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1. Introduction

In this chapter, I undertake a critical analysis of a recent public debate on the future of the Catalan language on the basis of a corpus of newspaper articles. Catalan is, together with Spanish, the official language of Catalonia and is spoken by over half of the country’s 7 M population. However, Spanish is the language most widely used in large urban centers such as Barcelona, which leads to recurrent debates on whether Catalan will eventually die out as a result of continuous immigration and the internationalization of the economy, politics and the media. My analysis does not address these concerns as such, but the social and political grounds of this debate, as well as its implications for different sectors of Catalan society. I will begin by laying out the social and historical conditions that render these debates significant as issues of national interest. Then I will move on to analyze a set of newspaper articles in terms of the particular constructions of language and of speech community that they present. I will finally discuss the significance of these debates in the construction of a Catalan nation and their implications for different social groups with different relationships to the language.
2. Historical background

Discourses over language in Catalonia and Spain have historically played an important role in the articulation of Catalan and Spanish nationalisms. Arguments about language use and policy are intimately connected with struggles over sovereignty, that is, over what social groups wield political power and control over territories and important economic resources within Spain. However, it is useful to appreciate that conflicts over sovereignty long preceded this politisation of language. When the Castilian elites started maneuvering to obtain the political control over Catalonia in the 17th century, Catalans opposed a bitter resistance through political and military means; but references to language are absent in contemporary texts. During the times of the Spanish Empire, members of the Catalan nobility had often sought to learn Castilian when they had interests or ambitions in the court, while a few writers chose to do their work in this language to gain recognition (largely unsuccessfully). After the fall of Barcelona in 1714, the crown imposed Castilian judges and military rulers, and banned Catalan from legal documents and schools (not always successfully) (Ferrer, 1985). In the 19th century, a significant section of the industrial and merchant elite adopted Castilian as a sign of distinction from the Catalan-speaking workers, peasants and the emerging middle-classes (McDonogh, 1986). However, at the same time, other social groups were logging onto the new romantic ideas on the intimate relationship of language with the ‘spirit of nations’. Conservative, liberal and revolutionary groups, while fighting each other for political hegemony, all contributed to invest language with much of the political significance that it has today. The new romantic focus on language provided a source of legitimacy for a ‘Catalan nation’, and the mere existence of the language was taken as proof of the existence of the Catalan group as an entity separate from Spanish-speaking Spain. The contemporary political interest in the reproduction of the Catalan speech community originates at this time.

At the turn of the 20th century, the Catalan elites concentrated their efforts in the establishment of a standard or ‘literary’ language and the development of a range of prestigious literary genres. It is immigration that explains the latter change of emphasis towards the ‘social use of Catalan’, which was the focus of the debate analyzed in this article. During the last Century, large numbers of immigrants began to arrive to industrial towns from other parts of Spain, thus giving rise to the present demolinguistic structure of Catalonia: urban centers display a predominantly Castilian-speaking profile in working-class areas and a predominantly Catalan-speaking profile in middle-class sectors. Immigration pushed most Catalan-speakers up the social ladder, thus turning Catalan into the language spoken by those who control the largest part of the administration and the local economy in Spain’s top manufacturing and exporting region. In this context, Catalan is an element of prestige and an important resource. Local Spanish-speakers can also profit by using the language to build personal relationships and find good employment, particularly in the public sector. In official surveys, 49% declare Catalan to be ‘their own language’, but as much as 75% claim to use it in different situations of their everyday life, such as at work with colleagues (GC, 2004). However, Spanish has retained an important position as a public language, particularly in the private sector, as privatized state services (i.e. telecommunications), banks, transnational companies, the cultural industry and the press are not controlled by Catalan capitalists and still treat the Catalan market as just a section of a wider, culturally and linguistically unified, Spanish market. The ‘new economy’ (including also tourism, software, the internet) is thus creating new spaces of penetration for the Spanish language, as well as the fact that it is the
Thus, at the turn of the millenium the Catalan language embodies not only national identity, but also the type of cultural capital that ensures access to powerful networks and prestigious employment. This sounds like a strong backing for a language, if it were not for the fact that native Catalan speakers present a comparatively weaker rate of biological reproduction than the rest of the Catalan population. Be that as it may, Catalan has so far held ground thanks to the fact that a section of the local Spanish speaking population regularly adopt it as a family language (GC, 2001, 2004; Subirats, 1990). But what disturbs the language-sensitive section of the population is the increasing presence of Spanish in the urban landscape or the fact that it is the main language of communication of children and young people in urban centres. The vigorous colloquial presence of Spanish presents a challenge to Catalan nationalists. If the reproduction of the Catalan speech community cannot be ensured, there is no case for a Catalan nation as long as language is seen as one of its constitutive features. In fact, the very status of the language as a national symbol is in doubt from the moment that it is not spoken by the whole of the population or is used as an element of social distinction or of differentiation. The 1980 statute of autonomy defined Catalan as Catalonia's 'own' language (llengua pròpia de Catalunya) and established it as the language of education. Education, it was hoped, would provide access to Catalan to people of immigrant origin and would thus prevent social and ethnic divisions on the basis of language. The results of various official surveys and research projects during the 1980s and 1990s suggest that this policy was successful in a general sense, as the younger generations have certainly learned Catalan (Reixach, 1997) and speakers of both languages often intermingle oblivious to their sociolinguistic background (Boix, 1993; Pujolar, 2001). However, observers are not convinced that Catalan is being used as much as it is known. In linguistically diverse groups, it is argued, Spanish tends to predominate because Catalan-speaking can speak it more fluently.

