

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Desired Language. Languages as objects of national ideology*.

Edited by Francesc Feliu.

© 2023. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

‘Compositionality’ in comparative standardology

Joan Costa-Carreras, Carla Amorós-Negre
and Miquel Àngel Pradilla

Pompeu Fabra University / IULATerm; University of Salamanca /
IULATerm; Rovira i Virgili University

Our aim of establishing the theoretical basis for the study of comparative standardology among the Spanish languages makes a revision of the metalanguage used in language standardisation studies a previous and necessary task. As one of the basic notions in the history and comparison of the emergence of the standard languages/varieties is ‘compositionality’, we decided to search for its origins and use among Spanish standardologists. Therefore, this paper begins by presenting the history of the words *composicional* and *composicionalitat* in the Catalan corpus language planning and explaining what their origin was in one of Haugen’s (1968) seminal paper. Secondly, it is analysed to what extent this notion has been applied in the Norwegian, the Catalan, the Basque and the Galician standardology. Some concluding remarks are provided in the end, mainly in the sense that *compositionality* is such a general notion that a lot of different practices can be included in its scope, some of which explained in this paper. On the other hand, a general reflection upon the possibility and desirability to conduct a comparative standardology is provided.

1. Introduction

A well-established metalanguage is needed not only to comparative standardology among the Spanish languages be possible but, in a wider perspective, to discuss the epistemological and extraepistemological status of comparative standardology, according to the issues put forward by Grabe (2002: 3–12) and Kaplan (2002: VIII).

To begin with, the very concept of standard is difficult to define, as Amorós Negre (2018) points out:

La estandarización de una variedad lingüística constituye un objetivo prioritario entre los cometidos de la política y la planificación lingüísticas, un proceso más sociopolítico y cultural que propiamente lingüístico, lo cual explica la polémica constante que lo envuelve. La polisemia misma del término constata la falta de unanimidad en torno al alcance y la naturaleza de una de las más discutidas variables sociolingüísticas.” (Amorós Negre 2018: 21)¹

And she adds later:

“[...] ya en el siglo XIX, Friedrich Max Müller emprendió [el estudio de la formación de los diversos estándares de las lenguas] desde un punto de vista comparativo, No obstant, las contribuciones desde el enfoque de la standardología comparada (Joseph 1987) son todavía muy limitados. (Amorós Negre 2018: 34)²

One of the main problems in the current standardology is the management of language variation:

Las interrelaciones entre lengua estándar y variación diasistemática han planteado dificultades diversas en muchas culturas.[...] Quizá esté el origen de tantos conflictos – teóricos, si bien con innumerables consecuencias prácticas – no en realidad lingüística sino en una terminología que, por ser insuficiente, ha sido malinterpretada y mal aplicada. (Torrent-Lenzen 2006: 176)³

As one of the basic notions for the relationship between uniformity and variation in the creation of a standard variety is the one about ‘compositionality’, we decided to search for its origins and use among standardologists in Spain. Thus, this paper begins by presenting the history of the words *composicional* and *composicionalitat*

1. From now on we provide our own translation into English of all the quotations that are not in English, giving the original texts in footnotes. The translation original of this excerpt is: “The standardisation of a linguistic variety constitutes a priority objective among the tasks of linguistic policy and planning, a more socio-political and cultural process than linguistic itself, which explains the constant controversy surrounding it. The polysemy itself of the term confirms the lack of unanimity around the scope and nature of one of the most discussed sociolinguistic variables.”

2. The translation of this excerpt is: “Friedrich Max Müller undertook the study of the formation of the different standards of the languages from a comparative point of view. However, the contributions from the comparative standardization approach (Joseph 1987) are still very limited.”

3. The interrelationships between standard language and diasystematic variation have posed diverse difficulties in many cultures. [...] Perhaps it is the origin of so many conflicts – theoretical, although with innumerable practical consequences – not in linguistic reality but in a terminology that, being insufficient, has been misunderstood and misapplied.

in the Catalan corpus language planning (taking for granted they are used in a monosemic way) and explaining what its origin was in one of Haugen's (1968) seminal paper. In a second part, it is analysed to what extent this notion has been applied in the Norwegian, in the Catalan – Pompeu Fabra's (1868–1948) and the Institute of Catalan Studies (IEC) works –, in the Basque and in the Galician corpus language planning. Some concluding remarks are provided in the end, mainly, on the one hand, in the sense that *compositionality* is such a general notion that a lot of different practices can be included within its scope. On the other hand, a general reflection upon the possibility of a comparative standardology is provided.

