



Nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu **National Languages in Higher Education**

Zbornik prispevkov z mednarodne konference Jezikovna različnost in nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu
Collected Papers from the International Conference Language Diversity and National Languages in
Higher Education

Uredili • Edited by
Marjeta Humar, Mojca Žagar Karer

© 2010, Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU • ZRC Publishing, Scientific Research Centre SASA

Prevod angleških povzetkov • Translation of abstracts into English

Matija Pavlič

Oblikovanje in oprema • Graphic art and design

Brane Vidmar

Prelom • Layout

Simon Atelšek

Izdal • Edited by

Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU

Za izdajatelja • Represented by

Marko Snoj

Založil • Published by

Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU

Za izdajatelja • Represented by

Oto Luthar

Glavni urednik • Editor-in-Chief

Vojislav Likar

Tisk • Printed by

DZS, d. d.

Naklada • Print run

300 izvodov • copies

Izid zbornika so finančno omogočili • The publication was financially supported by

Ministrstvo za kulturo, Sektor za slovenski jezik • Ministry of Culture, Sector for Slovene Language

Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije • Slovenian Research Agency

Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU • Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language
SRC SASA

Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France • General Delegation for the French
Language and the languages of France

To delo je na voljo pod pogoji slovenske licence Creative Commons 2.5, ki ob priznavanju avtorstva dopušča nekomercialno uporabo, ne dovoljuje pa nobene predelave.

Nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu

National Languages in Higher Education

Uredili • Edited by

Marjeta Humar, Mojca Žagar Karer

Ljubljana 2010

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

378:81-2(082)

MEDNARODNA konferenca Jezikovna različnost in nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu (2009 ; Ljubljana)

Nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu : [zbornik prispevkov z Mednarodne konference Jezikovna različnost in nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu] = National languages in higher education : [collected papers from the International Conference Language Diversity and National Languages in Higher Education] / uredili, edited by Marjeta Humar, Mojca Žagar Karer ; [prevod angleških povzetkov Matija Pavlič]. - Ljubljana : Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, 2010

ISBN 978-961-254-203-0

1. Gl. stv. nasl. 2. Vzp. stv. nasl. 3. Jezikovna različnost in nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu 4. Language diversity and national languages in higher education 5. Humar, Marjeta
251570944

Vsebina

Marjeta Humar, Mojca Žagar Karer	
Uvodnik	7
Editorial	8
Ljubljanska izjava o rabi slovenskega jezika v visokošolskih ustanovah v Sloveniji z namenom ohranjanja jezikovne raznolikosti v Evropski uniji	9
Ljubljana Declaration on the use of Slovenian in higher education institutions in Slovenia with an aim of preserving language diversity in the European Union	11
Gerhard Stickel	
Domain loss of a language and its short- and long-term consequences	13
Matej Accetto	
Nacionalni jeziki, visoko šolstvo in mobilnost v pravu EU	23
Marilena Karyolemou	
Lesser-used national languages in higher education: The case of Greek in Cyprus	37
Maja Bratanić, Ana Ostroški Anić	
Croatian in Higher Education – an Instrument of Language Integrity and a Means of Standardising National Terminology?	43
Seosamh Mac Donnacha	
The Role of the University in Sustaining Linguistic Minorities – an Irish Case Study	49
Alojzija Zupan Sosič	
Slovenščina ali angleščina?	63
Monika Kalin Golob	
Univerza, ali več svoj dolg?	67
Ágota Fóris	
Hungarian as the language of education in the universities of the Carpathian Basin	71
Georges-Louis Baron, Eric Bruillard	
Language diversity and research on education in France: The case of ICT	79

Niels Davidsen-Nielsen	
Language in higher education: A Danish view	87
Ina Druviete, Jānis Valdmanis	
Language Use in Higher Education Establishments in Latvia	91
Manuel Célio Conceição	
Des langues pour les savoirs ou une langue pour la science	95
Jan Roukens	
Preparing the future of national languages in higher education	99
Aleš Obreza, Jelka Šmid-Korbar, Mirjana Gašperlin	
Kako je vključevanje v evropske integracije spodbudilo razvoj slovenske farmacevtske terminologije	103
Tadej Bajd	
Slovenski jezik v elektrotehniki	107
Tomaž Erjavec	
Slovenska terminologija in svetovni splet	109
Georgeta Ciobanu	
Knowledge of Languages in Contact – an Antidote to Domain Loss	113
Anna-Lena Bucher	
The role of terminology in the Swedish language policy 2009	117
Fidelma Ní Ghallchobhair	
English and language diversity	121
Andreja Žele	
Vloga Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU pri vsakdanjem jezikovnem in jezikoslovnem osveščanju	127

Uvodnik

Zbornik *Nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu* obsega dopolnjena in z znanstvenim aparatom opremljena predavanja, ki so jih predstavili udeleženci mednarodne konference z naslovom *Jezikovna različnost in nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu*, ki je potekala od 19. do 20. novembra 2009 v Ljubljani. Pobudo za organizacijo konference je dala Evropska zveza za terminologijo (The European Association for Terminology – EAFT), katere član je tudi Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU. Omenjenima organizatorjema se je priključilo še Evropsko združenje državnih jezikovnih ustanov (European Federation of National Institutions for Language – EFNIL), moralno in finančno pa so konferenco podprli Sektor za slovenski jezik Ministrstva za kulturo Vlade Republike Slovenije, Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije in Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France iz Pariza.

Konferenca je bila posvečena problematiki jezikovnega sobivanja v večjezični globalni družbi in izpodrivanja nacionalnih jezikov iz visokega šolstva in znanosti. Sodelovali so predstavniki iz več evropskih držav: iz Belgije, Nizozemske, Švedske, Romunije, Španije, Portugalske, Madžarske, Francije, Irske, Nemčije, Latvije, Danske, Hrvaške, s Cipra in seveda iz Slovenije. Udeleženci so v svojih prispevkih prikazali razmere v visokem šolstvu v njihovih državah, govorili pa so tudi o izgubi strokovnih področij in o vplivu angleščine na nacionalne terminologije.

Eden od pokazateljev tihega prehajanja na angleščino kot jezik znanosti v Sloveniji je gotovo dejstvo, da prireditelji kljub večkratnim povabilom na konferenco niso mogli privabiti niti enega dekana slovenskih univerz, niti na odprtje ne.

Na konferenci sta bili pripravljene dve javni izjavi. Slovenski udeleženci so sprejeli t. i. Ljubljansko izjavo,¹ ki opozarja na problem izgubljanja slovenščine v visokem šolstvu, mednarodna izjava pa zaradi nekaterih različnih pogledov ni bila dokončana.

Slovenski udeleženci konference so ugotovili, da je odnos do slovenskega jezika v Sloveniji protisloven.

Izjava o slovenščini v visokem šolstvu je bila poslana vsem dekanom slovenskih univerz, Slovenski akademiji znanosti in umetnosti, predsedniku države, predsedniku slovenske vlade, ministru za znanost in tehnologijo, ministrici za kulturo, vsem poslanskim skupinam v slovenskem parlamentu, posameznim poslancem in drugim pomembnim posameznikom. Podprl jo je predsednik Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti akademik Jože Trontelj, prav tako tudi minister za visoko šolstvo, znanost in tehnologijo Gregor Golobič, ki je predstavnike Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU povabil na pogovor in obljubil, da se bo za to problematiko zavzel. Po dogovoru naj bi spomladi 2010 ministrstvo za znanost in tehnologijo, Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU in Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti pripravili pogovor o tem, kaj storiti. Prispevek k širši razpravi pa je tudi ta zbornik.

Urednici Marjeta Humar in Mojca Žagar Karer

¹ Ljubljanska izjava je bila objavljena v *Jezikoslovnih zapiskih, glasilu Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU*, št. 15, 1–2. Ljubljana 2009. 295–297.

Editorial

The collected papers entitled *National Languages in Higher Education* contain papers from the international conference *Language Diversity and National Languages in Higher Education* that took place between 19th and 20th November 2009 in Ljubljana; the papers have been complemented and are accompanied by bibliographic references. The initiative for the conference came from the European Association for Terminology (EAFI), whose member is also the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language SRC SASA. The two organisations were joined by the European Federation of National Institutions for Language (EFNIL), while the moral and financial support was provided by the Sector for Slovene Language of the Slovenian Ministry of Culture, the Slovenian Research Agency and Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France from Paris.

The conference was devoted to the problems related to co-existence of languages in a multilingual global society and the fact that national languages are being ousted from higher education and science. The conference was attended by participants from several European countries: Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, Romania, Spain, Portugal, Hungary, France, Ireland, Germany, Latvia, Denmark, Croatia, Cyprus and, of course, Slovenia. Presentations highlighted the current state of affairs in higher education, discussed domain loss and the impact of English on the terminology of the national language.

One of the indicators that the Slovenian language is being silently replaced by English as the language of science in Slovenia is the fact that the organisers were unable, despite repeated attempts, to convince a single dean from the Slovenian faculties to attend the conference or at least come to the opening.

Two public statements were prepared during the conference. The Slovenian participants passed the Ljubljana Declaration¹, which discusses the problem of the weakening position of the Slovenian language in higher education, whereas the international declaration was not completed due to certain different points of view.

The Slovenian participants find that the attitude towards the Slovenian language in Slovenia is contradictory.

The declaration on Slovenian in higher education was sent to the deans of Slovenian faculties, the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, the Slovenian President, Slovenian Prime Minister, Minister of Science and Technology, Minister of Culture, parliamentary parties, certain MPs and other important individuals. The declaration was supported by the President of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts academician Jože Trontelj and the Minister of Higher Education, Science and Technology Gregor Golobič, who invited the representatives of the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language SRC SASA to talks and promised to assume an active role in this issue. According to an agreement the Ministry of Science and Technology, the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language SRC SASA and the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts are to prepare a discussion on what is to be done. These collected papers represent a contribution to a broader debate on this issue.

Editors Marjeta Humar and Mojca Žagar Karer

¹ The Ljubljana Declaration was published in *Jezikoslovní zapiski*, the newsletter of the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language SRC SASA, no. 15, 1–2, Ljubljana 2009, 295–297.



Ljubljanska izjava o rabi slovenskega jezika v visokošolskih ustanovah v Sloveniji z namenom ohranjanja jezikovne raznolikosti v Evropski uniji

Slovenski udeleženci mednarodne konference *Jezikovna različnost in nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu / Language Diversity and National Languages in Higher Education*, ki je potekala 19. in 20. novembra v Ljubljani v organizaciji Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU (Ljubljana), Evropskega združenja za terminologijo (The European Association for Terminology – EAFT) in Evropske zveze državnih jezikovnih ustanov (European Federation of National Institutions for Language – EFNIL), ugotavljamo nasprotujoča si dejstva v zvezi s položajem slovenščine v Sloveniji:

- A) država Slovenija je s pravnimi akti slovenskemu jeziku kot temeljnemu delu slovenske nacionalne identitete določila ustrezen položaj;
- B) država Slovenija zahtev, zapisanih v pravnih aktih, zlasti glede rabe jezika v visokem šolstvu in razvoja slovenske terminologije, ne izpolnjuje v celoti ali pa sploh ne,

zato opozarjamo, da lahko slovenščina sčasoma postane jezik, v katerem nekatera področja ne bodo imela oz. ne bodo (več) razvijala slovenskih poimenovanj in bo sporazumevanje potekalo le še v tujem jeziku.

Rabo slovenskega jezika na ozemlju države Slovenije določajo:

- 11. člen Ustave Republike Slovenije, po katerem je uradni jezik v Sloveniji slovenščina;
- 12. člen Zakona o javni rabi slovenščine, po katerem vzgoja in izobraževanje v javno veljavnih programih od predšolske stopnje do univerze potekata v slovenščini;
- Zakon o visokem šolstvu, po katerem je učni jezik slovenski, v tujem jeziku pa lahko potekajo programi tujih jezikov ali del študijskih programov – v teh sodelujejo gostujoči visokošolski učitelji ali je vanje vpisanih večje število tujih študentov, obenem pa se ti programi izvajajo tudi v slovenskem jeziku;
- Statut Univerze v Ljubljani, po katerem se morajo diplomska, magistrska in doktorska dela praviloma pisati v slovenskem jeziku.

O skrbi za slovensko terminologijo posebej govori Resolucija o nacionalnem programu za jezikovno politiko 2007–2011. Ta je med drugim predvidela:

- financiranje jezikoslovnih raziskav, jezikovnotehnoloških projektov in razvoja slovenske terminologije;
- izdelavo specializiranih priročnikov za slovenščino, tudi terminoloških slovarjev;
- poživitev in uskladitev delovanja terminoloških skupin, zlasti v naravoslovno-tehničnih vedah, ekonomiji, menedžerstvu, vojaštvu;
- izpopolnjevanje in zagotovitev spletne dostopnosti jezikovnih orodij, med njimi tudi terminoloških zbirk;
- izdelavo skupne zasnove visokošolskega predmeta »strokovno-znanstvena zvrst knjižne slovenščine«, pripravo predavateljev in vpeljavo v študijske programe večine fakultet;
- zagotovitev temeljnih visokošolskih učbenikov v slovenščini;
- zagotovitev rabe slovenščine pri opravljanju izpitov, izdelavi diplomskih, magistrskih in doktorskih nalog, tudi če so člani izpitnih komisij gostujoči tuji predavatelji;
- okrepitev motivacije za objavljanje znanstvenih dognanj v slovenščini in za nastopanje v slovenščini na mednarodnih prireditvah v Sloveniji, spremembo meril za točkovanje objav v slovenščini, občutno okrepitev subvencij za slovenske znanstvene monografije in znanstvene revije.