At this point, we must also attend to a small but important sector of the population that has a special investment in language and plays a key role in language debates: what I call the ‘language professionals.’ It includes writers, translators, teachers of all educational levels, journalists and linguists (be they academics or not). Language professionals are those who claim expertise on language and on particular uses of language. Philologists (Catalan language professors and teachers, language assistants, writers and publishers) are an important section of these professionals. The discipline of ‘philology’ has historically played, in many countries, an important role in the production, reproduction and distribution of the traditional discourses that placed language and literature at the center of the political sphere. Thus philologists have contributed to define communities as monolingual, bounded wholes by constructing sanitized, unified images of all languages. Their sophisticated research on the origins of languages, the canons of literary traditions, dialectal boundaries as well as lexical and grammatical properties has been used to control ‘interferences’ from other languages and to define the stylistic and formal criteria to write and speak literary or standard forms of languages. In this way, philologists have acted as guardians of an important source of authority, the legitimate language (Bourdieu, 1991), which played two fundamental roles in the modern period: a) it determined the conditions for access to important resources and symbolic power, b) it contributed to the delimitation of the national speech community, that is, the construction of the nation on the basis of the ‘authentic’ native speakers of the language. Much work in linguistics and literary studies is still amenable to this philological reading of the role of language in society. Writers, in Catalonia and elsewhere, have also seen themselves as actors in the construction of a standard language and a national literary tradition (Fernàndez, 1995). Journalists are a second grouping who play an important role in
the contemporary world, not only in the dissemination of legitimate language practices, but also in the regulation of the distribution of discourses in the public arena, although they are also subjected to the interests of the media companies for which they work. In this context, newspapers, radio and television corporations, in so far as they market products that are constitutively linguistic and communicational, can be regarded as ‘language companies’ that also have important stakes in struggles over language policies, i.e. as to what languages, whose languages, what language ideologies, should be accorded legitimacy in given social contexts or territories. These ‘language companies’ can thus be seen, as I will show below, as important actors in struggles over languages in Catalonia, and not as simple loudspeakers of discussions that originate elsewhere (see also Cardús, 1995).

Thus, debates on the future of the Catalan language are not strictly speaking about the language, but about the reproduction of the national speech community and the means of access to the material and symbolic resources that this community manages. Such a debate gives rise to two constitutive tensions, first over who counts as a Catalan speaker and second over the relationship between speaking Catalan and being Catalan. As I will show, the former issue is very much dominated by the philological perspective, while the latter is the basis of a division between different strands of Catalan nationalism that can be characterized as either ‘ethnic’ nationalism or ‘civic’ nationalism. ‘Ethnic’ constructions of Catalan identity on the basis of cultural properties - i.e. language - are confronted by more inclusive, ‘civic’ conceptions based on citizenship - i.e. participation in political institutions and in civil society (Grad Fuchsel and Martín Rojo 2003, Smith, 1986, 1991). Most theorists of nationalism suggest that the ‘civic’ strand may represent a later, more civilized stage. However, in the Catalan case, I have my doubts with this view as far as chronology is concerned. The latest historical research on 19th Century Catalonia shows that a liberal nationalism, associated with the emergence of labor and revolutionary movements, predated the formation of a conservative culturalist nationalism that may well have been triggered as a response to the former (Hernández, 2005). Struggles between right wing and left-wing nationalist sectors continued throughout the 20th Century. However, Woolard’s view that the Catalan language had become an emblem not only of national identity, but also of class membership after the massive immigration movements of the 1950s and 1960s, is probably correct too. She also notes, though, that when the autonomous government was established (1980) all Catalan political parties were committed from an early stage to deconstruct the binary association between language and identity. This ‘de-ethnicization’ of language has been identified by sociolinguists in many social contexts (Boix, 1993; Nussbaum 1990; Pujolar, 2001, Tusón, 1985; Vila, 1996 and Woolard, 2003).

These struggles are further complicated by the pressures of a Spanish nationalism that strives for hegemony too, often through the interests of the media corporations that are instrumental in the constitution of ‘public opinion’ (Cardús, 1995). On the basis of existing data on the Catalan media market, I will also argue that media corporations are important actors in these struggles themselves, probably because of their interests in the markets of the various languages. I will show that, in Catalonia, the media market presents a predominant orientation towards Spanish markets, which contributes to sideline Catalan language issues and benefit Spanish nationalism. By doing this, I hope to show that debates about language endangerment are not only about preserving linguistic diversity in the face of globalized trends towards linguistic and cultural homogenization. These global trends are also deeply implicated in local political struggles over access to political and economic power. Whatever policies and resources are put in place for the development of endangered languages must be sensitive to the implications of linguistic policies for the various social groups affected by them.
3. Data analysis