2. The data to be commented on

The Catalan official academy dealing with the whole of the Catalan linguistic space, the Institut d'Estudis Catalans states that "the model of the Institut d'Estudis Catalans, which is at the base of the Grammar of the catalan language [is] compositional [and] admits the variation [and] polymorphism" (GIEC 2016: xiv).⁴

One of the main Catalan sociolinguists, Bibiloni (1997: 40–41), defines the "compositional model" as a "unitarian standard constructed from contributions by all the dialects" which "needs a codification based mainly on the criterion of diasystematicity [...]."⁵

In what is considered a foundational publication in the Catalan corpus planning, Polanco (1984: 116) characterises "*composicional*", stating that, when implemented "there is just one single standard variety created on the basis of a contribution – more or less egalitarian – by different geographical varieties. Some examples are the Greek *koinê* or the modern Norwegian dialects."⁶ In his footnote 26 he cites Haugen (1968), where the American-Norwegian language planner defines the term *compositional* (see below).

4. The original of this translation is: "El model propi de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans, que és a la base de la Gramàtica de la llengua catalana, continua la tradició fabriana, però va una mica més enllà. [És un model] composicional que admet la variació [...]" (GIEC, 2016: xiv).

5. "un estàndard unitari [...] a partir d'aportacions de tots [els dialectes]. Reclama una codificació que treballi a fons amb el criteri de diasistematicitat [...]" As for the "criterion of diasistematicity", see below.

6. "Hi ha una sola varietat estàndard creada a partir d'una aportació – més o menys igualitària – de diferents varietats geogràfiques. [...] *koinê* grega [...] moderns dialectes noruecs."

For his part, one of the outstanding Catalan standardologists, Xavier Lamuela, proposes (1984: 80) the “criterion for diasystematicity” which will be very useful when commenting on Ivar Aasen’s (1813–1896) works:

[This criterion is the] starting point [of a codification that proposes to establish a multiple norm: the] conception of variation [...] as an organized whole in which there is a hierarchy of the various linguistic forms established according to the measure in which each of them explains their concurrents[. It is] the term Weinreich [1954] coined for a structural dialectology, I will call this *criterion of diasystematicity*.⁷

As we said earlier, Haugen (1968 [1972: 265]), defines the term *compositional*: “that an S[tandard] L[anguage] is (or should be) a composite of dialects (the nature of composition being left unspecified) [may be called] the compositional thesis”. According to him, Aasen clearly rejected the unitary “hypothesis” (the standard being set up on only one dialect) and worked through the comparison of the dialects to “discover” the old Norwegian. Haugen calls this objective “reconstruction”, “creation” or “discovering”, not “composition”, a word we have not found anymore in his works after 1968 that we have read (Haugen 1972 and 1983). As examples of these words we have:

- a. “Construction⁸ and reconstruction in language planning: Ivar Aasen’s grammar”, which is the title of one of Haugen’s works (originally in 1965) collected in Haugen (1972).
- b. Haugen there refers to Aasen, as the “creator of the landsmal (nynorsk)” and as “a constructor of a new Norwegian language norm” (ibid.: 192).
- c. “In trying to find the ‘overall pattern’ of these dialects, what [Aasen] did in fact discover was a proto-norwegian, related by precisely statable correspondences to the existing dialects, to its sister languages [...], and to their common ancestor, Old Norse” (ibid.: 194).

7. “punt de partida [d’una codificació que es proposi d’establir una norma múltiple: la] concepció de la variació [...] com un tot organitzat en el qual existeix una jerarquia de les diverses formes lingüístiques establertes en funció de la mesura en què cada una d’elles explica les seves concurrents [...] el terme que Weinreich [1954] va encunyar per a la dialectologia estructural, l’anomenaré *criteri de diasistematicitat*.”

8. Let us recall that Bartsch (1987: 249) also uses this metaphor: “Standardization is a selection of one form or variety [...], or a *construction* [italics are ours] out of different varieties with a fixed amount of variants included. It further implies accepting, applying, and proposing the norms of the selected or *constructed* variety for a certain domain of situations of language use and for a population which has used different forms and varieties before.”

So it must be concluded that the history of *composicional(itat)* in Catalan has been that Polanco found it defined in Haugen (1968) and he adopted and adapted it for his exposition. Quite paradoxically, while it has become a cornerstone notion in the Catalan (re)standardisation literature, Haugen (1972, 1983) did not use it in his later works (see § 3.2).

3. The ‘compositionality’ in different standardologies

The notion of ‘compositionality’ will be analysed in the context of: (a) the Norwegian standardisation – Ivar Aasen’s “reconstruction/creation” and the “fusion” of the Norwegian standards; (b) the Catalan standardisation – Pompeu Fabra’s standardisation works⁹ and the IEC’s restandardisation proposals; (c) the standardisation of Basque; and (d) the standardisation of Galician.¹⁰

3.1 The ‘compositionality’ the Norwegian standardisation

3.1.1 *The ‘compositionality’ in Ivar Aasen’s (1813–1896) “reconstruction/creation”*

According to Haugen (1968 [1972: 135]) “Aasen [...] distilled [from the dialects] what he conceived to be their “over-all pattern” [and] he called it Landsmal [...]” The literal meaning of “distillation” is “the purification or concentration of a substance, the obtaining of the essence or volatile properties contained in it, or the separation of one substance from another, by such a process.” Of course, in this Aasen’s excerpt, it is used metaphorically, and this metaphor has to do with Lamuela’s *diasystematicity*, by virtue of which “there is a hierarchy of the various linguistic forms established according to the measure in which each of them explains their concurrents” (1984 cit.):¹¹ Aasen set up the hypothetic Old Norwegian establishing the hierarchy between the forms of his contemporary dialects. In Weinreich (1954: 390) words, “a ‘diasystem’ can be constructed by the linguistic analyst out of

9. For more details, see Costa (2009) and Ayres-Bennett (2018).

10. As the standardisation of Spanish has been very well analysed (see for example Amorós Negre 2018: 21–66) and we have no room for it in this paper, we are not going to deal with it.