Dejansko stanje:

1. Angleščina že vrsto let vztrajno prodira v študijske vsebine in raziskovalno delo visokošolskih učiteljev v Sloveniji, zlasti po vstopu v EU in uvedbi Bolonjske deklaracije.
2. Rabo angleščine podpirajo Merila za volitve v nazive visokošolskih učiteljev, znanstvenih delavcev in sodelavcev, po katerih so v slovenščini objavljeni znanstveni dosežki ovrednoteni le s polovičnimi točkami, med nujnimi pogoji za izvolitev pa so predvidene le objave »v enem od svetovnih jezikov«, zato so znanstvene objave v slovenščini zapostavljene in za napredovanje nepomembne.
3. Na mnogih slovenskih visokošolskih ustanovah se večinoma poučuje in zato razvija tujejezična terminologija, država in univerza ne financirata ustrezno mednarodnih izmenjav študentov, predvsem v smislu ovrednotenja in spodbujanja vzporednega izvajanja predmetov v slovenskem in tujem jeziku.
4. Terminološki slovarji, ki so navadno najmanj pet- ali desetletno delo skupine strokovnjakov, v sistemu ocenjevanja znanstvenih rezultatov niso ustrezno ovrednoteni.
5. Delo in sodelovanje pri razvoju slovenske terminologije je finančno zelo slabo podprto.

Slovenska država in slovenska univerza sta nastali tudi zato, da bi dokazali enakopravnost in odličnost slovenskega jezika ter njegovo sposobnost, da lahko deluje in izpolnjuje svojo polnofunkcijskost na vseh področjih človekovega delovanja in mišljenja. Še zlasti pa se zdi nevdržno in paradoksalno, da bi se prav v našem času, tj. v samostojni državi Sloveniji, izničila stoletna prizadevanja slovenskih izobražencev po enakovredni rabi slovenščine na vseh področjih družbenega delovanja. Zato z javno izjavo resno opozarjamo slovensko politiko na kritične razmere glede rabe slovenščine v visokem šolstvu in od nje zahtevamo, naj da slovenščini v visokem izobraževanju in znanosti tisto mesto, ki nacionalnemu jeziku ustavno, zakonsko in tudi samoumevno pripada.

Ljubljana, 12. januarja 2010

Ljubljana Declaration on the use of Slovenian in higher education institutions in Slovenia with an aim of preserving language diversity in the European Union

The Slovenian participants of the international conference entitled *Language Diversity and National Languages in Higher Education* that took place on 19th and 20th November 2009 in Ljubljana under the organisation of the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language SRC SASA, Ljubljana, the European Association for Terminology (EAFT), and the European Federation of National Institutions for Language (EFNIL), find contradicting elements relating to the position of the Slovenian language in Slovenia:

- A) Slovenia defined the proper position of the Slovenian language by adopting legal acts which state that Slovenian is an integral part of the Slovenian national identity;
- B) Slovenia is fulfilling the demands stated in legal acts – in particular concerning language use in higher education and the development of Slovenian terminology – only in part or not at all,

which is why we believe that certain domains in the Slovenian language may in time come to lack or no longer develop Slovenian denominations, causing communication within such domains to be carried out only through the medium of a foreign language.

The use of the Slovenian language on the territory of Slovenia is defined by:

- Article 11 of the Slovenian Constitution, stating that Slovenian is the official language in Slovenia;
- Article 12 of the Public Use of the Slovene Language Act, stating that education in publicly valid curricula from kindergarten to the university level is carried out in Slovenian;
- The Higher Education Act, stating that the language of instruction is Slovenian and that foreign language programmes or parts of the curriculum may be conducted in a foreign language in which visiting professors or a large number of exchange students participate, yet these programmes should, however, simultaneously also be carried out in Slovenian;
- Statute of the University of Ljubljana, stating that BA/MA/PhD thesis should, in general, be written in the Slovenian language.

Particular emphasis on the issues related to Slovenian terminology is explicitly stated in the Resolution on National Programme for Language Policy 2007-2011, which, among other things, puts forth:

- Financial support to linguistic research, language-technological projects and the development of Slovenian terminology;
- Compilation of specialised reference books for Slovenian, also terminological dictionaries;
- Stimulation and coordination of terminological groups particularly in natural sciences and technical fields, economy, management and the military;

- Improvement of language tools and making sure they are accessible online, among them terminological collections;
- Designing a common basis for a higher education programme “Expert-scientific variety of standard Slovenian”, as well as educating the lecturers and introducing the course into study programmes of most faculties;
- Ensuring that essential higher education textbooks are available in Slovenian;
- Ensuring that Slovenian can be used when taking an exam, writing BA/MA/PhD thesis, even if foreign visiting professors are part of the board of examiners;
- Encouraging scientific publications in Slovenian during international events in Slovenia, changing the regulations for evaluating publications in Slovenian, sizeably increasing subsidies for Slovenian scientific monographs and scientific journals.

The following facts attest to the current situation:

1. For several years the English language has been penetrating university courses as well as research work of university teachers, even more so after Slovenia’s entry into the EU and the introduction of the Bologna Declaration.
2. The use of English is supported by the document entitled “Measures for the election in the title of university teachers, scientific workers and university co-workers” in which Slovenian scientific achievements are evaluated with only half of all points available, and among the necessary requirements for election only publications “in one of the major world languages” are considered, causing publications in Slovenian to be neglected and thus irrelevant for promotion.
3. In many Slovenian higher education institutions mostly foreign language terminology is taught and consequently only foreign language terminology is being developed, the state and the university do not adequately finance international student exchange, particularly in terms of evaluation and encouragement of parallel courses in the Slovenian and foreign language.
4. Terminological dictionaries – the compiling of which usually takes a group of experts at least five to ten years – are not provided adequate evaluation in the system of scientific result assessment.
5. The work and participation in the development of Slovenian terminology is poorly funded.

The Slovenian state and the Slovenian University were created, in part, to demonstrate that the Slovenian language was on a par with other languages, demonstrating its ability to perform as a full-fledged language in all areas of human existence. Nowadays it seems particularly unbearable and paradoxical, i.e. when Slovenia is finally independent, that we should see the century-long endeavours of Slovenian intellectuals to ensure the parity of the Slovenian language in all domains of social life come to nothing. This public declaration is meant as an address to the Slovenian politics, drawing attention to the critical state of the use of Slovenian in higher education; we also demand from the Slovenian politics to secure the Slovenian language its proper position in higher education and science as a constitutional, legal and self-evident right of a national language.

Ljubljana, 12th January 2010

Domain loss of a language and its short- and long-term consequences

GERHARD STICKEL

European Federation of National Institutions for Language (EFNIL)
stickel@ids-mannheim.de

Modern European science and culture evolved in the process of emancipation of various national languages from medieval Latin. At present, this development from monolingualism to multilingualism seems to be reversed in several scientific disciplines and in higher education. The former linguistic diversity turns gradually into a modern monolingualism of scientific English, especially in the natural and some social sciences. A short-term consequence is that researchers and professors with other first languages need extra time and sometimes money to prepare their publications and lectures in English. Long-term consequences are, among others, that all languages except English are devaluated as media of science and learning and, thus, a diglossia might develop if only English be used for the important domains and other languages be limited to the domains of private communication and folklore. The way out can only be through a cultivation of at least bilingualism of researchers, professors, and their students in the natural sciences and trilingualism in social sciences and the humanities.

Sodobna evropska znanost in kultura sta se razvili v procesu osamosvajanja različnih nacionalnih jezikov iz srednjeveške latinščine. V sodobnem času pa ta razvoj od enojezičnosti k večjezičnosti na mnogih znanstvenih področjih in v visokem šolstvu poteka ravno v obratni smeri. Predhodna jezikovna raznolikost se postopoma spreminja v sodobno obliko enojezičnosti v okviru znanstvene angleščine, še posebej v naravoslovnih in nekaterih družboslovnih znanostih. Na kratki rok to pomeni, da bodo raziskovalci in profesorji, katerih materni jezik ni angleščina, potrebovali več časa in tudi denarja za pripravo svojih publikacij in predavanj v angleškem jeziku. Na dolgi rok pa lahko pričakujemo, da bodo vsi jeziki razen angleščine kot orodje znanosti in izobraževanja razvrednoteni, zaradi česar bi lahko prišlo do diglosije, v kolikor bi se angleščina še naprej uporabljala na vseh pomembnih strokovnih področjih, preostali jeziki pa le v zasebnem sporočanju in folklori. Rešitev bi lahko bila spodbujanje dvojezičnosti pri raziskovalcih, profesorjih in njihovih študentih v naravoslovnih vedah ter trojezičnosti v družboslovnih znanostih in humanistiki.

1. Domains in science

What do we mean when we talk about domain loss of a language? Who or what loses what? I will not discuss at length the concept of linguistic domains as introduced by Joshua Fishman (1970: 51) some forty years ago and elaborated in several variants by other sociolinguists.¹ For our discussion, the definition given by Iwar Werlen (2004) may suffice:

¹ Various concepts of domain are presented and discussed in Haberland 2005.

“Domains of language use or language choice are defined as abstract constructs that are determined by appropriate locations, relations of roles, and themes ... Examples of domains are family, neighbourhood, work place, church, and public administration.”
(transl. G. S.)²

Within the thematic context of this conference, loss of domain should obviously refer first of all to the fact that within the communicative domain of science many professionally involved persons nowadays use English instead of their first language for publication and sometimes also for teaching and also in certain institutions of higher learning, and the instruction of certain university departments is not or no longer given in the native language of the students but in English. Due to this lack of use, the language in question and its speakers might lose the communicative domains of scientific research and academic teaching on account of English. To put it differently, the scientific domains as such do not get lost, of course, because communication in research and teaching goes on. However, the communicative needs of the scientists and their students involved are no longer fulfilled by a language other than English. The speakers of the other language thus lose the possibility, and perhaps also the faculty, of using their own language in science.

Before I discuss this loss and its possible consequences in more detail let me briefly mention some historical facts of language use in science. Concerning the word *science*, we know that English *science* other than French *science*, Spanish *ciencia*, German *Wissenschaft*, or Russian *наука* usually refers only to the natural sciences, perhaps including medicine and mathematics. I will sometimes use the word *science* in a broader sense to refer to all fields and disciplines of academic research and teaching, i.e. including social sciences and the humanities, and some other times only in the sense of the so-called ‘hard sciences’. I hope the context will make these different uses clear. Similarly the vague term ‘domain’ will sometimes be used to refer to language use in all sciences and their disciplines and sometimes only to language use in a single discipline or a group of related disciplines.

2. Historical outline: the case of German

As we know the present European standard languages were not always the media of science and higher learning. In the Middle Ages the early forms of our languages existed mainly as bundles of vernacular varieties with very limited regional and social range. It took several centuries and demanded the efforts of many writers, scholars, and scientists to develop, expand, and standardise the various vernacular languages of the medieval Europe to a degree where everything that can be thought, asked, said, and written in science can also be expressed. One should remember that until the 16th and 17th centuries, in some countries even until the 19th century, Latin was the dominant communicative medium of science and the humanities and also the medium and object of higher education. Traces of this are revealed by the many Latinisms preserved not only in the daughter languages of Latin but also in other European languages.

² “Domänen (engl. domains) des Sprachgebrauchs oder der Sprachwahl sind definiert als abstrakte Konstrukte, die zu einander passende Orte, Rollenbeziehungen und Themen bestimmt sind ... Beispiele für Domänen sind *Familie, Nachbarschaft, Arbeitsplatz, Kirche* und *staatliche Verwaltung*.” (Werlen 2004, p. 335)

Allow me to take my own *lingua materna*, my mother tongue, German as a prototypical example for the change from Latin to a developing national language as a medium of scientific communication. At the end of the 17th century, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, the great philosopher, jurist, mathematician, physicist, and inventor, still wrote primarily in Latin, sometimes in French, and only very rarely in German. In one of his few German writings, he complains about the shortcomings in the development and uses of the German language. He argues that scholars themselves were to blame for the miserable state of their own language. Most of them were not interested in professional uses of German, because – as he put it - they thought that their wisdom could only be expressed by Latin or Greek. Others were afraid that the world might discover their concealed ignorance if it was not hidden behind big Latin words.³ Another negative aspect was, as Leibniz states, that most scholars of his time wrote only for other scholars and because of this all those who had not learnt Latin were excluded from science.⁴ This could also be our observation 300 years later if we exchanged the Latin example with English.

It is remarkable that Leibniz repeatedly pleaded for the development of German as a language of science. In this, he differs from his older contemporaries who focused their efforts on the cultivation of their mother tongue for literary uses. Leibniz argued that language use in science and education had a greater impact on the general development of a language than progress in its use for poetry and fictional literature. With his admonitions, Leibniz and some other intellectuals initiated a gradual emancipation of the German language since the Age of Enlightenment until it could be used in all domains of science and the humanities in the German-speaking states and regions. Leibniz could only stimulate this process. It was scholars such as the jurist Thomasius (1655-1728) and the philosopher Christian Wolff (1679-1754), who substituted Latin with German as an LSP (Language for Special Purposes, *Fachsprache*) in the minds of their disciplines against the protest of their academic colleagues. It was only in the second half of the 18th century that the development of German as a language for all sciences and the humanities was finally achieved. After that Immanuel Kant could write his great “critiques” in German, later on Hegel his “Phenomenology” and Marx his “Capital”, still later at the beginning of the 20th century Einstein his “Theory of Relativity”. In the course of the 19th century, German as a language of natural sciences, medicine, and philosophy became relevant even beyond the borders of the German-speaking countries and regions. To give just two examples: until the first half of the 20th century, students of chemistry all over the world had to study German in order to read important international journals and handbooks of their field. German medical terminology was used in Japan even until the middle of the 20th century.