My corpus consists of 41 articles published between the 1st of January and the 1st of July 2003. They are all the items that were detected and included in the press reports of the Institut de Sociolingüística Catalana and the Institut d’Estudis Catalans in Barcelona, and which cover all major newspapers distributed in Barcelona, as well as a number of local publications that are not systematically scanned. As my research approach is heavily invested by ethnographic methods, I tend to resist simple content analyses. Instead, I sought to see these texts as traces of an interaction process, not unlike other forms of human (e.g. face-to-face) conversation. After all, this debate had concrete spatial (the newspapers and magazines) and temporal locations and a set of concrete participants (33 authors plus 5 interviewees or extensively quoted ‘experts’2) who often responded to each other before a largely silent audience. This is why I have incorporated some (admittedly few) contextual elements to the analysis, mainly on the basis of publicly available information about the authors of texts, the immediate political context and the market of the printing press in Catalonia. One interesting way to analyze this type of texts is to examine the ‘participant constellation’ they tend to construct. I understand by participant constellation the set of individuals who participate in some form in a given social activity and their way of engaging with that activity, i.e. as legitimate speakers, bystanders, overhearers, legitimate audiences and so on. Students of interaction and conversation have long identified and studied these conversational roles (Goffman, 1981). Critical discourse analysts have pointed out that they are often not pre-given, but interactionally produced, and hence the object of struggles and tensions (Fairclough, 1992). In the media, a common participant is ‘the nation’ and the reader is often appealed in subtle ways as a member of that nation (Billig, 1995). One useful way to examine processes of construction of national audiences is through the uses of pronouns, particularly the first person plural ‘we’. I will show how the shifts and ambivalences of the referents of this pronoun reflect divergent views on the role of language in the construction of Catalan national identities.

The corpus cannot really be seen as a single conversation thematically. There is a clear divide between a ‘catalanist’ sector (37 items) and a ‘non-catalanist’ (4 items), the latter represented by individuals who could be easily ascribed to various strands of Spanish nationalism. 3 of these appear at an early stage to criticize a new linguistic regulation affecting shops and restaurants, which means that they do not take part in the main line of the debate: the so-called social use of Catalan, that is, the extent to which the language is used in everyday life. Two key events were a colloquium at Barcelona University led by a linguist and a well-known writer, and the publication of the results of an official survey where people were asked what ‘their language’ was (Subirats, 2003).

3.1. Participants

There were four basic types of participant: collaborators, journalists, quoted ‘experts’ and the relatively anonymous audience of readers. The first two categories were projected as both ‘authors’ and ‘animators’ of full articles, whereas the others tended to appear either in quotations or in more subtle forms of reporting and reference. Although some collaborators may be in the payroll of newspaper companies, their role is rather that of a person external to the organization whose writings can be argued to have an interest for the public, either because of their content or because of the social position of the writer (or both). Collaborators are normally expected to construct a ‘personal’ position or point of view. They are often identified by name and surname (although pseudonyms are not exceptional) and may address or respond to each other explicitly. Journalists, on the contrary, are supposed to take
a stance of professional reporting that formally evacuates issues of personal judgment and perspective. The journalistic voice of news reporting is normally expected to present ‘events’ in a descriptive way (in terms of the what, who, when and where) rather than arguments. In the corpus, only 8 articles (17%) were produced as news reports by professional journalists. The rest were written by regular collaborators (also 8) and by other collaborators who managed to make their views published by virtue of their social position and their personal contacts.

Language professionals, as I have defined this category, would constitute 75% of the individual characters identified in the texts (all except politicians, activists and teachers not specialized in language). The ‘philological’ sector would make 41% of the characters involved. As we can see in table 1, we find women only in the journalistic profession, which is surprising if one bears in mind the substantial presence of women in the teaching professions and amongst graduates in philology. Public debates on language remain, for some reason, a masculine concern.

Table 1
Professions of active participants in the debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Appear in n. articles</th>
<th>n. of persons mentioned</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language teachers, professors and language assistants</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>They all work specifically on Catalan, not on Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 work in Law in the non-catalanist group. Another one is a well-known nationalist ideologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>They all write fundamentally in Catalan, except one Englishman and except when they write in dailies written in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians and cultural activists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 of them of belong to clearly pro-Catalan parties or institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to publishing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In Catalan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalistic collaborators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Regular collaborators of the Catalan-written press. One of them writes exclusively on (against) Spanish nationalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional journalists</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Press reporters. 3 of them (in 4 articles) are signed by women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the table does not feature authors of texts, but all characters that actively intervene in the debate through different forms of textual presence. The first column presents the number of articles where the referred characters appear in each category. Because each article may contain references to more than one character, the sum of percentages (of articles where the characters appear) exceeds 100. The third column presents the actual number of characters that correspond to each category without repetitions.

Philologists also played an important role in the debate in that it was largely triggered by a colloquium jointly chaired by the prestigious linguist Solà and the popular writer Quim Monzó.
(Capdevila, 2003; Palomeras, 2003; Piñol, 2003a, 2003b; Piquer, 2003). Solà generally argued that Catalan was receding as a spoken language and that its use had to be promoted without concern for the ‘quality’ of the language, i.e. people should not be bothered for not using the ‘correct’ forms. Monzó accused the Catalan government of eluding its responsibilities with relation to the language and proposed, in an ironical key, a linguistic ‘euthanasia’, i.e. a national agreement to cease speaking Catalan on a certain date. The reactions were varied and will not be extensively glossed here; but most authors recognized the increasing linguistic diversity of Catalonia and lamented that most Catalan speakers would not use the language with most speakers of other languages even if these were able to speak it or at least understand it. This situation, they argued, gave Spanish its increasingly predominant position in everyday life.

