the point of view of different interviewer identities. This study could give an answer to the question: is it possible to empirically pinpoint the insider/outsider dichotomy in the interactional patterns of the interviews?

However, more importantly, future development of my research will focus on the methodological side. So far broad definitions and rough methodological tools have been used, which has been allowed by the approach of language ideologies. My goal is to pose a new research

question for the dissertation thesis: How are the language ideologies discursively (linguistically/interactionally) constructed in the data. To face this challenge, there is a need for the development of methodological tools for meticulous microanalysis of the interactional and textual structures which are being used for the construction of language ideologies in the data. As possible directions, I have indicated applications of the methods of conversation analysis and critical discourse analysis (see 4.4). However, only the practical analysis of data will show their true value for the study of language ideologies.

Bibliography

Ács Zoltán 1996. *Nemzetiségek a történelmi Magyarországon*. Budapest: Kossuth.

Antaki, Charles & Sue Widdicombe 1998. Identity as an Achievement and as a Tool. *Identities in Talk*. Eds. Charles Antaki & Sue Widdicombe. London: Sage, 1-14.

Anttonen, Marjut 1999. *Etnopolitiikkaa Ruijassa. Suomalaislähtöisen väestön identiteettien politisoituminen 1990-luvulla*. Helsinki: SKS.

Anttonen, Marjut 2003. Hungarian and German Minorities in the Romanian Banat. (Review of: Hannonen, Pasi, Lönnqvist, Bo & Barna, Gábor (eds) 2001. *Ethnic Minorities and Power*. Helsinki: Fonda Publishing.) *Acta Ethnographica Hungarica* 48 (3-4): 483-487.

Auer, Peter 1984. *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Auer, Peter (ed.) 1998. *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.

Baker, Colin 1992. *Attitude and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bakk, Miklós & Bodó, Barna 1999. Elitek, modellek, szerepek. *Korunk,* 4. available at: www.hhrf.org/korunk/9904/4k12.htm, visited January 2005.

Barna, Gábor 2000. Mentale Grenzen – verdoppelte Welten. *Kulturen – Sprachen – Übergänge*. Hirscfelder, Gunther, Dorothea Schell & Adelheid Schrutka-Rechtenstamm (Hg.). Festschrift für H. L. Cox zum 65. Geburtstag. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 643–656.

Barna, Gábor 2001. A search for stability: religion as a shelter and a symbolic manifestation of identity. *Ethnic Minorities and Power*. Hannonen, Pasi, Lönnqvist, Bo & Barna, Gábor (eds). Helsinki: Fonda Publishing, 107-125.

Bartha, Csilla 2002. A kétnyelvűség és a nyelvcsere kutatása. Válogatott bibliográfia (1990-2001). *Tér és terep. Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből.* Kovács Nóra & Szarka László (szerk.). Az MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézetének Évkönyve I. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 461-476.

Batt, Judy 2001. Between a Rock and a Hard Place – Multi-Ethnic Regions on the EU's New Eastern Frontier. *Sixth Meeting of the EESRG* – 27–28 April 2001. Available at: www.crees.bham.ac.uk/research/eesrg/JBattpap.htm, visited January 2005.

Blommaert, Jan 1996. Language Planning as a Discourse on Language and Society: The Linguistic Ideology of a Scholarly Tradition. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 20/3: 199-222.

Bodó Barna 1994. Bánság és az etnikai diskurzus. *Magyar Szemle*, 6: 625–654.

Bodó, Bárna 2003. *Talpalatnyi régiónk*. Kolozsvár: Komp-press.

Bodó, Bárna 2004. Identity and Diaspora Discourse. *Minorities Research 6.* Budapest: Lucidus. Available at: www.hhrf.org/kisebbsegkutatas/minres/06/2.htm, visited January 2005.