3. Multilingual science in Europe

With certain temporal differences and different names of protagonists, similar linguistic histories can, probably, be sketched for other European languages. However, the development of a transnational use in science was not the same for all European languages, even

³ “... teils weil einige unter ihnen gemeint, daß die Weisheit nicht anders als in Latein und Griechisch sich kleiden lasse; oder auch weil manche gefürchtet, es würde der Welt ihre mit großen Worten verlarfte [maskierte] geheime Unwissenheit entdeckt werden.” (Leibniz in Pörksen 1984, p. 62)

⁴ “...Denn die Gelehrten, indem sie fast nur Gelehrten [nur für Gelehrte] schreiben, sich oft zu sehr in unbrauchbaren Dingen aufhalten; bei der ganzen Nation ist aber geschehen, daß diejenigen, so kein Latein gelernt, von der Wissenschaft gleichsam ausgeschlossen worden [...]” (Leibniz in Pörksen 1984, p. 63)

if regional and minority languages are not considered. Some languages gained a wider use and distribution than others. Since the 14th century, Italian was important in the international domains of banking and music. During the 17th and 18th centuries French dominated the political and scientific scenes in Europe and became important in the French colonies in Africa and Asia. From the 16th century onwards the use of Spanish expanded to all public domains in Central and South America, English to North America, parts of Asia and Africa, and Australia. German, as mentioned before, became an international language of science in the 19th century. On the other hand there exists a certain reservation: scientists of smaller linguistic communities always had to use another language when wanting to be internationally recognised. Hungarian and Finish scholars, for instance, used to publish in German until the last century, Polish scientists in either French or German, meaning that although the European world of science and learning was multilingual, international linguistic diversity in science was never quite as rich and colourful as some of us might think and wish it to be.

It is, however, important to be aware of the fact that the developing diversity of various European languages did not hamper the progress in science and learning. In the late Middle Ages, thinking and teaching of the European intellectual elite came to a certain canonical dogmatism and sterility in its Latin monolingualism. With the emancipation of the various vernacular languages in combination with religious reformations and the spread of philosophical enlightenment, intellectual Europe woke up and increased its creativity – it became modern. The great literatures of the European peoples, Renaissance in art, modern philosophy, and the many scientific and technical discoveries did not develop within one and the same standard language but in a variety of developing European cultural languages. The idea that Dante, Cervantes, Molière, Shakespeare, Goethe, Andersen, Pushkin, and others could all be writing in Latin is absurd. They and other writers, philosophers, scientists, and inventors wrote in those various languages that had become fully developed national languages, i.e. languages that could be used for all purposes in all communicative domains, including those of science.

4. The turn towards English

In the last century the linguistic situation changed. The development Leibniz and others had advocated seems to be reversed, moving backwards. As far as the German language is concerned, everything in science can, perhaps, still be expressed in German with sufficient effort, however, a lot is not being said and written in German any longer. The mostly uncritical use of anglicisms as terms and working phrases in several sciences is only part of the development.⁵ What is more relevant is the fact that scientists in various fields have left their native tongue behind and started using English, at least in their publications. The European multilingualism of scientific communication that overcame the medieval Latin monolingualism is now being gradually substituted by the new monolingualism of scientific English. More than 20 years ago, the then president of the renowned Max-Planck-Society, Hubert Markl, declared: “Top science speaks English”.⁶

As far as the German language is concerned, there are several obvious reasons for its decline as an international language of science.⁷ There were first of all the two World Wars that were started by Germany. In addition, German was the propaganda language of the Nazis;

⁵ Concerning anglicisms in various (16) European languages, see Görlach 2002.

⁶ “Die Spitzenforschung spricht Englisch”. Hubert Markl in Kalverkämper/Weinrich 1986, pp. 20-25.

⁷ This was carefully studied and described by Ulrich Ammon (1998).

the plans for terrible crimes were made in German and the orders to execute these plans were shouted out in that language. Many people, therefore, felt that during the so-called Third Reich not only the Nazis but also the German language were guilty. This is, of course, an anthropomorphism of language. Only people can be guilty, not a language. Although this gives some explanation for the decline of German as a language of science, it does not explain the recent development of other European languages. The attractiveness of English, especially the American variety, is not limited to Germany and Austria, but it has also become prevalent in many other countries where no guilt or collective shame due to Nazi crimes exists. The outcome of the two World Wars and the end of the Cold War favoured the rise of the United States of America as the leading economic and military power, which also supported the increasing importance of English as an international vehicular language in trade and commerce, politics, and science.⁸

Let us have a closer look at what happened recently and is still happening. For this, I would like to distinguish between language use in research and the use of language for instruction in higher education, i.e. I distinguish between two sub-domains within the macro-domain of science, research and teaching. For the domain of scientific research, I concentrate again on the situation in Germany. The decreasing use of German in international communication has been investigated in several studies (Skudlik 1990, Ammon 1998). Ten years ago I made a survey among the 80 institutes of a publicly financed research network⁹ in Germany with about 5,000 scientists. I will not go into the details of the questionnaire and the many resulting data, but let me only present a few statistical figures. Among other questions, the participants were asked to what extent English had gained acceptance for written professional communication within Germany.¹⁰ Around 86% of the participating natural scientists, medical researchers, mathematicians, and engineers answered that English had been mainly or completely accepted for written communication even within Germany. Half as many social scientists (40.9%) assessed this for their disciplines. For the researchers in the humanities, the percentage was much lower (23.3%). These figures do not quantify the actual written use of English in the various scientific disciplines in Germany but are only assessments of the scientists who answered the questionnaire. However, these estimates are not independent of the actual situation.

The use of English for oral communication among scientists and scholars in Germany was estimated as less common than the use of English for written use. However the majority of those who participated in the survey stated that English was gaining importance, especially in the natural sciences, engineering, medicine, and mathematics. Scholars of the humanities considered the oral use of English as least important, which is not surprising. A cross-table of the answers with the age of the subjects showed that younger scientists considered English as more established in oral communication than the older ones. That is, with the retirement of the older generation and the former young generation still in office, the use of English in science will have increased in the meantime. Unfortunately I do not have more recent empirical data at my disposal. However, I conclude from the many punctual impressions that the trend towards the use of English as a medium of professional communication even within the internal context of German research institutes is increasing. The share of international publications written in English in several natural sciences and medicine has been mentioned in several studies during

⁸ I avoid in this context the ubiquitous phrase *lingua franca*, because the historical *lingua franca* was never a medium of science and learning: It was just a primitive pidgin of sailors and traders along the coasts of the Mediterranean.

⁹ Leibniz-Gemeinschaft (WGL) = Wissenschaftsgemeinschaft Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz); www.wgl.de.

¹⁰ See the table in the appendix.

the nineties of the last century. The figure that has been repeatedly given is 80%, sometimes even 90%. Though these percentages are not safely founded¹¹, the actual share of scientific publications in English will have undoubtedly risen in the meantime.

Now for some observations on language use in higher education. Teaching at the university level is based in various ways on research, or at least should be. We therefore find similar facts and tendencies in language use. For this, we have at our disposal extensive results in a study conducted by the German linguist Ulrich Ammon and his Canadian co-author Grant McConnell (2002). They investigated the use of English as an academic language in 22 European countries. The problem with a study like this is that within limited time and with limited financial means the actual linguistic reality in many countries can hardly be observed directly, that is, by visiting lecture halls and classrooms. The two investigators, therefore, had to rely on the answers that they received from government offices, university administrations, and other agencies involved in the organisation of university teaching. Anyhow, they tested the reliability of at least their general results by two in-depth studies. Let me give only a brief and simplified summary of some of their results.¹²

The overall European picture concerning the use of English in university teaching is not homogeneous. They found differences in three aspects – the main domains of science, the size of languages (in the numbers of their speakers), and geographic distribution. The data they got proved and confirmed that the situation differs between various fields of science. As my survey showed for language use in research institutions, the domains of natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities differ in the extent of their “anglisation”. As we can all also observe or suspect at present, the largest amount of teaching in English is to be found in programmes and courses in several disciplines of natural sciences, smaller amount in the social sciences, and the smallest amount in the humanities. A difference was also found between big-language countries such as France and Germany that were more reluctant to introduce English in university teaching and small-language countries such as Denmark and the Netherlands. The third aspect of the difference in the extent of the use of English according to Ammon and McConnell was between countries in northern and southern Europe. “The southern European countries seem to be generally less prone to use English (or any other foreign language) for university teaching than do the northern European countries.” Their main conclusion was “that English as a foreign language and major European *lingua franca* has by now widely spread into most European countries as a language of university teaching, alongside national official languages”. (Ammon, McConnell 2002: 171)

Their data and conclusions, which deserve more attention and discussion than I can give in our context, do not, unfortunately, offer a clear distinction between the use of English **along with** individual national languages and **instead** of them; domain loss could be diagnosed only in the latter case. Anyway, their findings indicate at least a trend towards an increasing loss of an increasing number of scientific domains in all European national languages except English. Further surveys and studies will have to look for more recent data also in connection with the effects of the Bologna Process on language use in various scientific fields in various European countries. Even without those necessary studies, a partial loss of linguistic domains in scientific research and university teaching can no longer be questioned.

¹¹ Percentages and other figures can be found among others in Swales (1991) and Schröder (1998). The 80% often given for English as the language of scientific publication does not seem unreliable. See Schröder (1998, 834) who also cites Swales (1991, 97).

¹² See this and the following quotes Ammon/McConnell 2002, p. 171ff.

5. Consequences

What are the consequences of this domain loss for languages other than English? I would like to distinguish between short-term and long-term consequences. Short-term consequences can be directly observed. Concerning long-term consequences only reasonable speculations are possible, especially since there are no linguistic or sociological methods that allow reliable prognoses of language development.

At first, we must consider that most people in Europe do not feel any loss because they do not teach at a university, read scientific journals, or attend medical conferences. Those who do, however, suffer from a disadvantage when expected to prepare their lessons and lectures or write articles or books in a language different from their mother tongue; they need more time than when they would use their native language. In most disciplines of natural sciences research articles written in other languages than English are not accepted by international journals. Many scientists interviewed in our survey mentioned earlier admitted that for the preparation of their papers and other publications they also needed the help of native speakers of English, which also needs extra time and often money. These short-term disadvantages that we all know of may diminish with new generations of scholars and scientists who started learning English in kindergarten.

A consequence graver than the often poor command of English of many scientists in comparison to their native language concerns the shift of essential sub-domains of scientific communication to a foreign language, i.e. English, which excludes a large part of a non-Anglophone society from participation in science, although science is financed by the whole society. I do not want to indulge in the myth of an ideal science that can be made comprehensible to everyone. However, access to difficult scientific topics, questions, and results should not be made even more difficult for laymen by forcing them to use a foreign language. We must not forget that with regards to a specific discipline, most colleagues from other scientific fields are also laymen or laywomen.

In addition, there are long-term consequences for languages and their linguistic communities. In those scientific disciplines where communication is conducted mainly or exclusively in English, the native idiom of scientists does not develop with scientific progress, among others in terminology. As a professional language, the native language may, thus, decline until it becomes useless as a medium of communication within a particular field. It loses even more of its use in communication between different sciences and beyond them. The expectation that the competence in English of continental Europeans is continuously improving is not a comforting argument. It will take at least two or three more generations before the majority of the population of continental Europe becomes bilingual or trilingual. (Even in Switzerland with its long tradition of official multilingualism, many people are still monolingual. The same can, probably, be said of Belgium.) During the two or three generations that are necessary for the spread of multilingualism among the European population, non-English standard languages are in danger, especially since the partial domain loss is not limited to science. Language use in science is not isolated in closed compartments. A similar shift of language use and partial loss of domains can be observed in business and commerce,¹³ in international politics, not to mention tourism and pop-music. The more English becomes the dominant or even exclusive language in these

¹³ Reports from several European countries on the linguistic situation in these domains can be found in Stickel (ed.) (2010).

domains and, perhaps, others as well within the present non-Anglophone countries, the more the standard languages of these countries are devaluated. With time this may lead to a diglossia, i.e. a split of communicative functions of the indigenous languages and English. This means that important matters in politics, economics, and science would be dealt with mainly or exclusively in English, and the use of native languages would be limited one day to the f-domains of family, friends, and folklore. The existing national languages would become socially and functionally limited regional languages under English as the all-European standard language.

The standard varieties of national languages would then also come into conflict with their dialectal varieties and minority languages that have always been preferred by many people for the f-domains. For limited communication on issues of family, friends and spare time, the standard variety of a language is less suitable than the local dialect or minority language. It has less practical and emotional value in these domains. Thus, it might happen that the developed national standard languages get into a clash between global English that expands to ever more domains on the one hand and locally and socially limited dialects and minority languages on the other, which due to their diminishing usefulness gradually die out. In the end there would be – apart from English as an all-European standard language and some leftovers of a few languages with extra-European distribution and, perhaps, also single “stubborn” languages such as Bask – only regionally and functionally limited dialectal remains of existing continental European languages. This is, of course, only a speculative negative scenario of a future development that may not occur. However, in view of the observations and data we already have, it is not impossible.