One interesting feature that is common to almost all contributors is that, despite the obvious connection between their own professional roles and their interest in the Catalan language, they rarely make this connection visible by, for instance, explaining personal experiences. Only the articles by a publisher (Muñoz, 2003a, 2003b) are clearly focused on the implications of language policies for the publishing industry. One can occasionally find (not in this sample) texts of writers or pop singers who mention the implications of writing in Catalan for those who seek professionalization (Vallverdú, 1975; Bargalló, 2005). In some cases (not in this sample either), university professors or secondary school teachers may attest to the language uses of their pupils as supporting evidence for the view that Catalan is receding; but this is very rarely connected with considerations about the specific roles of teachers for language policies. As Billig argues, the social groups implicated in the construction of national consciousness characteristically seek ‘to present their particular voice as the voice of the national whole’ (1995: 71). Thus, to the moment, the role of speaking for the speech community in Catalonia seems to be largely reserved to those who have a personal investment in the language professions and in the construction of a Catalan national literature.

3.2. The audience, the speakers and the nation

The general audience, although sometimes explicitly mentioned as well, takes up much more shifty and proteic forms. The most interesting resource for audience construction is the pronoun ‘we’ and its semantic equivalents (us, our), which are often used to build a sense of the reader accompanying the writer, as in ‘However, if we analyze the figures…’ (Sala, 2003). As Billig (1995) has pointedly argued, the press is a key site in the construction of the national community and its boundaries, often through implicit means, in which the ‘we’ plays a key role:

‘There is a case for saying that nationalism is, above all, an ideology of the first person plural. The crucial question relating to national identity is how the national ‘we’ is constructed and what is meant by such construction.’ (Billig, 1995: 70)

In a context where language is being discussed by virtue of its connection with national identity, then we (in this case, author and reader) can expect that first person plurals will be open to involve in multiple, ambivalent and contradictory ways either the speakers of the languages affected and/or the members of the national group.

As it is known, in most languages, the referent of the first person plural may or may not include the audience. Catalan is one of those languages and there is no linguistic marker that can unambiguously determine who exactly is included in the referent. The key must necessarily be found either in the textual or extratextual contexts, if it can be found at all.
Writers may well feel that the disambiguation is not needed or not in their interest. In fact, the shifts between inclusions and exclusions throughout a piece of writing may actually play a key role in the writer’s strategy. Thus, of all items in my data, there is one interview article that presents a most interesting itinerary of referents for the first person plural:

Text 1: occurrence 1 (L’Hiperbòlic, 2003)

hem de fer un esforç de revitalització de la societat civil
We must make an effort of revitalization of the civil society

Here we have a restricted ‘we’ that applies exclusively to the members or the board of a cultural society led by the newly elected person who is being interviewed. It is a relatively unproblematic ‘we’ in the sense that the interview is actually about what the organization wishes to present as being of public interest. Later, it emerges that the situation of the Catalan language is at the top of the agenda. In relation to this, the interviewee reportedly says:

Text 1: occurrence 2

aquí sempre basculem des d’un optimisme més aviat moderat fins a un pessimisme catastrofista
Here we always stay at a balance between a rather moderate optimism and catastrophist pessimism

Text 1: occurrence 3

... fins a la dictadura del General Franco, tots els avatars que hem tingut...
... Up to the dictatorship of General Franco, all the ups and downs we’ve been through...

Up to this moment, the ‘we’ points clearly to the Catalan national community from a historical perspective. It does not necessarily provide clues as to who may or may not be included in this category. There is, however, a significant cohesive connection between the language issue and the destinies of the nation, which builds a thematic relationship that does not need explicit elaboration. If we read further, we find sentences such as:

Text 1: occurrence 4

...un 50 per cent de la població nascuda a fora, que véen sense tenir...
... a 50 per cent of the population born outside [Catalonia], who [they] come without having...

This use of the third person plural to refer to ‘outsiders’ suggests a contrast between ‘us’ and ‘them’, but it is still, strictly speaking, ambivalent. Even if the writer considered ‘outsiders’ to be part of the Catalan group, the use of the third person plural remained mandatory, except if he would have wished to present himself as a member of the subgroup. However, the contrast between first and third person plural in the following sentence dispels the ambivalence:
...que la mateixa facilitat que tenim els catalanoparlants de passar al castellà, la tinguin els castellanoparlants per passar al català...
... that the same propensity that [we] Catalan speakers have to switch to Castilian, the Castilian speakers [they] have to switch to Catalan...

The use of the third person to refer to Catalan speakers would have been correct grammatically, of course if the reported speaker were willing to indicate that Catalan speakers were themselves a subgroup of the nation. This interpretation is not fully excluded by the text, although the stylistic effect of the syntactic contraposition is strong. In fact, there are clear contextual indications that the interviewee is striving to produce an inclusionary discourse. The very fact that Castilian speakers are mentioned at all is an indication of that. And further in the text, we find this sentence:

Text 1: occurrence 6
...tenim unes escoles que no van prou bé (...) hem de pagar peatges...
...We have schools that do not work properly (...) we must pay many tolls...

Here the interviewee is precisely trying to identify issues that may be of political interest to all Catalans irrespective of their language. This was a common strategy of the Catalan nationalist left in the period in which the interview was published, in the run up to local and national elections. Many leaders made it explicit by actually adding the coda ‘whether one speaks Catalan or Castilian.’