11. See also Senz, Minguell & Alberte (2011: 443–445): “diasystematicity (common to most linguistic systems), grammatical regularity, dissemination and representativeness of a feature are the priority criteria in the development of modern standards such as Catalan.” [la diasistematicidad (lo común a la mayor parte de sistemas lingüísticos), regularidad gramatical, difusión y representatividad de un rasgo son los criterios prioritarios en la elaboración de estándares modernos como el del catalán.]

any two systems which have partial similarities.” Haugen confirms that with more metaphors, to refer to Aasen’s task (*recovering*, *created* and *reconstructed*):

Aasen [...] set himself the task of *recovering*¹² the lost Norwegian language from its daughter dialects. [...] on the basis of [his field studies of Norwegian dialects] he *created* a norm which step by step departed from the individual dialects and became an overarching *reconstructed* norm for all the dialects (Haugen 1968 [1972: 281])

3.1.2 *The ‘compositionality’ in the “fusion” of the Norwegian standards*

The attempt to reach a single standard variety has been undertaken not only on the ground of the vernacular dialects, but also from two different standard varieties. Haugen states that

In Norway [...] although there are two official written languages, it is rather a case of schizoglossia than of a diglossia, since these are little more than divergent dialects of one language. The official government policy during the past 25 years has been to promote the fusion of these two languages into one compromise norm. [...] mutual approach of the two written languages on the basis of Norwegian folk speech [...] (Haugen 1962 [1972: 151])¹³

Not having a better designation for this process, we could propose to refer to it as a “second generation compositionality”: the attempt to create or construct a (super/acro)standard variety “fusing” two different standards which already were created or constructed on the basis of different dialects.

3.2 The ‘compositionality’ in the Catalan standardology

3.2.1 *Pompeu Fabra’s (1868–1948) Catalan standardisation*

We could provide a lot of sources to talk about Fabra’s compositionality, but we can give the floor to Polanco (1984), the first Catalan standardologist using this term. After stating that “the codifying model made by Fabra [...] can be described [...] rather as a compositional one – given the diversity of diatopic elements taken into account – but with an obvious priority for North-Eastern solutions,” he reminds that “Fabra’s work [was the] result of a compromise to determining sociolinguistic conditions” which even led other language reformers to a “claim of a completely autonomous (polycentric) fixation” for some issues in some regions (Polanco 1984: 120–121).¹⁴

12. Italics are ours.

13. This Haugen’s information is confirmed, for example, by Iglésias in 2010 and 2011.

14. “el model de codificació realitzat per Fabra [...] pot ser qualificat [...] més aïna com a *composicional* – atenent a la diversitat d’elements diatòpics tinguts en compte – si bé amb una prioritat evident per les solucions nord-orientals. [...] l’obra de Fabra [és el] resultat de compromís

But

Fabra's proposal seems to redirect the alleged polycentrism to very specific areas (morphology) and avoid the creation of independent coding centers through a generalization of the Institute's proposals through the use, and a simple complementation of the Institute's work in syntax and lexicon. [...] It was necessary [...] a strict Valencian agreement [Normes de Castelló] a polycentric fixation of the spelling [...] for sociolinguistic reasons [...]

(Polanco 1984: 122)¹⁵

From these excerpts *compositionality* and *polycentrism* seem in principle incompatible standardising strategies, given that the former is carried out in a single centre of standardisation whereas the latter is carried out in more than one center. Yet what must be highlighted is the fact that – as it is the case as for Basque, Catalan and Galician – they have been sometimes implemented alternatively, not only in different epochs but also just for specific linguistic issues (orthoepy, morphology and lexicon, for instance).

3.2.2 The 'compositionality' in the IEC's (2016) Catalan restandardisation

The IEC claims to be the heir and the follower of Fabra's work. In its last grammar, the *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana* (2016), known by its acronym *GIEC*, it claims explicitly that "the model of the Institut d'Estudis Catalans, which is at the base of the grammar of the catalan language, continues the Fabrian tradition, but goes a little further. [It is] compositional [and] admits the variation [and] polymorphism" (GIEC 2016: xiv).¹⁶ This is so, because "this grammar [...] gives an account of the

davant unes condicions sociolingüístiques determinants: [...] reduïda participació d'escriptors i gramàtics valencians o balearics." On note 23, about Fabra's work *La tasca dels escriptors valencians i balears*: "sobretot es tracta de la reivindicació d'una fixació [...] completament autònoma (policèntrica) [...]"