We must, therefore, remind each other and our contemporaries that the preservation of each language, especially its standard variety, is essential for social and cultural continuity of a society, also a multilingual society, and by this also for the socialisation of the individuals that belong to it. Since individuals do not gain most of their knowledge from their own experiences but from utterances and texts of other people, the continuity of social groups – that is from families, clubs, religious communities, professional organisations to nations – is linguistically based. And this basis is not only represented by oral and written texts of the present – including narrations of parents and grandparents – but also older texts such as legal codifications, classical literature as well as historical, philosophical, and religious writings. Substantial changes of language use, including partial or entire abandonment of the proper language, not only diminish or delete the value of a language for the present and its link with the past, but also make access to history more difficult for future generations.

6. Conclusion

Of course, the way out cannot be a return to the individual national languages as exclusive media of science within various countries. Scientists should continue to speak and write in English within the international world of their discipline whenever they want to be understood beyond the borders of their national language. Scientists should, however, be obliged to also publish and teach in their national languages whenever they are in their native environment. Professors of biology, chemistry, physics, other natural sciences, medicine, and mathematics should cultivate their own bilingualism or trilingualism and also encourage their collaborators and students to publish and lecture in English as well as in their native language.

Through this, both relevant demands can be met: the demand of science for international communication and the demand of each linguistic society to preserve its language and culture and

participation in science. A rough distinction between the three main domains of science can be kept. In the so-called hard sciences, English has already proved its usefulness as an international and interlingual auxiliary mode of communication in many cases. For research and publications where essential results are only in part verbally presented and are mainly given in tables, graphs, or formulas, the limited command of English of most natural scientists in comparison to their mother tongue is sufficient. There remains, however, the responsibility also of natural scientists towards their native linguistic society that makes science possible and which needs science. This requires some effort among others in the development of terminologies along the progress made in various sciences – i.e. efforts that cannot be entirely left to special institutions for norms and terminology. It may also be useful for the individual scientist to sometimes translate a paragraph written in English into his native tongue. This can be as revealing as translating the text of an English pop song into another language, thus exposing the semantic triviality of the English version.

For publications and teaching in the humanities and social sciences where theoretical concepts, methods, and results are developed and presented in a discourse and with interpretative arguments, the dominant use of English represents a grave methodical and heuristic hazard. In these disciplines, the use of the mother tongue besides English and other languages is essential. Individual multilingualism of scholars and their students is required. In order to profit from the stimulating quality of different semantic structures inherent in different languages, each scholar in the humanities and social sciences should cultivate at least trilingualism in his or her research and should also encourage his or her students to follow suit. Researchers and students in the humanities and social sciences can, of course, never be prevented from learning other foreign languages when studying cultures and societies based on languages other than English.

The various disciplines of science will thus not only keep and develop the stimulating multilingualism of their own domains but will also contribute to the preservation and further development of European linguistic diversity that is essential for cultural and social diversity as well as prosperity of our continent. Let us argue, plead, and hope that this will be the case.

Appendix

Written use of English in institutes of the WGL (2000)¹⁴

Subjects / Engl. written frequency in %	not yet	starting	partially	mainly	completely	no answer	total
humanities	22.6	30.5	22.0	21.5	1.7	1.7	100.0
social sciences, economics	6.9	34.9	17.0	32.5	8.4	0.3	100.0
bio-sciences	1.1	9.1	2.1	45.1	41.1	1.5	100.0
physics/chem./engineer./math.	0.9	10.4	1.9	51.6	34.9	0.3	100.0
environmental sciences	3.6	21.8	5.6	41.1	27.4	0.4	100.0
others	7.1	25.0	17.9	25.0	14.3	10.7	100.0
no answer	6.9	10.3	17.2	31.0	34.5	-	100.0
total average	4.6	18.1	7.5	41.6	17.2	0.9	100.0

¹⁴ WGL = Wissenschaftsgemeinschaft Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. For detailed results of the survey (in German) see Stickel (2001).

7. Literature

- Ammon, U., 1998: *Ist Deutsch noch internationale Wissenschaftssprache? Englisch auch für die Lehre an deutschsprachigen Hochschulen*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Ammon, U., McConnell, G., 2002: *English as an Academic Language in Europe. A Survey of its Use in Teaching*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.
- Debus, F., Kollmann, F. G., Pörksen, U. (Hrsg.), 2001: *Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache im 20. Jahrhundert*. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur / Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Fishman, J. A., 1970: *Sociolinguistics*. A brief introduction. Rowley/Mass.: Newbury House.
- Görlach, M. (ed.), 2002: *English in Europe*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haberland, H., 2005: Domains and domain loss. B. Preisler et al.: *The Consequences of Mobility*. Roskilde: Roskilde University, Dept. of Languages and Culture. 227-237.
- Pörksen, U. (Hg.), 1983: *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, Unvorgreifliche Gedanken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der deutschen Sprache*. Zwei Aufsätze. Kommentiert v. U. Pörksen und J. Schiewe. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- Rannut, M., 2009: Threats to national languages in Europe. G. Stickel (ed.), *National and European Language Policies*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main etc. 35-51.
- Schröder, H., 1998: Heutige Fachsprachen im internationalen Austausch III: die Stellung der englischen Wissenschaftssprachen in der Welt. L. Hoffmann, H. Kalverkämper, H. E. Wiegand (Hrsg.), *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Fachsprachen. 1. Halbband. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter. 828-840.
- Skudlik, S., 1990: *Sprachen in den Wissenschaften. Deutsch und Englisch in der internationalen Kommunikation*. (= Forum für Fachsprachenforschung, Bd. 10) Tübingen.
- Stickel, G., 2001: Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache an außeruniversitären Forschungseinrichtungen. F. Debus, F. G. Kollmann, U. Pörksen (Hrsg.), *Deutsch als Wissenschaftssprache im 20. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart: Franc Steiner Verlag. 125-142.
- Stickel, G. (ed.), 2006: *Brussels Declaration on Language Learning in Europe in the 20 Official Languages of the European Union*. EFNIL. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache.
- Stickel, G., 2008: Europäische Hochsprachen in der Klemme: Zwischen globalem Englisch, Dialekten, Minderheits- und Regionalsprachen. G. Lüdi et al. (Hrsg.), *Sprachenvielfalt und Kulturfrieden*. Sprachenminderheit – Einsprachigkeit – Mehrsprachigkeit. Fribourg: Academic Press / Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Stickel, G. (ed.), 2010: *Language Use in Business and Commerce in Europe*. Contributions to the Annual Conference 2008 of EFNIL in Lisbon. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.
- Swales, J. M., 1991: *Genre Analysis. English in Academic Research Settings*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Werlen, I., 2004: Domäne / Domain. Ammon et al. (eds.): *Sociolinguistics / Soziolinguistik Vol. 1,1 (=HSK 3.1, 2. Aufl.)*. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter. 335-341.

Nacionalni jeziki, visoko šolstvo in mobilnost v pravu EU

MATEJ ACCETTO

Pravna fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani, Slovenija
matej.accetto@pf.uni-lj.si

Ena od vrednot skupnosti je (tudi) skrb za lasten jezik; del vrednosti posameznika je (tudi) večjezičnost. Morda bi s to mislijo lahko povzeli trenje, s katerim se v sodobnem soodvisnem svetu vse bolj srečuje tudi visoko šolstvo, ki želi po eni strani igrati vlogo skrbnika nacionalnega jezika, po drugi pa se vse učinkoviteje vpenjati v mednarodno znanstveno skupnost, kar je skoraj predpogoj znanstvene odličnosti, a zahteva tudi rabo drugih jezikov. Prispevek najprej podaja kratek pregled slovenske ureditve učnega jezika na univerzitetnem študiju, nato pa skuša jezikovno zagonetko osvetliti še v primerjalni luči, zlasti v okviru ureditve večjezičnosti in mobilnosti v pravu Evropske unije.

One of community values is (also) the nurturing of its own language; a part of an individual's value is (also) multilingualism. This thought may illustrate the tension that is also, in this ever more interdependent world, present in the institutions of higher education trying, on the one hand, to play the role of the caretaker of the national language but also, on the other hand, to become ever more integrated in the international scientific community, which both enables scientific excellence and requires opening up to other languages. This paper first outlines the Slovenian codification of the language of instruction in university studies and then offers some comparative highlights of the issues of language and mobility, in particular within the ambit of the European Union.

1. Uvod: Jezik, izobraževanje in narodna identiteta

V drugi polovici šestdesetih let so v Sloveniji uvedli obvezno šolanje v dvojezični šoli na narodnostno mešanih območjih. Skupina 681 občanov Lendave in okolice je pri republiškem ustavnem sodišču vložila pobudo za oceno ustavnosti zakona, ki je to obvezo določal, saj naj bi bili otroci slovenske narodnosti prikrajšani za osnovnošolsko izobrazbo v materinem jeziku. Skupščina, ki je zakon sprejela, je v odgovoru na pobudo trdila, da zakon pomeni neposredno izvedbo ustavnega načela o enakopravnosti jezikov narodnosti na narodnostno mešanih območjih in služi kot poroštvo za varstvo pravic narodnosti.¹

Zakon je bil poskus težavne naloge usklajevanja potrebe po spoštovanju pravic manjšine in ohranjanju njene identitete ob omogočanju vključevanja v politično skupnost z bremini, ki jih je predstavljala za večinsko prebivalstvo. Po predmetniku, izdelanem na podlagi zakona, je na teh območjih pouk do 5. razreda osnovne šole potekal v obeh jezikih, od 6.

¹ Odločba U-31/69 z dne 30. 6. 1970, Ur. l. SRS 27/70, str. 539.

razreda naprej pa so se skoraj vsi predmeti izvajali v slovenščini, poleg tega pa so učenci dobili še osnovno terminologijo v madžarščini.

Da je naloga težavna, je pokazala tudi presoja ustavnega sodišča, ki je na koncu v tedaj zelo kontroverzni odločitvi zakon razglasilo za skladnega z ustavo s petimi glasovi proti štirim, preglasovana manjšina pa je objavila tudi ločeno mnenje, kar se v ustavnosodni praksi po tej sodbi ni ponovilo vse do leta 1991.²

Manjšina je poudarjala, da dvojezično šolanje za otroke, ki večinoma ob vstopu v šolo sploh ne znajo obeh jezikov, pomeni večje breme, vzgojne težave in slabše učne uspehe ter da cilja, da bi otrokom madžarske narodnosti omogočili učenje slovenskega jezika, ne bi smeli uresničevati s kršenjem pravice drugih učencev do pouka v maternem jeziku, ki naj bi bil »ne le ustavna pravica, marveč tudi eno izmed povelj v svetu priznanih pedagoških načel osnovnošolskega pouka«. ³ Po mnenju večine pa je bilo dvojezično šolanje najbolj smotno udejanjenje zahteve po pouku narodnosti v lastnem jeziku, saj pouk tako poteka v jezikih obeh narodnosti in tako tudi ne posega v ustavno pravico Slovencev do šolanja v materinščini.⁴

Omenjena sodba je seveda neizogibno posegala v širše vprašanje medetničnih odnosov in manjšinskih pravic, v katerega se tu ne bom spuščal.⁵ A lepo kaže pomen, ki ga ima jezik za vprašanje narodne identitete in kulturne samobitnosti posameznega naroda oziroma jezikovne skupnosti. Včasih se pojavlja na ravni celotne politične skupnosti, včasih na ravni manjšinskega prebivalstva, vedno pa neodvisno od siceršnje politične ureditve v posamezni državi.

Tako je po eni strani denimo v dvajsetih in tridesetih letih dvajsetega stoletja v Teksas prišlo večje število mehiških priseljencev, katerih otroci niso znali angleško, zaradi česar se je vnela žgoča razprava o tem, ali bi zanje uvedli dvojezično šolanje. Vprašanje naj bi prišlo tudi do tedanje guvernerke Teksasa Miriam Ferguson, ki naj bi nanj odgovorila z nerodno zavrnitvijo: »Če je bila angleščina dovolj dobra za Jezusa Kristusa, bi morala biti tudi za otroke Teksasa.«⁶

Po drugi strani pa so podobni zapleti prisotni še danes. Slovaški parlament (*Národná rada*) je 30. junija letos sprejel spremembe zakona o slovaškem državnem jeziku,⁷ ki so ga zlasti na Madžarskem sprejeli z ogorčenjem in o katerem je tudi podpredsednik odbora Evropskega parlamenta za zunanje zadeve dejal, da diskriminira manjšinske jezike, da v določenih primerih morda celo kriminalizira rabo manjšinskega jezika ter da Slovaška z njim žal še zdaleč ne dosega evropskih standardov.⁸ Kritike moti vrsta določb, od nejasne ureditve

² Tako Peter Pavlin v Zupančič in dr., *Ustavno kazensko procesno pravo*, Ljubljana, Pasadena, 2001, str. 217.

³ Odločba U-31/69 z dne 30. 6. 1970, Ur. l. SRS 27/70, str. 542.

⁴ *Ibid.*, str. 540.

⁵ Za več o sodbi in problematiki medetničnih odnosov glej denimo Matej Accetto, *Sodstvo in medetnični odnosi v nekdanji Jugoslaviji*, v: *Historični seminar* (posredovano v objavo).

⁶ Kot je navedeno v Jose Roberto Juarez, *The American Tradition of Language Rights: The Forgotten Right to Government in a »Known Tongue«*, v: *Law & Inequality* 13 (1995), 443–462, 447. Sicer je povsem verjetno, da je pripis apokrifin, saj naj bi podobne zmote kristjanom pripisovali že v koncu devetnajstega stoletja. Vsekakor pa drži, da so imeli že tedaj v ZDA prav tako burno razpravo o dvojezičnem šolanju, ki je pogosto ravno tako naletelo na glasno neodobravanje.