Now if we move on to analyze how first-person plural pronouns are used throughout the corpus to construct different alignments of readers as speakers and as members of the Catalan nation, we can divide them in 4 categories. The categories involve assumptions as to whether the reader is or is not a speaker of Catalan or Castilian. I shall connect these categories with national belonging below:

A: ‘We’ points towards a writer and an audience that is presumed to be Catalan speaking.
B: The ‘we’ is more ambivalent. It may be interpreted like A in the light of the contextual bearing of the discourses on language, but the letter of the text does not unambiguously call forth this interpretation.
C: The ‘we’ is produced in ways that make clear that the audience includes speakers of both Catalan and Castilian.
D: ‘We’ refers to groups not defined by linguistic or national identities: political parties, professional groups, the writer-reader tandem and so on.

In the corpus, category B is the most present. It appears in 29 articles, though often in combination with all the other categories. Thus, Category A appears in 11 articles and Category C in 5. One article actually includes both A and C first persons, although they are in principle contradictory. Interestingly enough, the 3 articles with the clearest, unambiguous occurrences of category C belong to authors who are Spanish nationalists:

Text 2: occurrence 7 (Marhuenda, 2003b)
Los catalanes tenemos dos idiomas propios.
[We] Catalans have two languages that are our own.
All in all, we find 26 articles where no explicit claims are made about the linguistic ascription of readers (i.e. they either contain B, B+D or D first person plurals, or none at all).

3.3. Whose language?

In this subsection, I am going to deal with the connection between language and identity, i.e. the ways in which speaking Catalan is associated with being Catalan, which also raises questions as to who counts as a speaker of Catalan. 15 articles contain statements presenting or implying rather directly that speakers of both languages are included in the category ‘Catalan’. The 4 items by Spanish nationalists are amongst these. 5 contain these statements in combination with category A first persons, that is, they may recognize that the category ‘Catalan’ includes everyone but they are assuming that the reader is a speaker of Catalan. However, of these 5, 3 actually contain statements that clearly imply that a Catalan is a Catalan speaker, that is, they are clearly inconsistent.

To provide a fuller picture of the discursive resources and processes connecting language and identity, it is necessary to examine the notion of llengua pròpia ‘own language’, as well as the use of the terms catalanoparlant ‘Catalan speaker’ and castellanoparlant ‘Castilian speaker’. For the former, we find authors that distinguish between the individual and the collective dimensions of language, which is one option for a ‘civic’ conception of national membership. However, one view shared by everyone has to do with who count as speakers of Catalan and Castilian.

The expression llengua pròpia, present in the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia and in various Spanish legal texts (Jou, 1998), can be treated as equivalent to expressions such as ‘our language’, or simply ‘the language’, meaning Catalan. In the corpus, one finds phrases like the following, which in Catalan comes across as remarkably redundant:

Text 3: occurrence 8 (Solé, 2003)

Tinc molt respecte pels qui senten el castellà com a llengua pròpia seva…, però és discriminar-los no acollir els immigrants en la llengua pròpia de Catalunya

I have a lot of respect for those who feel Castilian as their own language (…), but it is to discriminate immigrants not to welcome them in Catalonia’s own language

The phrase assumes that there is a personal and a collective dimension to language belonging. Castilian speakers thus could personally feel that Castilian is ‘their own language’ and Catalan is Catalonia’s own. This undoubtedly reinforces the view that the Catalan language has a privileged relationship with the Catalan community or nation, and thus fosters the assumption that its speakers may also have a privileged access to Catalan identity. From this perspective, we could add 8 more articles to the set that somehow excludes the Castilian-speaking readership. However, what this phrase is seeking to do, albeit not very successfully, is precisely to construct a Catalan identity formed mainly by speakers of both Catalan and Spanish in opposition to foreign immigrants in order to argue that Catalan should be given preference to Castilian when interacting with these immigrants who generally speak other languages. One additional article by a well-known sociologist contains (besides the sentence ‘the natural state of the Catalan is to weep about the language’) an explicit discussion on the individual and collective dimensions of the notion of ‘own language’ (Cardús, 2003b).
Occurrence 5 above presents another form of constructing who count as ‘Catalan speakers’. The conventional terms catalanoparlant ‘Catalan speaker’ and castellanoparlant ‘Castilian speaker’ arose in public discourse as an alternative to the colloquial ethnic labels Catalan and Castilian, which were unambiguously exclusionary (Pujolar, 1995). In the late 1970s, as Woolard (1989) noted, a Catalan was a person who spoke Catalan within the family and to others known to be Catalan. From this viewpoint, the new sociolinguistic labels are not actually descriptive of the specific language abilities of people, but of people’s adscription to a language by virtue of the same indicators that served the earlier classification. Thus, while the terms ‘Catalan-speaker’ and ‘Castilian-speaker’ have the advantage of not excluding the latter from the group label ‘Catalan’, they contribute to preserve the notion of what defines a speaker of Catalan. People who speak Catalan (like the castellanoparlants in Occurrence 5), but do not use it in the way Catalans do are not considered Catalan speakers.