15. "la proposta de Fabra sembla reconduir el pretès policentrisme a àmbits molt concrets (la morfologia) i evitar la constitució de centres codificadors independents mitjançant una generalització de les propostes de l'Institut a través de l'ús, i una simple complementació de l'obra de l'Institut en la sintaxi i el lèxic [...] Va caldre [...] un acord valencià estricte [Normes de Castelló] una fixació policèntrica de l'ortografia [...] per raons sociolingüístiques [...]"

And he continues: "Són aquestes mateixes raons les que han impulsat altres gramàtics i lingüistes a defensar el policentrisme, però amb matisacions importants. [...] Sanchis Guarner[:] esbossar una teoria de la normativització desitjable. S'oposa en principi a l'alternativa unitarista [...] i defensa el polimorfisme [...], "car la unitat absoluta [...] és més bé un punt d'arribada [...]"; p. 124: "[...] el policentrisme, és a dir, els diversos focus de normativització [...] és defensat per raons eminentment sociològiques."

16. "El model propi de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans, que és a la base de la gramàtica de la llengua catalana, continua la tradició fabriana, però va una mica més enllà. Es tracta d'un model posicional que admet la variació i, doncs, que accepta el polimorfisme."

most representative variants of each speaker who have achieved prestige, and for each variant, the main speeches to which they belong” (GIEC 2016: xxiii).¹⁷ And in his table about the “Geographical variants of the Catalan language mentioned in this grammar” it claims that “2 dialectal blocks”, “6 dialects” and “13 subdialects” are dealt with in this grammar (GIEC 2016: xxiv).¹⁸

3.3 The ‘compositionality’ in the standardisation of Basque

The standardisation of Basque has been given as an example both of compositionality and of polycentrism, not within its own tradition – where these terms, according to Miren Azkárte (in a 2018 personal communication), are not used – but by foreign scholars. In this section we will analyse how this has been possible.

Among the authors adscribing Basque within the compositional model, we can cite the following ones. Stillwell and Hetrovicz state that “Haugen defines the selection process as one which strives for ‘minimal variation in form’ (1972: 107). This requires that [...] a koiné be created, adopting elements of various varieties and combining them into one form which did not previously exist, as in the case of Standard Basque” (Stillwell & Hetrovicz 2013: 69–70). They do not use the label *compositional*, but they claim that a single standard is created from all the previous dialects. Where Basque is explicitly given as an example of compositionality is – moving back to the Catalan standardology – in Ruiz, Sanz & Solé (2001):

Compositional or compositive model. [The model] with the contributions of all [the dialects], although one can have more weight than the others. The *Euskera Batua* (unified Basque) would be an example of that [...]: it is not identified with any of the pre-existing dialects, but rather it is intended to be the synthesis of them” (Ruiz, Sanz & Solé, 2001: 113)¹⁹

Also Polanco (1984: 116) mentions the “unified Basque” as an example of a compositional standard.

But, on the other hand, Kloss (1967: 31) claims that “polycentric standards will be found [...] in speech communities which are still in the beginning stage of

17. “Aquesta gramàtica [...] dona compte de les variants més representatives de cada parlar que han assolit prestigi, i per a cada variant esmenta normalment els parlars principals als quals pertany.”

18. “Quadre 1. Varietats geogràfiques de la llengua catalana esmentades en aquesta gramàtica”: 2 “blocs [dialectals]” / 6 “dialectes” / 13 “subdialectes”.

19. “Model composicional o compositiu. [...] amb les aportacions de tots [els dialectes], encara que un pugui tenir més pes que els altres. L’euskera batua (basc unificat) [en] seria un exemple [...]: no s’identifica amb cap dels dialectes preexistents, sinó que pretén ser-ne la síntesi.”

their modernization (Albanians, Basques, Kurds, etc.)” It seems that one possible explanation for these contradictory classifications would be that Kloss refers to the “the beginning stage of modernization”, whereas the other sources are referring to the process once it has been being implemented for a while. This could be argued on the ground of the different dates of the two viewpoints: Polanco; Ruiz, Sanz & Solé, and Stillwell & Hetrovicz were published between 1984 and 2013, and Kloss in 1967, 17 years earlier and just before fundamental events in the Basque standardisation process took place.

This explanation seems to be confirmed when we move on to the Basque standardology. If we analyse the texts of the main Basque language reformer, Koldo Mitxelena (1915–1987), we can confirm that. In 1981 he wrote that “local and regional varieties have had to compete [...] with the so-called literary dialects” (Michelena 1981: 291).²⁰ This could mean what Kloss wrote: before a systematic language reform by linguists, there already were different “literary dialects” cultivated in different regions, that being a situation of “polycentrism”. That is confirmed by Mitxelena: “our case is according to all evidence analogous to that of the Greek prior to the Hellenistic era” (Michelena 1981: 294;²¹ see also Azkárate & Lindemann 2018).