Chelcea, Liviu 1999. Why Did the Banat Region Become Multicultural? Social Transformations and Collective Memory in a Romanian Region. *The Socrates Kokkalis Graduate Student Workshop: New Approaches to Southeast Europe.* Available at: www.ksg.harvard.edu/kokkalis/GSW1/GSW1/07%20Chelcea.pdf, visited January 2005.

Cretan, Remus 1997. Ethno-Geographical Aspects of Romanian Banat. *Banat*. Eds. Jovan Romelić et al. Novi Sad: University of Novi Sad, Institute of Geography, 131-141.

Cristea, Octav, Lațea, Puiu & Chelcea, Liviu 1997. Egy roma közösség etnikai megbélyegzettsége. *Antropológiai Műhely*, (11–12) 3–4: 47–58.

Day, Dennis 1998. Being Ascribed, and Resisting, Membership of an Ethnic Group. *Identities in Talk*. Eds. Charles Antaki & Sue Widdicombe. London: Sage, 151-190.

Dufva Hannele, Mika Lähteenmäki & Sari Isoherranen 1996. *Elämää kielen kanssa*. Arkikäsityksiä kielestä, sen oppimisesta ja opettamisesta. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, Solki.

Duranti, Alessandro 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, Alessandro 2001. Linguistic Anthropology: History, Ideas, and Issues. *Linguistic Anthropology*: *A Reader*. Alessandro Duranti (ed.). Oxford: Blackwell, 1-38.

Fairclough, Norman 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Felföldi, László 2002. A tánccal kapcsolatos ideológiák kutatása a Bánság hagyományos kultúrájában. *Hagyomány és interkulturalitás*. Bodó, Barna (szerk.) Timişoara: Centrul de cultură şi artă al judeţului Timiş, 73–85.

Gal, Susan & Kathryn Woolard (eds.) 1995. Special Issue on Constructing Languages and Publics. *Pragmatics* vol. 5, no. 2.

Gal, Susan & Kathryn Woolard 1995. Constructing languages and publics: Authority and representation. *Pragmatics* vol. 5, no. 2: 129–138.

Gal, Susan 1979. *Language Shift*: Social Determinants of Language Change in Bilingual Austria. New York: Academic Press.

Gal, Susan 1987. Codeswitching and consciousness in the European periphery. *American Ethnologist* 14(4):637-653.

Gal, Susan 1993. Diversity and Contestation in Linguistic Ideologies: German Speakers in Hungary. *Language in Society* 22: 337–359.

Gal, Susan 1998. Multiplicity and Contention among Language Ideologies: A Commentary. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard & Paul Kroskrity eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 317-332.

Gal, Susan 2002. Language Ideologies and Linguistic Diversity: Where Culture Meets Power. *A magyar nyelv idegenben*. Keresztes, László & Sándor Maticsák (eds.). Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem, 197-204.

Gereben, Ferenc 1999. *Identitás, kultúra, kisebbség: felmérés a közép-európai magyar népesség körében*. Budapest: Osiris.

Greffner, Otto 1996. *Das Banat und die Banater Schwaben. Kurzgefasste Geschichte einer deutschen Volksgruppe*. Weil am Rhein. Published by the author.

Halmesvirta, Anssi 2001. Subsistence, 'The Political Circus', and Cultural Revivalism: A Survey if the Contemporary Political Culture of the Hungarian Minority in the Romanian Banat. *Ethnic Minorities and Power*. Hannonen, Pasi, Lönnqvist, Bo & Barna, Gábor (eds). Helsinki: Fonda Publishing, 72–98.

Hannonen, Pasi 2001. Broken Chains: German and Hungarian Conceptions of History and Ethnic Relations in the Romanian Banat. *Ethnic Minorities and Power*. Hannonen, Pasi, Lönnqvist, Bo & Barna, Gábor (eds). Helsinki: Fonda Publishing, 46–71.

Hester, Stephen & William Housley (eds.) 2002. *Language, Interaction and National Identity*. Cardiff Papers in Qualitative Research. Ashgate: Hants.