The conceptual framework provided by expressions such as ‘llengua pròpia’, catalanoparlant and so on is so widely accepted that official surveys can unproblematically ask residents what la seva llengua ‘their language’ is, to which they may respond ‘Catalan’, ‘Castilian’, ‘both’ or ‘others’ (see Subirats, 2003). This makes also possible phrases such as the following:

**Text 4: occurrence 9 (Pla, 2003)**

... els catalans –més ben dit, l’escàs 50% de la gent del país que voldríem poder-hi viure un dia amb normalitat en català- ...

... The Catalans –to put it more properly, the not quite 50% of people in this country who [we] would like to be able to lead one day a normal life in Catalan-

**Text 4: occurrence 10**

... un 50% dels catalans senten el castellà com la seva llengua més íntima i personal, a la qual se senten units per un fortíssim vincle d’identificació.

... 50% of Catalans feel that Castilian is their most intimate and personal language, to which they feel united by a very strong attachment of identification.

**Text 5: occurrence 11 (Domínguez, 2003)**

Per què acostumem a ser els catalanoparlants els que ens passem al castellà davant d’un català castellanoparlant? (Domínguez, 2003)

Because it is usually [we] Catalan speakers who switch to Castilian before a Castilian-speaking Catalan.

This implies that, generally speaking, both authors and readers will exclude many ‘users’ of Catalan from the category ‘Catalan-speaker’, which in turn implies that articles that assume a Catalan-speaking readership exclude them too.

### 3.4. The mass-media market

The process through which actors –writers- construct particular relationships with the audience -readers- does not involve just the texts, but the whole social context of communication. From this perspective, the analysis of media texts presents typical limitations when no evidence is available about the processes of text production and reception. However, there are a few interesting points that can be made by simply looking at the market
of the printing press in Catalonia. These have to do with the insertion of the language debate in particular sections of the press, mainly the publications written in Catalan, and the discursive differences found in texts published in different media.

An overview of the Catalan market for daily newspapers is useful (see table 2). The market is clearly dominated by Catalan-based (mainly Barcelona-based) publications, which make 85% of the net circulation average. However, the market share of the Catalan-written dailies is only 25%.

Table 2
Net Circulation average of dailies in Catalonia (2003)\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Based in</th>
<th>In Castilian</th>
<th>In Catalan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>10271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avui</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>28368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diari de Girona</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>8161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diari de Tarragona*</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>15031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El País</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>61830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Periódico</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>101155</td>
<td>69356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Punt</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>23843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mañana*</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>5732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Razón</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vanguardia</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>205330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segre</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>7209</td>
<td>6365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diari de Sabadell</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>5685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diari de Terrassa</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>5611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Mundo</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>14486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regió 7</td>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>8922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>432340</td>
<td>145015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERCENTAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some articles, often on local issues, are written in Catalan.

The 4 non-catalanist articles appear in Madrid-based daily newspapers, though two of them in special sections addressed to Catalan audiences only. The rest of the corpus is dominated by the dailies Avui (in Catalan, 22 articles) and La Vanguardia (in Spanish, 9 articles). The remaining articles (6) are written in magazines, regional dailies and the ‘cultural’ section of the Madrid-based El País, all written in Catalan. The absence of items in El Periódico is interesting, as it is one of the largest newspapers and it is published bilingually, i.e. readers can buy either a Castilian or a Catalan version (largely translated from the Castilian original). The ‘opinion’ section of this newspaper seems to be more strictly controlled than in the others. There are fewer articles by external collaborators and most of them are related to issues addressed in other sections, which suggests that self-appointed collaborators may have little chance to get published. In any case, we are sadly left with the question of how would a national ‘we’ be constructed in a bilingual newspaper (and with the suspicion that this might have been the problem behind the editorial policy of this paper).

Catalan-speaking first-person plurals (category A) and statements that link Catalan identity and language appear only in Catalan-based, Catalan-written media. To this rule, there are the following exceptions:
1) One article in la Vanguardia with the phrase ‘We users of Catalan have (...).’
2) One article in the Catalan-written cultural section of El Pais, although the expression is inserted in a quotation of a character separate from the author.
3) Phrases of the ‘our language’ type also appear in two articles of La Vanguardia, one of them within quoted text.

Otherwise, these features appear always in ‘opinion’ articles from external collaborators and very rarely in articles by regular collaborators (only once) and in the voices of journalistic reporting. 5 Journalistic reports feature category A pronouns in quotations from the linguist or the writer of the Barcelona colloquium. However, in three interviews, we also find the journalists using these. The need to build some kind of collusive relationship with interviewees may lead journalists to produce these exceptions.

We can draw three main conclusions of these data. First, Catalan professional journalistic discourse tended to avoid expressions that might potentially exclude readers on the basis of language (consistently with general trends towards neutral styles in relation to gender and race). This means that Catalan formal journalistic discourse tactically favors ‘civic’ orientations to Catalan nationalism.6 Second, public debates on the future of Catalan are largely promoted from the (monolingual) Catalan-written press, and particularly by the daily Avui, a medium associated with nationalist sectors. Given the market position of the monolingual Catalan-written press, the 2003 debate was marginal in the sense that it reached a small fraction of the potential readership, most of it through the few articles published by La Vanguardia. Third, ‘ethnic’ orientations to Catalan nationalism get expressed almost exclusively in the Catalan-written press, in which they are in a minority position. It is, from this perspective, a clearly marginal discourse.7