⁷ Zákon z 30. júna 2009, ktorým sa mení a dopĺňa zákon Národnej rady Slovenskej republiky č. 270/1995 Z. z. o štátnom jazyku Slovenskej republiky v znení neskorších predpisov a o zmene a doplnení niektorých zákonov, *Zbierka zákonov* č. 318/2009, št. 113, str. 2362.

⁸ Michael Gahler, *Neues slowakisches Sprachengesetz entspricht nicht europäischen Standards*, izjava za tisk z dne 9. julija 2009, dostopna na: <http://www.eppgroup.eu/press/showPR.asp?PRControlDocTypeID=1&PRControlID=8669&PRContentID=15019&PRContentLg=de> (15. 9. 2009).

vprašanja nujnosti rabe slovaškega jezika (kot enega od jezikov) na kulturnih prireditvah narodnih manjšin do določb, ki za kršitev zakona predvidevajo kazni od 100 do 5000 evrov. Glede izobraževanja spremenjeni zakon denimo določa, da mora biti vse pedagoško in drugo gradivo na voljo v državnem jeziku (slovaščini), v šolah in izobraževalnih ustanovah, v katerih pouk poteka v jeziku narodnih manjšin, pa v obeh jezikih, tako slovaščini kot jeziku konkretne narodne manjšine.⁹

Slovaški primer je seveda še preveč svež, da bi o njem lahko sprejemali splošnejše sklepe, čeprav gre najverjetneje res za ureditev, ki je za današnjo stvarnost mednarodne soodvisnosti in zavest o standardih varstva manjšinskih pravic vsaj nerodno zasnovana, tudi če ne neposredno namenjena krnitvi jezikovnih pravic manjšin na Slovaškem. A ne glede na pomanjkljivosti je nemara obenem še en primer majhne države z lastnim jezikom, ki se v taistem globaliziranem svetu počuti ogroženo in išče načine za ohranitev jezikovne samobitnosti.

To protislovje, ko vse tesnejša politična povezanost držav obenem zahteva jezikovno odprtost in ogroža jezikovno avtonomnost, vsekakor prihaja do izraza tudi v Evropski uniji, ki večjezičnost obenem doživlja kot svojo kulturno in celo gospodarsko¹⁰ vrlino ter kot praktično zagato pri dolžnosti sprejemanja zakonodaje v vseh uradnih jezikih članic, ureditve držav članic glede rabe njihovih nacionalnih jezikov pa obenem kot odraz njihove hvalevredne kulturne raznolikosti ter kot morebitno nedopustno prepreko čezmejnemu gibanju delavcev ali blaga.

Ta prispevek ne bo poglobljena analiza ključnih podrobnosti omenjene problematike. Ambicije so skromnejše: v grobih potezah bom skušal orisati pravne okvire rabe slovenščine na slovenskih univerzah in nekaj pomenljivih razvojnih poudarkov v pravu EU glede rabe jezika in mobilnosti v izobraževanju ter na sorodnih področjih.

2. Raba jezika v slovenskem visokem šolstvu

Ureditev rabe jezika v visokem šolstvu izhaja iz več predpisov različne ravni.

Najbolj splošne določbe o rabi jezika v Sloveniji so vsebovane v ustavi. 11. člen določa, da je v Sloveniji uradni jezik slovenščina, na območjih občin, v katerih živita italijanska ali madžarska narodna skupnost, pa tudi italijanščina ali madžarščina. Kljub temu jezik ne more biti podlaga za razlikovanje ali za odrekanje človekovih pravic posamezniku, kot izkazuje več ustavnih določb: določbi 14. in 16. člena o prepovedi diskriminacije; določba 19. člena o varstvu osebne svobode, po kateri mora biti vsakdo, ki mu je odvzeta prostost, takoj v maternem ali drugem jeziku, ki ga razume, obveščen o razlogih za odvzem prostosti; ter določbi 61. in 62. člena, po katerih ima vsakdo pravico, da uporablja svoj jezik in pisavo tako zasebno kot pri uresničevanju svojih pravic in dolžnosti ter v postopkih pred državnimi in drugimi organi, ki opravljajo javno službo.

Posebno jezikovno določbo, ki se neposredno nanaša tudi na vprašanje organiziranega izobraževanja, vsebuje 64. člen, ki ureja posebne pravice avtohtone italijanske in madžarske narodne skupnosti v Sloveniji. Ti narodni skupnosti oziroma njuni pripadniki imajo pravico do vzgoje in izobraževanja v svojem jeziku, zakonu pa je prepuščena odločitev o tem, na katerih območjih je obvezno dvojezično šolstvo.

⁹ Glej Zákon z 30. júna 2009, op. 7 zgoraj, novi odstavek §3(4) na str. 2363.

¹⁰ Glej denimo Marko Stabej, Večjezičnost: vojna, tekma, sožitje?, v: M. Ivšek (ur.), *Jeziki v izobraževanju*, Ljubljana, Zavod RS za šolstvo, 2008, str. 61–69.

O rabi jezika v izobraževanju govori tudi Zakon o javni rabi slovenščine,¹¹ ki v 12. členu določa, da v Sloveniji vzgoja in izobraževanje v javno veljavnih programih, od predšolske stopnje do univerze, potekata v slovenščini, raba tujih jezikov pa je dovoljena v skladu s področnimi predpisi, ki urejajo dejavnost vzgoje in izobraževanja. Delno se na to nanaša tudi 13. člen, ki določa, naj za spodbujanje učenja slovenščine sprejmejo program, ki je poleg rednega izobraževanja namenjen tudi jezikovnemu izpopolnjevanju mladine in odraslih državljanov, ter posebni programi, namenjeni tujcem v Sloveniji, prav tako pa naj se za promocijo slovenščine po svetu spodbuja njeno poučevanje na tujih izobraževalnih ustanovah.

Za univerzitetno izobraževanje je seveda tudi glede učnega jezika najbolj relevanten Zakon o visokem šolstvu,¹² katerega 8. člen je namenjen učnemu jeziku:

Učni jezik je slovenski.

Visokošolski zavod lahko izvaja študijske programe ali njihove dele v tujem jeziku, pod pogoji, določenimi s statutom.

Če visokošolski zavod opravlja javno službo, se lahko v tujem jeziku izvajajo:

- študijski programi tujih jezikov,
- deli študijskih programov, če pri njihovem izvajanju sodelujejo gostujoči visokošolski učitelji iz tujine ali je vanje vpisano večje število tujih študentov,
- študijski programi, če se ti programi na visokošolskem zavodu izvajajo tudi v slovenskem jeziku. [...]

Končno pa slovenske univerze rabo slovenščine v študijskem programu določajo tudi v svojih lastnih pravnih aktih, zato je nemara koristna primerjava, kako je ta urejena v statutih štirih slovenskih univerz.

Univerza v Ljubljani vprašanju jezika namenja predvsem dva člena statuta,¹³ pri čemer 110. člen v veliki meri meri povzema določbo Zakona o visokem šolstvu:

Učni jezik na univerzi je slovenski.

V tujem jeziku se lahko izvajajo:

- študijski programi tujih jezikov,
- deli študijskih programov, če pri njihovem izvajanju sodelujejo gostujoči visokošolski učitelji iz tujine ali je vanje vpisano večje število tujih študentov,
- študijski programi, če se ti programi na visokošolskem zavodu izvajajo tudi v slovenskem jeziku,
- skupni študijski programi, ki jih na temelju posebne pogodbe ali sporazuma izvaja Univerza v Ljubljani z univerzo iz tujine.

O študiju v tujem jeziku sprejme sklep senat članice, ki mora pri tem upoštevati jezikovno znanje študentov in predavatelja.

111. člen Statuta nato ureja še vprašanje diplomskih, magistrskih in doktorskih del, ki se morajo praviloma pisati v slovenskem jeziku, lahko pa v angleščini, če so zato podani utemeljeni razlogi (če gre za študijski program v tujem jeziku, ki se sicer izvaja tudi v slovenskem

¹¹ Zakon o javni rabi slovenščine (ZJRS), Ur. l. RS, št. 86/2004, str. 10114.

¹² Zakon o visokem šolstvu (uradno prečiščeno besedilo) (ZViS-UPB3), Ur. l. RS, št. 119/2006, str. 12497.

¹³ Statut Univerze v Ljubljani, Ur. l. RS, št. 8/2005, 118/2005, 72/2006 (76/2006 popr.), 59/2007 (82/2007 popr.), 81/2007, 5/2008, 42/2008, 62/2008, 14/2009, 38/2009, 48/2009, 55/2009.

jeziku, če gre za tujega študenta, mentorja ali člana komisije, če obstaja možnost objave dela v knjižni obliki pri tuji založbi ipd.). V drugem tujem jeziku (torej razen v angleščini) se lahko ta dela pišejo le, če gre za študij tega jezika ali za dogovorjeni jezik v okviru skupnega doktorskega študija s tujo univerzo. V vsakem primeru se doktorska disertacija v tujem jeziku lahko odda le skupaj z izčrpnim povzetkom v slovenskem jeziku, ki mora uporabljati ustrezno slovensko strokovno izrazje z znanstvenega področja disertacije.

Statut Univerze v Mariboru¹⁴ vprašanju učnega jezika posveča štiri člene. V 71. členu podobno kot statut ljubljanske univerze bolj ali manj povzema zakonsko določbo:

Učni jezik je slovenski.

Univerza v Mariboru skrbi za razvoj slovenščine kot strokovnega oziroma znanstvenega jezika.

Tujcem in Slovencem brez slovenskega državljanstva se omogoči učenje slovenščine.

Študijski programi se lahko izvajajo v tujem jeziku, če gre za opravljanje javne službe, in sicer:

- *študijski programi tujih jezikov,*
- *deli študijskih programov, če pri njihovem izvajanju sodelujejo gostujoči visokošolski profesorji ali študenti iz tujine ali je va[n]je vpisano večje število tujih študentov,*
- *študijski programi, če se ti programi izvajajo na članici Univerze tudi v slovenskem jeziku.*

V 72. členu še nekoliko podrobneje določa primere, v katerih se lahko študijski programi ali deli programov izvajajo v tujem jeziku: če pri njihovem izvajanju sodelujejo gostujoči učitelji tujih univerz ali mednarodno priznani strokovnjaki, ki jih univerza povabi k sodelovanju; če gre za študijske programe, ki niso zajeti v nacionalnem programu visokega šolstva; ali če gre za študijske programe, v katere so vključeni tuji študenti oziroma so pretežno namenjeni tujim študentom ali je vanje vpisano večje število tujih študentov. V primerjavi z 71. členom torej dodaja novo kategorijo programov zunaj nacionalnega programa visokega šolstva in nekoliko razširjajoče tolmači že omenjeni kategoriji vključenosti tujih profesorjev ali študentov. V primeru, ko se zaradi tujih študentov poučuje v tujem jeziku, mora članica izbrati jezik, ki ustreza jezikovnemu znanju večine domačih študentov na tem programu. 73. in 74. člen določata še, da o izvajanju študijskih programov ali delih programov v tujem jeziku sklepa senat članice univerze, ki izvaja študijski program, če gre za izvajanje na podlagi mednarodnih sporazumov, pa senat univerze, ki sprejme tudi pravila za izdelavo in zagovor diplomskih, magistrskih in doktorskih nalog v tujem jeziku.

Poleg tega se statut mariborske univerze vprašanja jezika dotakne tudi pri določbi 88. člena o vpisovanju tujih državljanov in Slovencev brez slovenskega državljanstva, kjer se za vpis praviloma zahteva potrdilo o uspešno opravljenem izpitu iz slovenskega jezika na ustrezni ravni, ki jo določi članica univerze, ali uspešno opravljen preizkus pred posebno komisijo članice. Pogoj se šteje za izpolnjenega, če so kandidati v Sloveniji že končali eno od stopenj izobraževanja (osnovno ali srednjo šolo ali dodiplomski študijski program) ali dvojezično srednjo šolo.

¹⁴ Statut Univerze v Mariboru (uradno prečiščeno besedilo) (Statut UM – UPB7), Ur. l. RS, št. 36/2009.

Univerza na Primorskem v svojem statutu¹⁵ vprašanju učnega jezika posveča tri člene. V 112. členu je določeno, da je učni jezik slovenski ter da univerza skrbi za razvoj slovenščine kot strokovnega oziroma znanstvenega jezika, za kar lahko študentom ponudi ustrezni del izbirnih vsebin ter tujcem in Slovencem brez slovenskega državljanstva omogoča učenje slovenščine. Člen 112.a se zopet navezuje na zakonsko določbo o poučevanju v tujem jeziku, a podobno kot statut mariborske univerze poudarja razliko med programi v okviru javne službe in drugimi študijskimi programi:

Študijski programi se lahko na podlagi sklepa senata univerze na predlog senata članice izvajajo v tujem jeziku.

Če se dodiplomski in podiplomski študijski programi izvajajo v okviru javne službe, se lahko izvajajo v tujem jeziku v naslednjih primerih:

- *ko gre za programe tujih jezikov;*
- *deli študijskih programov, če pri njihovem izvajanju sodelujejo gostujoči visokošolski učitelji iz tujine ali je vanje vpisano večje število tujih študentov;*
- *študijski programi, če se ti programi na visokošolskem zavodu izvajajo tudi v slovenskem jeziku.*

O izvajanju študijskih programov ali delov programov v tujem jeziku sklepa senat univerze. V posebnem splošnem aktu, ki ga sprejme senat univerze, se opredeli[jo] pravila za izdelavo in zagovor zaključne naloge (diplomsko ter magistrsko delo in naloga, doktorska disertacija) v tujem jeziku.