But when the planned, systematic reform was implemented, “a common language outline has been reached for written use as a first step [...] What is built on this foundation may serve as a reference point for the multiplicity of dialects and varieties, whose sap [...] will have to nourish the common language” (Michelena 1981: 295).²² With the metaphor of the sap, he makes it clear that the dialects are expected to contribute to the standard variety.

More recent publications confirm the compositionality in the Basque standardisation. Oñederra (2016: 346) states that orthoepy is a field with specific conditions: “The challenge for the linguist would be to find a way to make Standard Basque phonologically compatible with the dialects [...] an oral standard will always be more variegated than a written one. That is to say, different dialectal colourings will give rise to several standard pronunciations.” So this puts forward the issue about the relation between, on the one hand, language levels (phonetics, morphology,

20. “[...] variedades locales y comarcales han tenido que competir [...] con los llamados dialectos literarios [‘escritos’].” It must be taken into account that due to the political censorship during the Francoist dictatorship (1939–1975) he had to sign up his papers as “*Luis Michelena*” in his hispanised name.

21. “nuestro caso es según toda evidencia análogo al del griego anterior a la época helenística.”

22. “se ha llegado [...] a un esbozo de lengua común para el uso escrito como primer paso [...] Lo que se construya sobre este fundamento podrá servir de punto de referencia para la multiplicidad de dialectos y variedades, de cuya savia [...] se tendrá que nutrir la lengua común.”

lexicon and syntax) and orthography, and, on the other, compositionality, polycentrism and polymorphism.

Within the Basque standardology, we have not found any instances of the words neither *compositionality* nor *polycentrism*. But what is unanimous is the label *Euskara Batua* ('unified Basque'). Salaburu (2015: 10) claims that "[Euskaltzandia was formed in order to] determine a standard or unified Basque: to specify a Basque model that grows up from the blood of all the dialects". Besides all that what has been said up to now, Garabide Elkartea (Barandiaran 2010: 50) claims that "nowadays *Euskaltzaindia* acknowledges dialectal vocabulary as an asset to be maintained and exploited", which is another aspect of the compositionality: the role of lexical warehouse that dialects play to provide the standard with solutions to terminological elaboration problems.

3.4 The 'compositionality' in the standardisation of Galician

First of all, it must be said that, according to Henrique Monteagudo (in a 2019 personal communication) the word *composicionalidade* (the Galician morphological equivalent of *compositionality*) is not used in the Galician standardology – as far as he knows. He himself (Monteagudo 1993, 2005a, 2005b) deals with the treatment of geographical variation in the current Galician standardisation. The following information must be highlighted:

- a. "In Galician, the standard has a polylectal basis, selected and proclaimed by means of a procedure of adoption." (Monteagudo 2005b: 415)²³
- b. "The standard is a genuine dialect, but a very special dialect because it is 'supradialectal' or rather, 'transdialectal': it becomes indeed what he have called an 'axiolect'." (Monteagudo 2005b: 416)²⁴
- c. In the orthoepy (Monteagudo 2005a: § 6.2), there are cases – "gheada" and "seseo" (see also Monteagudo 1993: 134) – of geographical polymorphism.
- d. In morphology (Monteagudo 2005a: § 6.4.), there were different regional norms – which we could call "spontaneous polycentrism" (see also Monteagudo 1993: 123); but an "intrasystematicity" was applied to decide. The latter criterion reminds Lamuela's "diasystematicity".
- e. As for lexicon (Monteagudo 2005a: § 6.5), he proposes the dialects as assets to renew the vocabulary.

23. "En galego, o estándar ten unha base polidialectal, seleccionada e elevada mediante un proceso de adopción."

24. "o 'estándar' é un dialecto feito e dereito, só que un dialecto moi especial, pois ten carácter 'supradialectal' ou mellor, 'transdialectal': constitúese no que antes denominamos o 'axiolecto'."

Summing up these quotations, the word used to refer to the dialectal basis of the Galician standard is “polylectal(ism)”, being this variety ‘transdialectal’. As for some linguistic levels, what we have called ‘compositionality’ and ‘polycentrism’ could be applied discretionarily.

4. Concluding remarks

The authors of this paper have been working at least partly within the Catalan standardology. They maybe should admit that that is why they used to think that the term *compositionality* was universally used specially because it was defined by Haugen (1968), the language planner taken by this standardology as a “pillar” of its epistemology, like most standardologists (for example Ayres Bennet 2016 and 2020). It has been recently discussed even as for Spanish by Amorós-Negre (2018: 30, 62 and 308). As we said earlier, quite paradoxically, while it has become a cornerstone notion in the Catalan (re)standardisation, Haugen (1972, 1983) did not use it in his later works. However, some standardologists use words which at least belong to the same root:

- a. *composicional* is used by Segura Malagón (2011: 443), describing the Aragonese standardisation, and Andrés (2018), describing the Asturian standardisation;
- b. “*compositivo/compositiva*” is used by Sánchez Vidal (2018: 166), who cites Biblioni (1997);
- c. “*composite*” is used by Cerrutti (2011, 2018), Cerrutti & Regis (2014: 86) and Darquennes & Vandenbussche (2015: 6); and
- d. “*composito*” is used by Cerrutti, Crocco & Marzo (2017).