4. Discussion

What these data show is that Catalan nationalist discourses tilt between the ‘ethnic’ and the ‘civic’ poles and that the latter may be gaining strength, in tune with the principles that legitimize contemporary liberal democracies. In the corpus analyzed, a number of authors seek to construct a ‘civic’ discourse that maintains a connection between language and identity by distinguishing between personal linguistic identity and a collective or territorial one, thus reproducing a common distinction used in the definition of language rights and policies. This does not constitute a fundamental challenge to the traditional connection between language and national identity. What it seeks to do is precisely to salvage the connection in a way that is in principle inclusive of speakers of other languages. In this way, many Catalan nationalists strive to make room for the large numbers of speakers of Castilian in the representations of Catalonia as a nation, as well as the new foreign immigrants. In some cases, a new picture is emerging of a bilingual Catalan community in the face of the new multilingual population intake.

However, these ideas are not widely established and appear in contradictory ways. As a consequence, participation in language debates may still have an ‘ethnicizing effect’ for people who may not speak Catalan or may not be seen as native speakers of Catalan. The ‘users’ of Catalan who do not qualify as actual ‘Catalan-speakers’ reside in a symbolic limbo. There is actually no term to name them (could it be L2 speakers?). Thus, if we sought to follow the discussion from the perspective of a Catalan who may well speak Catalan often, but speaks Spanish at home and with many of her acquaintances, she would...
articles where no assumptions are made in relation to the languages she speaks or how she speaks them, plus 10 articles which assume that speakers of both languages are members of the Catalan community. But in the remaining 11 articles, she might feel displaced as if she was a simple bystander to a conversation between people who see each other, but not her, as legitimate speakers of Catalan concerned for the future of the language and of the Catalan nation.

One point that needs to be granted in this critique: appeals to a restricted Catalan-speaking audience appear basically in Catalan-written media, where it may be legitimate to assume that the reader can count as an everyday user of the language. Surely Catalan speakers have every right to construct themselves as a group and discuss their concerns. The university colloquium, whose voices leaked into the Castilian-written press, was clearly constructed as one such ‘insider’ space. However, when this kind of debates are potentially important to construct Catalonia as a nation, then Castilian speakers as such should also have the means to participate in them. Authors should not act as if the Catalan language concerned only a minority, a fraction or a faction in Catalan society, even if they put forward positive representations of Castilian-speakers. In the corpus, Castilian-speakers were commonly depicted in a favorable light. Their attitudes towards Catalan were positive. Newly created pressure groups of ‘new Catalan speakers’ were mentioned. Two authors also sought to represent a kind of ‘outsider’ perspective: one who reflected on the history of his partly Castilian-speaking family (Sáez, 2004) and an Englishman, who also used the Catalan-speaking ‘we’ (Tree, 2003). But the large numbers of Catalan L2 speakers were clearly underrepresented in the debate, that is, people generally more fluent in Castilian covering a varied range from the actively bilingual (probably the middle-class) to the passively bilingual (probably the lower class) (Rodríguez-Gómez, 1993; Ros, 2000; Unamuno, 2000). Catalan-medium media should provide a neutral space for Catalans of different backgrounds to negotiate their relationship to the languages they speak and their modes of participation in the construction of the Catalan nation.

These considerations point towards the need to revise the notion of ‘speaker’ that is largely coincident and has a long-standing tradition both in the academy and in politics. The overrepresentation of ‘philologists’ in the debate attests to the historical connection between, on the one hand, expert discourses in linguistics and literary studies and, on the other hand, the political discourses that legitimize national identities on the basis of adscription to the national speech community. It is not incidental that the conception of ‘speaker’ that can be found in my own writings and in those of most of my colleagues is basically the same - including this very text. In fact, most linguistic and sociolinguistic studies in multilingual communities tend to reproduce similar essentializing constructs of ‘the speaker’. The category is probably productive because it bespeaks the social position of actors in a very material sense. This is precisely why it is necessary to analyze it critically, even when it may be difficult to find alternatives that help to structure intelligible academic and political narratives.

It is also necessary to acknowledge that Catalan nationalists who wish to construct more inclusive discourses encounter important limitations in the dissemination of these discourses. The market is dominated by corporations that do not have stakes in the Catalan language. This may be due, in part, to the simple fact that these enterprises benefit from their position in the Spanish linguistic market, which gives them a dominant position in Catalonia too. There is also an argument that could be made as to the role that these companies play in the articulation of new Spanish nationalist projects in which the development of Catalan as a national language is not seen with sympathy. From this perspective, the memoirs of the writer Gaziel on the anti-Catalanist tradition of La Vanguardia are illuminating (Calvet, 1994). In any
case, the reserved attitude of the Spanish-speaking press in relation to the Catalan language means not only that the circulation of Catalan nationalist discourses are hampered; it also prevents a substantial section of the population to participate in debate on language and nation and thus to enable other voices to be constructed and heard. It is also relevant to note that Spanish linguistic nationalism is generally much more ‘ethnic’ and excluding (Grad Fuchsel and Martin Rojo, 2003), but critical analyses of it are rare in academic circles (see del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman, 2002 and del Valle, 2005) and non-existent in forms more accessible to the public. In any case, these issues are pure politics; they belong to the field of struggles for the legitimation of different conceptions of the nation. From this perspective, one should not forget that catalanist elites have other means of discourse production and distribution which, in some circumstances, can make good the limitations encountered in other sections of public life: a virtually unchallenged hegemony in the public sector, including local and regional institutions, schools and universities.