Hester, Stephen & William Housley 2002. Ethnomethodology and National Identity. *Language, Interaction and National Identity*. Eds. Stephen Hester & William Housley. Cardiff Papers in Qualitative Research. Ashgate: Hants, 1-15.

Irvine, Judith 1998. Ideologies of Honorific Language . *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard & Paul Kroskrity eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 51-86.

Iskanius, Sanna 2004. Venäjänkieliset toisen asteen opiskelijat Suomessa: Pohdintoja kielestä ja identiteetistä. *Äidinkieli ja toiset kielet*. Sirkku Latomaa (toim.). Tampere: Tampere University Press, 28-42.

Kalaja, Paula 1999. Kieli ja asenteet. *Kielenoppimisen kysymyksiä* Kari Sajavaara and Arja Piirainen-Marsh (eds.). Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, Solki, 45-72.

Kupó Jenő 2002. Etnikumközi viszonyok néhány bánsági településen. *Hagyomány és interkulturalitás.* Bodó Barna (szerk.). Timişoara: Centrul de cultură şi artă al judeţului Timiş, 99–106.

Laihonen, Petteri 2000. Self-deprecations in American and Hungarian Everyday Conversations. A pro-gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of English. Available at: selene.lib.jyu.fi:8080/gradu/f/ plaihonen.pdf.

Laihonen, Petteri 2001. Multilingualism in the Banat: Elite and Everyday Language Ideologies. *Ethnic Minorities and Power*. Eds. Pasi Hannonen, Bo Lönnqvist & Gábor Barna. Fonda Publishing: Helsinki, 11–45.

Laihonen, Petteri 2002. Kielisota Unkarissa. *Kielikello* 2002/2, 8-12.

Laihonen, Petteri & Heino Nyyssönen 2002. Vähemmistö rajojen takana. *Ulkopolitiikka* 2002/1, 70-77. An extended version in English: Laihonen & Nyyssönen: On the preferential treatment of Hungarians living in neighbouring countries. *The Anthropology of East Europe Review.* Vol. 20, No. 2: 127-134.

Langman, Juliet 1998. Identitás és nyelv: Fiatal magyarok a felvidéken. *Nyelvi érintkezések a Kárpátmedencében, különös tekintettel a 'magyarpárú' kétnyelvűségre.* István Lanstyák & Gizella Szabómihály (eds.). Bratislava: Kalligram, 102-112.

Langman, Juliet & István Lanstyák 2000. Language negotiations in Slovakia: Views from the Hungarian minority. *Multilingua* 19 (1-2): 55-72.

Lucy, John 1993 (ed.). *Reflexive Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press*.*

Lönnqvist, Bo 1995. The outsider's view. Ethnological studies in everyday life in Norway. *Encountering Ethnicities*: *Ethnological Aspects on*

Ethnicity, Identity and Migration. Teppo Korhonen (ed.) Helsinki: SKS, 45-57.

Lönnqvist, Bo 2000. Wo ist die 'Heimat' des Volkskundlers? *Volkskultur und Moderne*. Europäische Ethnologie zur Jahrtausendwende. Band 21. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Wien, 141–148.

Neumann, Victor 1996. *Multicultural Identities in a Europe of Regions: The Case of Banat County.* Budapest: Collegium Budapest / Institute for Advanced Study. Discussion Papers, 34.

Niedzielski, Nancy & Dennis Preston 2000. *Folk Linguistics.* Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 122. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Nieminen, Tommi 2002. Charles S. Peircen semiotiikka. *Kielentutkimuksen klassikoita*. Hannele Dufva & Mika Lähteenmäki (eds.). Soveltavan kielentutkimuksen teoriaa ja käytäntöä 4. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, Solki, 125-154.