The absence of this word in Haugen (1972, 1983), after having defined it in 1968, is perhaps why, as it has been shown by the proofs we have analysed, it is not used in the Basque and the Galician traditions. This would be also confirmed by the absence of this term in the main international standardologists’ publications; among others: Kloss (1967); Joseph (1987), Barstch (1987), Brozović (1992); Clyne (1992), Dalibor (1992), Muljacić (1993), Metzeltin (2004, 2007), Koch & Oesterreicher (1990); Coupland & Kristiansen (2011), and Ayres Bennet (2016, 2020). So the Catalan standardology is the only one of the four traditions analysed – the other three being the Norwegian, the Basque and the Galician – in which it has been used as a central notion since 1984 up to now.

However, the lack of that designation for the use of the geographical dialects when setting up a standard variety in these three traditions does not mean neither that this use is not described nor it is not named in any way. In the case of Aasen, his work on the dialects was aimed at “distilling” their “over-all pattern”, a metaphor that has to do with Lamuela’s *diasystematicity*, by virtue of which “there is a hierarchy

of the various linguistic forms established according to the measure in which each of them explains their concurrents" (1984 cit.): that allowed him to *recover* the Old Norwegian and *create* and/or *reconstruct* his new norm. Monteagudo (2005a: § 6.4) uses the term "intrasystematicity" which reminds Lamuela's "diasystematicity".

A second management of the geographic dialects is the one implemented in the "fusion" of the two Norwegian standards. Not having a better designation for this process, we could propose to refer to it as a "second generation compositionality/creation/(re)construction": the attempt to create or construct a (super/acro) standard variety "fusing" two different standards which already were created or constructed on the basis of different dialects.

A third relationship between dialects and standard found in our analysis is that the former must provide the latter with their "sap" or must be managed as an asset to be maintained and exploited, which is also proposed in all the traditions.

A fourth issue is the one about the relation between, on the one hand, language levels (phonetics, morphology, lexicon and syntax) and orthography, and on the other, *compositionality*, *polycentrism* and *polymorphism*. Orthoepy, morphology and lexicon seem to be the levels where some kind of 'compositionality' is more or less unavoidable.

From the analysis of the Catalan standardisation, where compositionality is the cornerstone, we can draw as a first conclusion that *compositionality* and *polycentrism* are in principle incompatible standardising strategies, but they have been sometimes implemented alternatively, not only in different moments but also just for specific linguistic issues (morphology, for instance). The apparent contradiction in the adscription of Basque as compositional (Polanco 1984; Ruiz, Sanz & Solé 2001; Stillwell & Hetrovicz 2013) and polycentric (Kloss 1967) has been explained taking into account that both strategies were implemented in different times. This seems to be also the situation described by Monteagudo (1993: 123, 2005a: § 6.4), as for Galician. But not only that: it also can be stated that polycentrism is generally carried out not by a standardiser looking for a standard variety, but by "cultivators" needing or wanting to write, not needing or wanting to fix a norm. Compositionality, instead, it is generally a strategy chosen by language reformers looking for unification. This is confirmed in the IEC's recodification, which is explicitly called 'compositional' and in which up to "13 subdialects" are dealt with.

Could all these different interventions be named "compositional"? Within the Basque standardology, we have not found any instances of the words neither *compositionality* nor *polycentrism*. But what is unanimous is the label *Euskara Batua* ('unified Basque'). So unification could be a synonym for compositionality. Monteagudo (2005b: 415) states that "in Galician, the standard has a *polylectal* basis". As we said earlier, Bartsch (1987: 249) uses *construction* as one type of standardisation. Joseph proposes the word *engineered* (Joseph 1987: 60). Does the word 'transdialectal', used by Monteagudo (2005b: 416) have to do with the role played by the dialects

in a standardisation? So after our analysis, we can say that we have nine candidates to design the multidialectal ground for a standard variety; in alphabetical order: *compositionality*, *composite*, *construction*, *creation*, *engineering*, *polylectalism*, *reconstruction*, *recovering* and *unification*.

And a final observation of this paper is that the way to compare the different standardologies seems to be to describe what has been done in each one no matter how it has been named. Once the different strategies are identified, then it must be checked whether they are named in any way. Finally the list of terms can be set up to try to propose a single term for each one.

Acknowledgements

Amorós-Negre and Costa-Carreras, together with twenty other researchers, obtained in July 2022 a grant for the project "Language standardization revisited: mediatization, vernacularization and language ideologies in contemporary Spain (ESTANDAREV; PID2021-124673NA-IOO)". This paper is the first step in this sense.