5. Conclusion

The debate on the future of the Catalan language analyzed here was clearly more than a debate about language. It was also a debate about the Catalan nation and about who was entitled to participate in the construction of the nation. To the extent that speakers of Catalan (in the traditional sense) enjoy a comfortable social position and control the local administration, and to the extend that being recognized as a speaker of the language may formally or informally determine social relations and access to symbolic and material resources, debates on language survival and language policy cannot be treated as simply ‘linguistic’ or ‘cultural heritage’ issues, but as important political questions that may affect the social and economic position of the social groups of a given territory.

Most participants in the debate analyzed here seemed to pursue an inclusive, ‘civic’, conception of the Catalan nation that would involve both speakers of Catalan and Castilian (and maybe other languages too). The observations made in the Barcelona colloquium by the linguist Joan Solà (more accurately argued in Argente, 1991) that the quality of the language is a comparatively minor issue, attests to a general awareness that the linguistic diversity of Catalonia should not be ignored. However, most contributions represented the point of view of native speakers, while the perspective of other types of users of Catalan was underrepresented. The traditional notion of ‘speaker’, that restricts its meaning to ‘native speakers’ contributes to make other types of speakers invisible. As a result, the practical outcome of these debates is, at present, to confirm the native-speakers’ status as legitimate interpreters of the national destinies. The substantial presence of ‘philologists’ in these debates probably contributes to overlook the fact that academic categories of what counts as a speaker may not be the most adequate to deal with issues that are fundamentally social and political. Additionally, the conditions of the Catalan media market and the agendas of media corporations may restrict the circulation of new discourses, prevent the participation of wider audiences in particular debates and foster the agendas of conservative groups, Spanish nationalists and others.

Be that as it may, individual participants may have inclusive intentions but the overall picture of the discursive field is still that of an ethnonational discourse that leaves non-native Catalans in a marginal position. Those who wish to see the Catalan language playing a prominent role in the future must do more than produce inclusive texts. They must organize spaces of communication and participation for a more plural constituency.
enjoy the same rights in the construction of the nation, irrespective of the languages they use, then they are entitled to make their views and their experiences heard in all aspects of public life, including the ‘national’ language.

Notes

1 The category ‘writer’ has been applied on the basis of the self-adscription of authors. Most of these are not professional writers, though. What is interesting is the fact that they feel that it is their identity as ‘writers’ that accords them the legitimacy to participate in this debate.

2 I am taking a loose sense of expertise, i.e. any person who is presented as entitled to speak publicly about a given issue on the basis of her or his professional background. Academic sociolinguists have played so far a low profile in the debates on the future of Catalan. Only three participated in the debate, always with signed articles and were never presented by journalists as ‘experts’.

3 It is important to note that the exact wording of this text may or may not reflect to the detail what the interviewee actually said in the interview situation. There is an anonymous reporter acting as animator (Goffman, 1974) who may have advertently or unadvertently manipulated relevant elements of the text. Thus, the analysis addresses not the interviewee’s position, but the version of it that the reporter deemed legitimate or appropriate to circulate.

4 Two of these 8 provide more elements for ambivalence. In one of them, the Category A pronoun appears within a quotation of an expert, but not in the journalistic voice. In the other, the opposite happens: it is a lengthy interview where the interviewee seems to be interested to present Catalonia as a linguistically diverse community whereas the interviewer uses once a Category A expression.

5 The missing datum of ‘La Razón’ does not vary the results significantly. Given that the Catalan editions of other Madrid-based papers constitute only 8.7% of their sales, this one cannot exceed 12000 copies (and probably not more than 6-7000, given that it is a conservative newspaper).

6 Whether the same could be said in relation to Spanish nationalism remains to be seen. Grad Fuchsel and Martín Rojo (2003) found that ethnic orientations predominated in Spanish nationalist discourse stemming from parliamentary debates, whereas Catalan nationalist leaders articulated an eminently ‘civic’ nationalism.

7 It is difficult to assess the impact of the predominantly Catalan-written local and regional press, where the publication of responses to national debates is common. In the few instances that appear in this corpus, it appears that this sector is more Catalan-speaker-centered.

8 I am after all a graduate in two Philologies myself: ‘Anglogermanic’ and ‘Catalan’.

9 With respect to this argument, it is interesting to bear in mind that –as far as I can attest by my own experience- the Spanish written press is overwhelmingly managed by native speakers of Catalan too.
References used as data

Branchadell, Albert (2003a) ¿Tan mal anda el catalán? La Vanguardia, cultural s 21/05/2003.
Capdevila, Jordi (2003) Joan Solà creu que el català és a l'UVI però que es pot recuperar. Avui 26/03/03.
L'Hiperbòlic (2003) Jordi Porta, nou president d'Òmnium Cultural. 'El català se’n pot sortir.'
L'Hiperbòlic 01/01/2003.
Marhuenda, Francisco (2003a) Cataluna y el bilingüismo. La Razón 24/01/03.
__________ (2003b) Otra polémica con el catalán. La Razón 06/02/2003.
Muñoz, Josep (2003a) El libro no suma. La Vanguardia 03/02/2003.
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