Péntek, János 2002. Örökség és kihívás. Az erdélyi magyar nyelvtudomány a század- és ezredfordulón. *Tizenkét év: Összefoglaló tanulmányok az erdélyi magyar tudományos kutatások 1990-2001 közötti eredményeiről*. I kötet. Tánczos, Vilmos & Tőkés, Gyöngyvér (szerk.). Kolozsvár: Scientia, 15-50. Available at: mek.oszk.hu/01700/01764/

Protze, Helmut 1995. Zur Erforschung deutscher Sprachinseln in Südost- und Osteuropa. Siedlung, Sprache, Geschichte und Wechselwirkung *Die Deutschen in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa. Geschichte – Wirtschaft – Recht – Sprache*. Bd. 1. Gerhard Grimm und Krista Zach (Hg.). München: Verlag Südostdeutsches Kulturwerk, 55-84.

Reisigl, Martin & Ruth Wodak 2001. *Discourse and Discrimination*. Rhetorics of Racism and Anti-Semitism. London: Routledge.

Sarangi Srikant & Christopher N. Candlin 2001. 'Motivational relevancies': Some methodological reflections on social theoretical and

sociolinguistic practice. *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*. Nikolas Coupland, Srikant Sarangi & Christopher N. Candlin (eds.). London: Pearson, 350-388.

Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard & Paul Kroskrity (eds.) 1998. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Silverstein, Michael 1998. The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard & Paul Kroskrity eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 123-148.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove 2002. Linguistic Human Rights in Education: Western Hypocrisy in European and Global Language Policy. *Power and Culture*. Plenary Sessions of the 5th International Congress of Hungarian Studies. Lahdelma, Tuomo, J. Jankovics, J. Nyerges & P. Laihonen (eds.). Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Hungarian Studies, 115-156.

Stevenson, Patrick 1997. The Dynamics of Linguistic and Cultural Identification on the Central Margins of Europe. *Sociolinguistica* 11, 192-203.

Spitulnik, Debra 1998. Mediating Unity and Diversity: The Production of Language Ideologies in Zambian Broadcasting. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard & Paul Kroskrity eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 163-188.

Toma, Alina 1998. Grenzen und Perspektiven einer Sprache und Kultur – die Lage des Deutschen im Rumänischer Banat. *Sprachgebrauch - Sprachanpassung*: Eine Untersuchung zum heutigen Gebrauch der deutschen Sprache in Westrumänien und zur sprachlichen Anpassung der Donauschwaben. Hg. Hans Gehl. Tübingen: Institut für donauschwabische Geschichte und Landeskunde, 46–91.

Verdery, Katherine 1985. The unmaking of an Ethnic Collectivity: Transylvania's Germans. *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 12, No. 1: 62-83.

Vološinov, Valentin 1990. *Kielen dialogisuus: Marxismi ja kielifilosofia.* käännös, esipuhe ja selitykset Tapani Laine. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg 1978. *Zur Interethnik*: *Donauschwaben, Siebenbürger Sachsen und ihre Nachbarn*. Suhrkamp: Frankfurt am Main

Whetherell, Margaret and Jonathan Potter 1992. *Mapping the language of Racism*: *Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation.* New York: Harverster Wheatsheaf.

Widdicombe, Sue 1998. 'But You Don't Class Yourself': The Interactional Management of Category Membership and Non-Membership. *Identities in Talk*. Charles Antaki & Sue Widdicombe (eds.). London: Sage, 52-70.

Wilson, John 2001. Who needs social theory anyway? *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*. Nikolas Coupland, Srikant Sarangi & Christopher N. Candlin (eds.). London: Pearson, 334-349.

Woolard, Kathryn 1998. Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. *Language Ideologies*: Practice and Theory. Eds. Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-47.

Woolard, Kathryn & Schieffelin Bambi 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55-82.

www.recensamant.ro. (Census of Rumania, 2002) Institutitul National de Statistica, visited January 2005.

Zimmerman, David 1998. Identity, context and interaction. *Identities in Talk*. Eds. Charles Antaki & Sue Widdicombe. London: Sage, 87-106.