References

- Amorós-Negre, Carla. 2018. *La estandarización lingüística de los relativos en el mundo hispánico*. Madrid: Iberoamericana. <https://doi.org/10.31819/9783954877874>
- Andrés, Ramon d'. 2018. "Lenguas minoritarias y estandarización." In *Lenguas minoritarias en Europa y estandarización*, ed. by Javier Giralte Latorre and Francho Nagore Laín, 19–46. Zaragoza: Pressas Universitarias de la Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Ayres-Bennett, Wendy. 2016. "Codification and prescription in linguistic standardisation: myths and models." In *Constructing languages: norms, myths and emotions*, ed. by Francesc Feliu and Josep Maria Nadal, 99–130. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ivitra.13.07ayr>
- Ayres-Bennett, Wendy. 2018. "An interview with Joan Costa-Carreras on the standardisation of Catalan and comparative standardology (May 2018)". [Available on line: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326017748_An_interview_with_Joan_Costa-Carreras_on_the_standardisation_of_Catalan_and_comparative_standardology_May_2018. Accessed 4 March 2021]
- Ayres-Bennett, Wendy. 2020. "From Haugen's codification to Thomas's purism: assessing the role of description and prescription, prescriptivism and purism in linguistic standardisation." *Language Policy* 19: 183–213. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-019-09521-4>
- Azkárate, Miren and David Lindemann. 2018. "Basque lexicography and purism." *International Journal of Lexicography* 31 (2): 132–150. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/icy003>
- Barandiaran, Alberto (coord.) 2010. *Language standardisation. Basque recovery II*. Eskoriatza: Garabide Elkartea.
- Bartsch, Renate. 1987. *Norms of language. Theoretical and practical aspects*. New York: Longman. [Original version: *Sprachnormen. Theorie und Praxis*, 1985].
- Bibiloni, Gabriel. 1997. *Llengua estàndard i variació lingüística*. València: Tres i Quatre.

- Cerrutti, Massimo. 2011. "Regional varieties of Italian in the linguistic repertoire." *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 210: 9–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2011.028>
- Cerrutti, Massimo. 2018. "La formazione di varietà intermedie tra dialetti di base e standard in situazioni europee. Alcune considerazioni dall'angolatura italiana." *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 42: 79–99.
- Cerrutti, Massimo and Riccardo Regis. 2014. "Standardization patterns and dialect/standard convergence: a north-western Italian perspective." *Language in Society* 43 (1): 83–111. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404513000882>
- Cerrutti, Massimo, Claudia Crocco and Stefania Marzo. 2017. "On the development of a new standard norm in Italian." In *Towards a new standard. Theoretical and empirical studies on the restandardization of Italian*, ed. by Massimo Cerrutti, Claudia Crocco and Stefania Marzo, 3–28. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614518839-001>
- Clyne, Michael. 1992. "Introduction." In *Pluricentric languages. Differing norms in different nations*, ed. by Michael Clyne, 1–6. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Costa, Joan (ed) 2009. *Pompeu Fabra (1868–1948). The Architect of Modern Catalan. Selected writings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.150>
- Coupland, Nikolas and Tore Kristiansen. 2011. "SLICE: critical perspectives on language (de) standardisation." In *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe*, ed. by Tore Kristiansen and Nikolas Coupland, 11–37. Oslo: Novus Press.
- Dalibor, Brozović. 1992. "Serbo-Croatian as a pluricentric language." In *Pluricentric languages. Differing norms in different nations*, ed. by Michael Clyne, 347–380. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Darquennes, Jeroen and Wim Vandenbussche. 2015. "The Standardisation of Minority Languages – Introductory Remarks." *Sociolinguistica* 29 (1): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1515/soci-2015-0003>
- GIEC = *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana*. 2016. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- Grabe, William. 2002. "Applied linguistics: an emerging discipline for the twenty-first century." In *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, ed. by Robert B. Kaplan, 3–12. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haugen, Einar. 1962. "Schizoglossia and the linguistic norm." *Quoted from The ecology of Language*. Essays by Einar Haugen. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil, 1972, 148–158. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Haugen, Einar. 1965. "Construction and reconstruction in language planning: Ivar Aasen's grammar." *Quoted from The ecology of Language*. Essays by Einar Haugen. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil, 1972, 188–207. Stanford, Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1965.11435423>
- Haugen, Einar. 1968. "The Scandinavian languages as cultural artifacts." *Quoted from The ecology of Language*. Essays by Einar Haugen. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil, 1972, 265–286. Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Haugen, Einar. 1972. *The ecology of Language*. Essays by Einar Haugen. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Haugen, Einar. 1983. "The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice." In *Progress in Language Planning. International Perspectives*, ed. by Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman, 269–289. Amsterdam / New York / Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110820584.269>