Člen 112.b določa le še, da se način skrbi za razvoj in učenje slovenščine na univerzi ter učenje in raba tujih jezikov natančneje opredelijo v posebnem pravilniku.

Kot zanimivost je moč dodati še, da statut Univerze na Primorskem odraža tudi delovanje te ustanove na dvojezičnem območju, saj so vsa imenovanja univerze in članic poleg slovenščine podana tudi v italijanskem jeziku (statut pa poleg tega vsebuje še prevode nazivov v angleščino).

Nedržavna Univerza v Novi Gorici pa v svojem statutu¹⁶ jeziku posveča le 63. člen, ki določa:

Učni jezik na Univerzi je slovenščina.

Univerza lahko izvaja posamezne študijske programe ali njihove dele v tujem jeziku.

O uvedbi izvajanja posameznega študijskega programa ali njegovega dela v tujem jeziku odloča senat fakultete ali šole na predlog dekana.

Ureditev vprašanja rabe slovenskega in tujih jezikov v okviru univerzitetnega izobraževanja seveda s tem še ni izčrpana. Dotika se ga še več drugih aktov univerz in njihovih članic.¹⁷ Vprašanje jezika je tudi sestavni del Nacionalnega programa visokega šolstva,¹⁸ kjer je (v odseku 2.1) omenjen že v samem začetku opredeljevanja strateških ciljev »kakovostne dodiplomske ter po-

¹⁵ Statut Univerze na Primorskem (uradno prečiščeno besedilo) (Statut UP-UPB1), Ur. l. RS, št. 124/2008, str. 16627.

¹⁶ Dostopen na: http://www.ung.si/img/storage/doc/statut_ung_2007.pdf (15. 9. 2009).

¹⁷ Seveda predvsem v okviru opredeljevanja posameznih študijskih programov, pa tudi pri drugih vsebinskih ali organizacijskih podrobnostih, kot so vprašanje priloge diplom, vprašanje določanja jezika pri skupnih študijskih programih s tujimi univerzami in splošneje mednarodnega sodelovanja ali vprašanje kadrovanja in nosilcev funkcij na univerzi.

¹⁸ Nacionalni program visokega šolstva Republike Slovenije (NPVS), Ur. l. RS, št. 20/2002, str. 1513.

diplomske izobrazbe [kot bistvenega dejavnika] ekonomskega, socialnega in kulturnega razvoja ter razvijanja nacionalne identitete in slovenskega jezika kot njenega integralnega dela«. Po drugi strani program poudarja tudi pomen znanja in uporabe tujih jezikov: študij jezikov je omenjen med osrednjimi nalogami nacionalnega programa (pododsek 2.3.5), za enakovredno sodelovanje pri izmenjavi študentov v programih EU pa naj bi se morali večkrat kot doslej odločiti za izvajanje študijskih programov ali njihovih delov tudi v tujem jeziku (pododsek 2.3.3).

Nacionalni program je tako še en odraz težavnega iskanja ravnovesja med delovanjem univerz kot središč znanosti in raziskovanja, ki naj se čim uspešneje in enakovredneje vključujejo v mednarodno raziskovalno delo (kar narekuje uporabo tujih jezikov, zlasti angleščine), ter kot hramov znanja, izobraževanja in negovanja avtonomne slovenske znanosti in kulture (kar narekuje skrb za slovenščino). Trenja med tema dvema smotroma univerzitetnega delovanja se kažejo na različnih ravneh, tako pri izvajanju predavanj kot pri vprašanju objavljanih znanstvenih razprav v »svetovnih« jeziki ali v domačem jeziku.

Da bi se resneje posvetil vprašanju vrednotenja raziskovalnega dela glede na jezik (in povezano kraj) objavljanih, ki je v zadnjih letih še posebno aktualno v luči prenov habilitacijskih meril za izvolitve v nazive, bi že presegalo namen tega prispevka, a ga je tu relevantno vsaj omeniti, saj kaže, kako lahko tudi (znanstveni) jezik postane talec drugih težav z zagotavljanjem konkurenčnosti ali preverljivosti kakovosti znanstvenega dela, ko je objavljane v slovenščini pogosto avtomatično ovrednoteno slabše kot objavljane v tujih jezikih.¹⁹ Kako uskladiti nacionalno in globalno ter posledično rabo slovenskega in tujega jezika v življenju univerz, je v zadnjih letih za ene pereča, za druge morda tudi moteča tema.²⁰

Jezik je seveda neločljivo povezan z vprašanjem nacionalne identitete. Zato je še posebno občutljiva tema za možnost zakonodajnega urejanja na ravni Evropske unije, ki je zavezana k spoštovanju raznolikosti držav članic. Vendarle pa se, kot rečeno, pravo EU v določenih primerih lahko dotakne tudi vprašanja jezika, kadar se ta potencialno postavi po robu svoboščinam skupnega trga in prostemu gibanju oseb in kadar je nato treba presojati, ali so morebitne tovrstne omejitve utemeljene z legitimnimi interesi države članice. V nadaljevanju zato navajam nekaj relevantne prakse Sodišča Evropskih skupnosti.

3. Jezik, nacionalna identiteta in mobilnost v Evropski uniji

Evropsko unijo odlikuje dobro znana stvarnost večjezične politične tvorbe s (trenutno) 23 uradnimi jeziki, pri čemer že temeljne pogodbe odražajo njihovo popolno enakovrednost kot verodostojne različice skupnostnega pravnega reda,²¹ v skladu z Uredbo Sveta (ES) 1/58²²

¹⁹ Krivda za nastalo stanje je nemara deljena in vsaj deloma tudi na strani izkušenj z drugimi mehanizmi nadzora kakovosti znanstvenih objav, ki ob neizvajanju verodostojne kakovostne in vsebinske ocene kandidatovih objav silijo v zatekanje k formalizirani količinski oceni teh objav, pa tudi če je v praksi zgrešena in povsem nedosledna. O tem več v Matej Accetto, Nadležna slepost objektivizirane znanstvene uspešnosti, v: *IUS Kolumna*, 1. 10. 2008, dostopno na: http://www.ius-software.si/Novice/prikaz_Clanek.asp?id=38179&Skatla=17 (15. 9. 2009).

²⁰ Za historiat dogodkov in odprta vprašanja jezikovne problematike glej Monika Kalin Golob, Univerza med nacionalnim in globalnim: slovenski jezik v visokem šolstvu in znanosti, v: M. Ivšek (ur.), *Jeziki v izobraževanju*, Ljubljana, Zavod RS za šolstvo, 2008, str. 111–116.

²¹ Glej 314. člen Pogodbe o ustanovitvi Evropske skupnosti, uradno prečiščeno besedilo objavljeno v slovenski različici Ur. l. EU, 29. 12. 2006, C 321, str. 37–187.

²² Uredba št. 1 o določitvi jezikov, ki se uporabljajo v Evropski gospodarski skupnosti, Ur. l. EU, posebna izdaja v slovenščini, poglavje 1, zvezek 1, str. 3.

pa so vsi uradni jeziki EU tudi uradni jeziki delovanja skupnostnih institucij. Posledično je eden pomembnih vidikov delovanja evropskih institucij prevajanje besedil pravnih aktov v vse uradne jezike,²³ kar je na svoji koži ob pristopanju k Uniji občutila tudi Slovenija.²⁴

Poleg zaveze k večjezičnosti delovanja uradnih institucij Evropska unija večjezičnost spodbuja tudi kot eno od vrednot evropskega povezovanja. Tudi tu se kaže potreba po usklajevanju združevalnih teženj k večji povezanosti evropske politične tvorbe in zadrževalnih teženj k spoštovanju jezikovne raznolikosti. Po eni strani je bil program *LINGUA*, ki ga je Unija sprva vzpostavila za obdobje od leta 1990 do 1994²⁵ in kasneje vključila v okvir programa Socrates, uveden z namenom spodbujanja učenja tujih jezikov kot poti do večje solidarnosti med narodi Skupnosti.²⁶ Po drugi strani pa zlasti Parlament poudarja tudi potrebo po večjem varstvu manj prodornih kultur in manj govorjenih jezikov,²⁷ zaradi česar Evropska unija finančno podpira tudi delovanje nevladne Evropske pisarne za manj pogosto uporabljane jezike.

Ta dvojnost se odraža v podobnih današnjih programih,²⁸ sem ter tja pa privede tudi do konkretnih pravnih sporov. Leta 2003 je Španija pred Sodiščem Evropskih skupnosti²⁹ sprožila postopek proti Eurojustu, češ da je ta organ Unije kršil pravo Unije z objavo določenih razpisov za zapolnitev delovnih mest, ko je od kandidatov zahteval, da določene dokumente posredujejo v angleščini, prav tako pa od njih tudi pričakoval predvsem znanje angleščine in francoščine. Čeprav je generalni pravobranilec Maduro v svojih sklepnih predlogih³⁰ predlagal, naj Sodišče tožbi deloma ugotovi, je Sodišče v sodbi izreklo, da Španija ob upoštevanju posebne narave Eurojusta in pristojnosti v okviru tretjega stebra Unije take tožbe ne more vložiti na Sodišču ES, temveč bi morali sami interesenti vložiti tožbo pred Sodiščem prve stopnje, v postopku pred tem sodiščem pa bi potem lahko intervenirala tudi Španija.³¹ Leta 2005 je podobno tožbo zoper Komisijo pred Sodiščem prve stopnje vložila Italija in v njej zahtevala ugotovitev ničnosti odločbe Komisije, v kateri je ta sprejela odločitev, »naj se zu-

²³ Vsak akt je seveda najprej pripravljen v enem »izvirnem« jeziku, ki je v zadnjih letih v vse več primerih angleški – nekaj več o tem in problematiki prevajanja pravnih besedil v Matej Accetto, *Pravno prevajanje in večjezična ureditev: Med verodostojnostjo besedila in avtoriteto prevajalca*, v: N. Ledinek, M. Žagar Karer, M. Humar (ur.), *Terminologija in sodobna terminografija*, Ljubljana, Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, 2009, str. 291–300.

²⁴ O tem glej več v Darja Erbič, *Jezikovna ureditev Evropske unije in posledice članstva v EU za slovenski jezik*, v: M. Ivšek (ur.), *Jeziki v izobraževanju*, Ljubljana, Zavod RS za šolstvo, 2008, str. 107–110.

²⁵ Ustanovljen s Sklepom Sveta 89/489/EGS o vzpostavitvi akcijskega programa za spodbujanje tujejezičnih kompetenc v Evropski skupnosti (*Lingua*), Ur. l. EGS, 16. 8. 1989, L 380, str. 24.

²⁶ O izplenu programa in številu izobraževalnih institucij, ki so bile vključene vanj, glej poročilo Evropske komisije, *Report from the Commission to the Council, LINGUA Programme, 1994 Activity Report*, 5. 10. 1995, COM(95) 558 final, str. 15 in *passim*.

²⁷ Za pregled aktov glej denimo Evangelia Psychogiopoulou, *The Integration of Cultural Considerations in EU Law and Policies*, Leiden in Boston, Martinus Nijhoff, 2008, op. 46 na str. 39.

²⁸ Program *Leonardo da Vinci* denimo med ukrepi za uresničevanje svojih ciljev določa »spodbujanje jezikovnih kompetenc, tudi za manj splošno uporabljane in poučevane jezike, ter spodbujanje razumevanja različnih kultur v kontekstu poklicnega usposabljanja« – glej Sklep Sveta 1999/382/ES o izvedbi druge faze delovnega programa poklicnega usposabljanja Skupnosti, »Leonardo da Vinci«, Ur. l. EU, 11. 6. 1999, L 146, str. 33.

²⁹ Z Lizbonsko pogodbo je prišlo tudi do preimenovanja Sodišča Evropskih skupnosti v Sodišče Evropske unije (in Sodišča prve stopnje v Splošno sodišče) – v tem članku, ki je bil napisan še pred uveljavitvijo Lizbonske pogodbe, je uporabljena še stara terminologija.

³⁰ Zadeva C-160/03, *Španija proti Eurojustu*, [2005] ZOdl. I-2077, točke 40–50 in 68–74 sklepnih predlogov.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 42. in 43. točka obrazložitve Sodišča.

nanje objave razpisov prostih delovnih mest za visoke vodstvene položaje odslej objavljajo v Uradnem listu Evropske unije le v nemščini, angleščini in francoščini, kar velja za obdobje, ki bo predvidoma končano 1. januarja 2007,«³² kar naj bi narekemale težave z zagotavljanjem prevodov. Sodišče prve stopnje je ugotovilo, da uporaba te odločbe lahko povzroči diskriminacijo med kandidati na podlagi jezika, zavrnilo argumente Komisije, da je takšna nevarnost zgolj teoretična, in izpodbijano odločbo ter razpis razglasilo za nična.³³

Navsezadnje je vprašanje jezika še vedno povezano tudi s tradicionalno dilemo, v kolikšni meri lahko skupnostni zakonodajni ukrepi glede rabe jezika pomenijo nekakšno avtonomno zakonodajno pristojnost Unije, v kolikšni meri pa so še vedno vezani predvsem na uresničevanje bolj nespornih gospodarskih ciljev. Primer tovrstnih trenj je tožba, ki jo je Evropski parlament konec devetdesetih let uperil proti Svetu, ko je slednji sprejel sklep o spodbujanju jezikovne raznolikosti v informacijski družbi,³⁴ a po mnenju Parlamenta na napačni pravni podlagi. Parlament je v tožbi trdil, da bi moral kot pravna podlaga zanj služiti tudi (današnji) 151. člen PES, ki je poglavitna podlaga za delovanje Unije na področju kulture (in bi zahteval tudi večjo zakonodajno vlogo Parlamenta),³⁵ Sodišče ES pa je v svoji sodbi³⁶ pritrdilo Svetu, da je bil ustrezna pravna podlaga (današnji) 157. člen PES, namenjen zagotovitvi pogojev, ki so potrebni za konkurenčnost industrije Skupnosti.

Seveda pa še zdaleč ni nujno, da bo v tovrstni presoji vedno krajšo povlekla kultura ali da kulturni pomisleki nikoli ne igrajo vloge tudi pri izpolnjevanju gospodarskih ciljev evropskega povezovanja. Že leta 1977 je Svet tako sprejel direktivo o izobraževanju otrok delavcev migrantov,³⁷ ki je določala obveznost držav članic, da za otroke migrantov zagotovijo tako »brezplačno poučevanje, ki olajša začetni sprejem; v to zlasti spada poučevanje uradnega jezika ali enega od uradnih jezikov države gostiteljice, ki mora biti prilagojeno posebnim potrebam takih otrok«, kot tudi »ustrezne ukrepe za spodbujanje učenja maternega jezika in kulture države izvora«. Po drugi strani je morda še bolj povedno, kako je Komisija v luči prava EU glede državnih pomoči presojala subvencije v založniškem sektorju, kjer je med drugim denimo kot skladno s pravom EU potrdila slovensko shemo pomoči založnikom, avtorjem, knjigarnam in drugim akterjem publicistične dejavnosti, ker je ocenila, da gre za legitimno pomoč za spodbujanje slovenske kulture na omejenem slovenskem trgu in za spodbujanje čezmejnne kulturne izmenjave,³⁸ ni pa potrdila dveh italijanskih shem za spodbujanje založniške dejavnosti, ki naj po njeni oceni ne bi bile namenjene spodbujanju italijanske kulture, ampak predvsem podpora zasebnega vlaganja v založniško dejavnost.³⁹

Podobni jezikovni kulturni interesi lahko prevladajo tudi na sorodnih področjih televizijske in filmske produkcije. Leta 2007 je Sodišče ES izdalo sodbo v zadevi *United Pan-Europe*

³² Zadeva T-185/05, *Italija proti Komisiji*, sodba Sodišča prve stopnje z dne 20. 11. 2008 (še ni objavljena v ZOdl.), 5. točka obrazložitve.

³³ *Ibid.*, točke 138–153 obrazložitve.

³⁴ Sklep Sveta 96/664/ES o sprejetju večletnega programa za spodbujanje jezikovne raznolikosti Skupnosti v informacijski družbi, Ul. l. EU, 28. 11. 1996, L 306, str. 40.

³⁵ Za več o tem glej Evangelia Psychogiopoulou, *The Integration of Cultural Considerations in EU Law and Policies*, Leiden in Boston, Martinus Nijhoff, 2008, str. 25–27 in 59–60.

³⁶ Zadeva C-42/97, *Parlament proti Svetu*, [1999] ZOdl. I-869.

³⁷ Direktiva Sveta 77/496/EGS o izobraževanju otrok delavcev migrantov, Ur. l. EGS, 6. 8. 1977, L 199, str. 32.

³⁸ Glej pismo Evropske komisije Sloveniji z dne 19. 6. 2006, K (2006) 3172 končni, dostopno na: http://ec.europa.eu/community_law/state_aids/comp-2006/n001-06.pdf (15. 9. 2009).

³⁹ Glej Evangelia Psychogiopoulou, *The Integration of Cultural Considerations in EU Law and Policies*, Leiden in Boston, Martinus Nijhoff, 2008, str. 319–320 in splošen pregled na str. 314–323.

*Communications Belgium*⁴⁰ v kateri je nekaj kabelskih operaterjev izpodbijalo zakonitost obveznosti, ki jim jo je nalagala belgijska ureditev, da v dvojezični regiji glavnega mesta Bruselj obvezno oddajajo televizijske programe nekaterih zasebnih izdajateljev televizijskih programov, ki jih imenujejo belgijske oblasti. Sodišče je odločilo, da je takšna nacionalna zakonodaja dopustna, če je sorazmerna in če si prizadeva za splošni interes, kot je ohranitev pluralizma televizijske programske ponudbe na tem območju v kontekstu kulturne politike. Podobno je marca 2009 v zadevi *UTECA*⁴¹ odločilo, da pravo EU načeloma ne nasprotuje nacionalni ureditvi, kakršna je bila v Španiji vpeljana z uredbo, ki izdajateljem televizijskih programov nalaga, da 5 % svojih prihodkov iz poslovanja v preteklem letu namenijo za financiranje evropskih kratko- in dolgometražnih kinematografskih ter televizijskih filmov, pri čemer morajo 60 % od tega nameniti delom, katerih jezik izvirmika je eden od uradnih jezikov Španije. S tema dvema sodbama je Sodišče še enkrat potrdilo cilj držav članic, da zaščitijo in spodbujajo enega ali več svojih uradnih jezikov kot nujni razlog splošnega interesa, ki ga upošteva tudi pravo EU.⁴²

Podobno kot področje kulture nasploh je tudi področje izobraževanja predvsem predmet določenih podpornih projektov za spodbujanje sodelovanja in čezmejne mobilnosti, ne pa bolj enovite in ambiciozne skupne izobraževalne politike. Razlog vsekakor ni zgolj jezikovna raznolikost sama po sebi – Južna Afrika se denimo sooča s primerljivim izzivom z enajstimi uradnimi jeziki, pa njena listina temeljnih pravic vsebuje določbo, da ima vsakdo »pravico do izobraževanja v uradnem jeziku ali jeziku lastne izbire v javnih izobraževalnih ustanovah, kjer je ta izobrazba razumno izvedljiva«, pri čemer je udejanjanje te pravice v praksi seveda odvisno od različnih dejavnikov, kot so število učencev v posameznem jeziku, razpoložljivost učiteljev in učilnic, stroški in podobno.⁴³ Evropska ureditev je tudi v tem pogledu vezana na naravo razvoja evropskega povezovanja kot politične tvorbe avtonomnih držav članic in na občutljivo vprašanje kulturne raznolikosti.⁴⁴ Vprašanje se tako najlažje pojavi v povezavi z vprašanjem mobilnosti oziroma prostega čezmejnega gibanja, od koder je tudi poglobljena sodba Sodišča ES v tej zvezi, sodba v zadevi *Groener*.⁴⁵

Že zelo pomembna uredba o prostem gibanju delavcev iz leta 1968,⁴⁶ ki je v 3. členu izključevala uporabo nacionalnih predpisov, kadar bi ti tujce omejevali pri sklepanju ali odvrčali od sklepanja pogodb o zaposlitvi v državi članici, je v drugem pododstavku istega odstavka 3. člena vsebovala izjemo, da ta določba »ne velja za pogoje v zvezi z znanjem jezika, ki ga zahteva narava prostega delovnega mesta«. V tem pogledu se prosto gibanje oseb razlikuje od prostega pretoka blaga, kjer je bilo pravo Skupnosti in Sodišče ES od nekdaj bolj pozorno na nacionalne ukrepe, ki bi pod pretvezo kulturnih interesov v resnici lahko zasledovali protekcionistične cilje.⁴⁷ V zadevi *Piageme I* so se tako tožniki sklicevali

⁴⁰ Zadeva C-250/06, *United Pan-Europe Communications Belgium in dr. proti Belgiji*, [2007] ZOdl. I-11135.

⁴¹ Zadeva C-222/07, *Unión de Televisiónes Comerciales Asociadas (UTECA) proti Administración General del Estado*, sodba Sodišča ES z dne 5. 3. 2009 (še ni objavljena v ZOdl.).

⁴² Glej denimo *ibid.*, točke 27–29 obrazložitve.

⁴³ O tem glej William F. Foster in dr., *Religion, Language and Education: Contrasting Constitutional Approaches*, v: *Education and Law Journal*, 9 (1999) 211, str. 214–215 in 223–226.

⁴⁴ Za pregled ukrepov na tem področju glej Evangelia Psychogiopoulou, *The Integration of Cultural Considerations in EU Law and Policies*, Leiden in Boston, Martinus Nijhoff, 2008, str. 99–102.

⁴⁵ Zadeva C-379/87, *Groener*, [1989] ZOdl. 3967.

⁴⁶ Uredba Sveta št. 1612/68 (EGS) o prostem gibanju delavcev v Skupnosti, Ur. l. EU, posebna izdaja v slovenščini, poglavje 5, zvezek 1, str. 15.

⁴⁷ Več o tem v Evangelia Psychogiopoulou, *The Integration of Cultural Considerations in EU Law and Policies*, Leiden in Boston, Martinus Nijhoff, 2008, str. 141–142.

na belgijski predpis, ki naj bi izvajal tedaj veljavno direktivo⁴⁸ o označevanju živil: direktiva je zahtevala, da so podrobnosti na prehrabnih izdelkih navedene v »jeziku, ki ga kupci zlahka razumejo, razen če je obveščenost kupca zagotovljena z drugimi ukrepi«, belgijski predpis pa je zahteval »jezik ali jezike jezikovne regije, kjer so prehrabni izdelki ponujeni na prodaj«. ⁴⁹ Sodišče je odločilo, da gre zahteva v belgijskem predpisu dlje od direktive in da pomeni nedopustno oviro prostemu pretoku blaga.

Drugače pa je bilo v zadevi *Groener*. Nizozemska delavka je bila leta 1982 na neki šoli na Irskem najprej sprejeta na delovno mesto učitelja umetnosti za določen čas s polovičnim delovnim časom, leta 1984, ko se je prijavila na delovno mesto učitelja umetnosti za nedoločen čas s polnim delovnim časom, pa bi morala v skladu z irskimi predpisi opraviti poseben preizkus iz znanja irskega jezika (izjema bi bila mogoča le, če za razpisano delovno mesto ne bi bilo drugih kandidatov, ki bi izpolnjevali vse pogoje). Gospa Groener je na preizkusu padla in nato sprožila postopek sodne presoje irskih predpisov, češ da naj bi bili v nasprotju s pravom Skupnosti, zlasti ker je pouk potekal v angleščini (drugem izmed dveh uradnih jezikov na Irskem) in znanje irskega jezika za opravljanje nalog poučevanja ni potrebno. Ko je vprašanje prejelo Sodišče ES v okviru predhodnega odločanja, se je postavilo na stran Irske:⁵⁰

19. Pogodba EGS ne prepoveduje sprejema politike za varovanje in promocijo jezika države članice, ki je obenem nacionalni in prvi uradni jezik. Kljub temu pa izvajanje takšne politike ne sme posegati v temeljne svoboščine, kot je prosto gibanje delavcev. Iz tega razloga zahteve, ki izhajajo iz ukrepov, katerih namen je izvajanje takšne politike, ne smejo v nobenih okoliščinah biti nesorazmerne glede na njihov cilj, način njihovega izvrševanja pa ne sme povzročiti diskriminacije državljanov drugih držav članic.

20. Pri izvajanju takšne politike je treba priznati pomen izobraževanja. Učitelji igrajo bistveno vlogo ne samo preko poučevanja, temveč tudi preko njihove udeležbe v vsakodnevnem šolskem življenju in posebnega odnosa, ki ga imajo s svojimi učenci. V takšnih okoliščinah ni neupravičeno od njih zahtevati, da imajo določeno znanje prvega nacionalnega jezika.

Zaradi pomena izobraževanja za nacionalno kulturno identiteto in ob upoštevanju posebnega položaja Irske, ki je že vrsto let spodbujala uporabo irskega jezika kot sredstva izražanja nacionalne identitete in kulture, je Sodišče sporno ureditev potrdilo kot skladno s pravom Skupnosti.

4. Sklepno

Leta 1969, ko so starši slovenskih otrok v Prekmurju na republiškem ustavnem sodišču iskali svojo jezikovno pravico, so v Quebecu sprejeli poseben zakon o spodbujanju francoščine v Quebecu.⁵¹ Zakon je namesto obstoječe ureditve, po kateri so starši otrok lahko (vsaj v teoriji) prosto izbirali izobraževanje v angleškem ali francoskem jeziku, francoščino

⁴⁸ Direktiva Sveta 79/112/EGS o približevanju zakonodaje držav članic o označevanju, predstavljanju in oglaševanju živil za prodajo končnemu potrošniku, Ur. l. EGS, 8. 2. 1979, L 33, str. 1.

⁴⁹ Zadeva C-369/89, *Piageme in dr. proti BVBA Peeters*, [1991] ZOdl. I-2971, 2. in 4. točka obrazložitve.

⁵⁰ Zadeva C-379/87, *Groener*, [1989] ZOdl. 3967, 19. in 20. točka obrazložitve.