- Iglésias, Narcís. 2010. "Les études de cas de la standardologie, un enjeu épistémologique de la sociolinguistique. Approche à une comparaison historique entre le cas catalan et le norvégien." In *Pour une épistémologie de la sociolinguistique*, ed. by Henri Boyer, 197–205. Limoges: Lambert-Lucas.
- Iglésias, Narcís. 2011. "Analyse métahistoriographique du cas du norvégien." *Scandinavian-Canadian Studies / Études Scandinaves au Canada* 20: 72–90. <https://doi.org/10.29173/scancan64>
- Joseph, John E. 1987. *Eloquence and power. The rise of language standards and standard languages*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Kaplan, Robert B. 2002. "Preface." In *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, ed. by Robert B. Kaplan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kloss, Heinz. 1967. "'Abstand Languages' and 'Ausbau Languages'." *Anthropological Linguistics* 9 (7): 29–41.
- Koch, Peter and Wulf Oesterreicher. 1990. *Gesprochene Sprache in der Romania: Französisch, Italienisch, Spanisch*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter. [Spanish version: *Lengua hablada en la Romania: español, francés, italiano*. Madrid: Gredos, 2007] <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111372914>
- Lamuela, Xavier. 1984. "Fixació i funcionament de la gramàtica normativa en el procés d'estandardització de la llengua catalana." In *Problemàtica de la normativa del català. Actes de les Primeres Jornades d'Estudi de la Llengua Normativa*, ed. by M. Teresa Cabré, Joan Martí, Lúcia Pons and Joan Solà, 65–92. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- Metzeltin, Miguel. 2004. *Las lenguas románicas estándar. Historia de su formación y de su uso*. Uviéu: Academia de la Llingua Asturiana.
- Metzeltin, Miguel. 2007. "Del Renacimiento a la actualidad (I). Procesos de codificación de las lenguas románicas." In *Manual de lingüística románica*, ed. by José Enrique Gargallo and Maria Reina Bastardas, 147–198. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Michelena, Luis. 1981. "Lengua común y dialectos vascos." *Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca "Julio de Urquijo"* 15 (1): 289–313. [Available on line: <https://ojs.ehu.eus/index.php/ASJU/article/view/7578/6764> Accessed 3 March 2021]
- Monteagudo, Henrique. 1993. "Aspects of corpus planning in Galician." *Plurilinguismes. Revue du Centre d'Études et de Recherches en Planification Linguistique* 6: 121–153.
- Monteagudo, Henrique. 2005a. "La estandarización del gallego. Problemas y avances." In *Norm und Normkonflikte in der Romania*, ed. by Carsten Sinner, 112–130. Munich: Anja Gärtig.
- Monteagudo, Henrique. 2005b. "Do uso á norma, da norma á o uso (variación sociolingüística e estandarización no idioma galego)." In *Norma lingüística e variación. Unha perspectiva desde o idioma galego*, ed. by Rosario Álvarez and Henrique Monteagudo, 377–436. Santiago de Compostela: Instituto da Lingua Galega. <https://doi.org/10.17075/nlv.2005.018>
- Muljacić, Žarko. 1993. "Standardization in Romance." In *Bilingualism and Linguistic conflict in Romance* (Trends in Romance Linguistics and Philology, vol. 5) ed. by Rebecca Posner and John N. Green, 77–116. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110848649.77>
- Oñederra, Miren Lourdes. 2016. "The Standardisation of Pronunciation: Basque Today, between Maintenance and Variation." In *Prescription and Tradition in Language Establishing Standards across Time and Space*, ed. by Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade and Carol Percy, 342–354. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096510-024>

- Polanco, Lluís B. 1984. "La normativa al país Valencià. Problemàtica i perspectives." In *Problemàtica de la normativa del català. Actes de les Primeres Jornades d'Estudi de la Llengua Normativa*, ed. by M. Teresa Cabré, Joan Martí, Lúcia Pons and Joan Solà, 107–146. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- Ruiz, Francesc, Rosa Sanz and Jordi Solé. 2001. *Diccionari de sociolingüística*. Barcelona: Enciclopèdia Catalana.
- Salaburu, Pello. 2015. *Writing words. The unique case of the standardization of Basque*. Reno: Center for Basque Studies (University of Nevada).
- Sánchez Vidal, Pablo. 2018. *Os idiomas del estado español. Un enfoque sociolingüístico*. Santiago de Compostela: Servizo de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico (University of Santiago de Compostela).
- Segura Malagón, Juan José. 2011. "Principios y criterios para una codificación normativa del aragonés." In *Pirinioetako hizkuntzak: lehena eta oraina*, ed. by Andoni Sagarra, Joseba A. Lakarra and Patxi Salaberri, 441–468. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- Senz, Silvia, Jordi Minguell and Montserrat Alberte. 2011. "Las academias de la lengua Española, organismos de planificación lingüística." In *El dardo en la Academia. Esencia y vigencia de las academias de la lengua Española*, ed. by Senz, Silvia and Montserrat Alberte, vol. 1, 371–550. Barcelona: Melusina.
- Stillwell, Kevin and Lauren Hetrovicz. 2013. "The standardizations of Catalan: Latin to present day." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences: Illinois Working Papers* 2013: 68–86.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1954. "Is a structural dialectology possible?" *Word* 10 (2–3): 388–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1954.11659535>