⁵¹ Loi pour promouvoir la langue française au Québec, L.Q. 1969, ch. 9 (Loi 63).

postavil za primarni jezik poučevanja in za šole predpisal obvezno ponudbo predmetov v francoščini, čeprav so starši v konkretnih primerih še vedno lahko izbirali jezik poučevanja za svoje otroke. Leta 1974 se je z novim zakonom ureditev spremenila in otroci so lahko prišli v angleško šolo le, če so na posebnem testu izkazali »zadostno znanje« angleščine.⁵² Ker je bilo izvajanje testov težavno, je Quebec leta 1977 sprejel Listino o francoskem jeziku,⁵³ ki je določala, da izobraževanje v vrtcih, osnovnih in srednjih šolah poteka v francoščini, na zahtevo staršev pa se lahko otroci šolajo v angleščini le, če se je vsaj eden od staršev tudi sam šolal v angleščini (v Quebecu ali, če je v času začetka veljave Listine živel v Quebecu, tudi zunaj njega), če se je otrok sam ob začetku veljave Listine že šolal v angleščini ali če gre za mlajše brate ali sestre takega otroka. Ta ureditev je bila podvržena več pritožbam in se je skozi leta malo spreminjala.⁵⁴

Leta 2000 so to ureditev izpodbijali starši osmih družin; vsi z izjemo ene matere so bili kanadski državljani, vsi z izjemo dveh mater so bili rojeni v Quebecu in se tam tudi šolali v francoščini. Trdili so, da izvedba ustavne pravice do izobraževanja v manjšinskem jeziku nedopustno krši ustavno pravico enakosti, ki naj bi bila po njihovem mnenju ustavna pravica višje ravni in naj bi zahtevala, da imajo vsi otroci v Quebecu možnost dostopa do izobraževanja v angleščini. Pomisleki na strani zakonodajalca, ki je omejeval možnost, da bi se člani večinskega jezika šolali v manjšinskih šolah, pa so izhajali iz strahu, da bi vsaj zunaj Quebeca tudi manjšinske šole same lahko postale sredstvo asimilacije, če bi jih zasuli člani večinske jezikovne skupnosti. V samem Quebecu naj bi ti pomisleki imeli še dodatno razsežnost, saj šole za manjšinsko jezikovno skupnost ne bi smele spodkopavati namenov večine, da varujejo in krepijo francoščino kot večinski jezik v Quebecu, ob upoštevanju dejstva, da bo ostala manjšinski jezik v kontekstu celotne Kanade.⁵⁵ Kanadsko ustavno sodišče se je v sodbi leta 2005 strinjalo s tem stališčem in ugotovilo, da pravice do izobraževanja v manjšinskih jezikih ni mogoče podrediti pravici do enakega obravnavanja, ter posledično pritožbo staršev zavrnilo. Ob tem pa je poudarilo, da je treba pri presoji posledic upoštevati tudi številne druge dejavnike, zaradi katerih je v sorodni zadevi istega leta ugodilo pritožbam dveh družin, kjer sta mati oziroma hči predhodno izobraževanje opravljali v dvojezični šoli, kjer je del pouka potekal v angleščini, del pa v francoščini.⁵⁶

Če primer iz Quebeca postavimo ob bok tistemu iz Prekmurja, nam primerjava ne bo ponudila rešitve jezikovne zagonetke, temveč bržkone zgolj razkrila, da je ta zagonetka težko rešljiva. V Prekmurju je težava glede jezika poučevanja izvirala iz odpora večinskega prebivalstva do izobraževanja v manjšinskem jeziku, v Quebecu in širše v Kanadi pa nasprotno iz želje večinskega prebivalstva po učenju manjšinskega jezika in manjšinskega po učenju v večinskem jeziku. Tako je bila denimo zunaj Quebeca politika uradnega poučevanja v manjšinskem jeziku, ki je omejevala dostop večinskega prebivalstva, na eni strani deležna

⁵² Loi sur la langue officielle, L.Q. 1974, ch. 6 (Loi 22), 41. člen.

⁵³ Charte de la langue française, L.R.Q., ch. C-11.

⁵⁴ Za pregled glej *Gosselin (Tuteur de) c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [2005] 1 R.C.S. 238, 2005 CSC 15, 17.-22. točka obrazložitve. Na splošno o zadevi glej tudi Susan Luft in Greg M. Dickinson, Supreme Court Holds Charter Protection of Minority Language Education Rights Does Not Guarantee Instruction in Language of Choice, v: *Education and Law Journal*, 15 (2006), str. 293-295.

⁵⁵ *Gosselin (Tuteur de) c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [2005] 1 R.C.S. 238, 2005 CSC 15, 31. točka obrazložitve.

⁵⁶ *Solski (Tuteur de) c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [2005] 1 R.C.S. 201, 2005 CSC 14.

pravne in politične podpore oblasti in aktivistov, na drugi pa odpora s strani večinskega in manjšinskega prebivalstva.⁵⁷

Podobno protislovni so tudi današnji vzgibi univerzitetnega izobraževanja in raziskovanja. Po eni strani je univerza zibelka nacionalne kulture in znanosti, ki želi in mora skrbeti tudi za razvoj lastnega (znanstvenega in siceršnjega) jezika; po drugi pa so pripadniki nacionalnih univerzitetnih skupnosti vedno, pa naj gre za sorazmerno majhno Slovenijo ali za sorazmerno veliko Nemčijo, podobni tudi pripadnikom francosko govoreče quebeške skupnosti, ki bi si želeli povezati v mednarodno skupnost.⁵⁸ Na eni strani uradna ureditev podpira ohranjanje nacionalnih jezikov, na drugi se v praksi marsikdo boji prevelike »vkljenjenosti« vanje.

Seveda je pri vsaki tovrstni težavi vedno prisotno vprašanje, koliko je rešitev (ali odgovornost) moč najti v pravu. Ob tem je nemara še bolj nejasno, na koga je to vprašanje najustrezneje nasloviti – na Evropsko unijo ali na lastno državo? To še zdaleč ni jasno tudi v primeru tesneje povezanih državnih ureditev, kot denimo v ZDA, kjer je še vedno sporno, ali so zvezne oblasti ali oblasti zveznih držav tiste, ki naj sprejemajo odločitve glede dvojezičnega šolanja in poučevanja v (manjšinskem) maternem jeziku.⁵⁹ S stališča Evropske unije je za ljubitelje slovenščine (ali kateregakoli nacionalnega jezika) nemara spodbudna novica, da evropski pravni red do nadaljnjega kaže velik posluh za jezikovne interese držav članic, ki se jim, kadar so povezani z vprašanjem njihove kulturne identitete, umaknejo tudi gospodarski interesi čezmejne povezovanja.

Kot vedno pa se vse začne pri domači politični skupnosti in njenih gradnikih. Ena od vrednot skupnosti je (tudi) skrb za lasten jezik; del vrednosti posameznika je (tudi) večjezičnost. Jezikovni problem tako nemara ni le v dvojnosti nacionalno-globalno oziroma kulturno-ekonomsko, temveč poleg tega tudi v dvojnosti skupnost-posameznik. Posameznik, prek katerega se udejanja mobilnost, je obenem tudi tisti, ki mora skrbeti za stabilnost. Tudi to je nemara popotnica, ki naj mu jo da visoko šolstvo.

⁵⁷ Več o jezikovni politiki poučevanja v manjšinskem jeziku zunaj Quebeca glej Troy Riddell, *The Impact of Section 23 of the Charter of Rights on Official Minority-Language Education Policy outside Quebec Since 1982*, v: *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, 21 (2002), str. 277–303.

⁵⁸ Kot vemo, kako fakultete pri nas vse več predmetov ponujajo tudi ali (v hoji po robu, če ne prek njega, zakonske in statutarne ureditve) zgolj v tujih jezikih, poznam tudi primere predmetov na nemških univerzah, ki potekajo v angleškem jeziku, pa čeprav so vsi slušatelji nemški študenti.

⁵⁹ O tem glej Ronald D. Wenkart, *Native Language Instruction and the Special Education Student: Who Decides the Instructional Methodology?*, v: *West's Education Law Reporter*, 125 (1998), str. 581–594.

Lesser-used national languages in higher education: The case of Greek in Cyprus

The language of instruction issue at the University of Cyprus:
local versus global considerations

MARILENA KARYOLEMOU

University of Cyprus, Cyprus
makar@ucy.ac.cy

In this paper I propose to examine the status, place and future of Greek - a European lesser used language and an official language of Cyprus - in higher education in Cyprus. The issue concerning language in higher education has been a controversial issue for the last two decades or so, especially in relation to the creation of the University of Cyprus. Although the predominance of English runs through every area of academic life such as administration, curricula, textbooks, academic evaluation, etc. and flexibility measures have been introduced to enable the use of foreign languages as media of instruction in some areas, the university law is compelling and restricts the possibility of using English or any other foreign language on a regular basis.

V prispevku analiziram status, položaj ter prihodnost grščine, v Evropi manj razširjenega jezika in uradnega jezika Cipra, v ciprskem visokem šolstvu. Problematika jezika v visokem šolstvu v zadnjih dveh desetletjih sproža obilo polemik, še posebej v povezavi z ustanovitvijo Univerze na Cipru. Čeprav je prevlada angleščine prisotna na vseh področjih akademskega življenja, kot so administracija, izobraževalni programi, učbeniki, akademsko ocenjevanje itd., in so na nekaterih področjih v okviru vzpostavitve tujega jezika kot medija poučevanja bila vpeljana načela prilagodljivosti, pa je univerzitetni zakon jasno določen in omejuje stalno rabo angleščine ali katerega drugega tujega jezika.

Educational institutions such as universities do not usually have explicit regulations concerning their official language(s) or language(s) of instruction. In Cyprus, however, the issue of the official language(s) of the University of Cyprus was discussed repeatedly and sometimes passionately on several occasions and was finally settled by the Law 144 of 1989 (art. 4/1) whereby the University of Cyprus was established and Greek and Turkish were recognised as its official languages.

Those who are familiar with the history of Cyprus can guess that this issue was examined in the light of the political situation and to be more precise, in the light of the conflict between the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot communities and of their geopolitical separation since the '70s. Especially during the '80s the debate, concerning the language(s)-of-instruction issue both in the Cypriot Parliament and in the Greek Cypriot community at large, revolved around such questions as: "Are we looking for a state university that represents the whole of the island? Is the university going to be a university for local consumption, i.e. for Cypriot students alone, or do we intend it to be a university of reference for Middle East and South Europe? Will the Turkish Cypriots be able or willing to join the University of Cyprus?", ect.

The possibility of using English as an official language and as a language of instruction has also been extensively discussed (Karyolemou 2002). This option was not at odds with the educational practices in Cyprus, since all private and most public (vocational) tertiary education institutions have been since the early 1960s operating in English (Persianis 1994-95). At the same time English (and later American) universities were among the most favoured institutions for Cypriots who wished to study abroad. Notwithstanding this tradition, and despite recommendations by local and international experts who felt that the use of English as a medium of instruction would help the university become a regional centre for academic teaching and research, the Cypriot Parliament, on 13 July 1989, decided that Greek and Turkish (Karyolemou 2002) should be the official languages and subsequently also the languages of instruction. This decision was taken mostly on the basis of political and ideological considerations: i.e. the final choice was seen as a political message regarding the willingness of Greek Cypriots to pursue a solution to the Cyprus problem (Karyolemou 2002, 2003). At the same time, they were underlining their position as the main guardians of the constitutional order since they were, by their choice, complying with the provisions of the Cyprus Constitution (1960), whereby Greek and Turkish were recognised as the two official languages of the state (art. 3). However, it soon became obvious that the recognition of Turkish as an official language did not have any practical consequences, because Turkish Cypriots did not join the University in large numbers, and those few who did followed instruction in Greek. In the years that followed, Greek became *de facto* the sole language of instruction (Karyolemou 2002, 2007).

Sidestepping national language policies: implementing flexibility measures

While the use of a less widely spoken language like Greek is in agreement with national objectives, some people may think that this is an impediment to academic achievement and growth of the university. It is true that although it does not represent an obstacle for Cypriot academics in their personal contacts with their colleagues abroad - it has not hindered their involvement in European and international research or programs whatsoever due to a relatively high degree of bi/multilingualism predating the globalisation era - it might be problematic for some disciplines where most of the research is published in other major European languages, and original works or translations in Greek are scarce. As a consequence, students' insufficient knowledge of foreign languages, especially languages other than English, as well as their poor command of academic and scientific register, usually hinders access to the bulk of knowledge that exists in languages other than Greek and impedes their ability to fully understand and substantially contribute to the area of their study.

At the same time, the obligation to know Greek in order to be able to integrate the courses seems to hold back European students from joining graduate or post-graduate courses at the University of Cyprus, even for a limited period of time, for instance as part of European exchange programs. If (Modern and Ancient) Greek is a requirement in disciplines such as Archaeology, Greek studies, Philosophy and the Classics, where most students consider it to be a useful instrument for their studies and often a necessity for their own work, this is not so for disciplines such as Social and Political sciences, Economics, Physics, Mathematics, etc. In this respect, it is worth noting that, according to recent statistics (NATMOB 2005), Cyprus sends a majority of its youth to study in European universities yet gets but a small number of European students in return (Karyolemou 2008).

The responses of national higher education systems to the increasing demands of a globalised educational market have been the object of several publications in the last few years. On the other hand, many scholars underline the linguistic, economic and cultural pitfalls of transferring educational systems from one country to another (Vlk 2006; Alderman 2001). As far as language is concerned, scholars point to the prevalence of English in every area of academic life such as administration, curricula, textbooks, academic evaluation, etc. (Ammon 2001, 2002, 2007; Ammon and McConnell 2007). However, they also point to the fact that using English as a medium of instruction has proven to be a safe way of attracting international students and academics into local programmes.

Let us take the University of Cyprus as an example. The possibility of using foreign languages in post-graduate courses was discussed by the University Senate, which is the highest academic body, in its 69th meeting on 10 December 1997. It was decided that visiting academics could use, if they wished, a foreign language to teach in post-graduate programmes and local academics could supervise dissertations in a foreign language if such permission was granted to them by their department and faculty. By doing this, the Senate was adopting “flexibility measures” about language use. Flexibility measures are regulations about language use that aim at specific categories of students, for instance European exchange programme students, or concern certain disciplines such as Physics, Economics, Mathematics, Business etc. or even some programmes within disciplines like post-graduate programmes, but do not overtly affect the official language policy. In clear, flexibility measures aim at sidestepping compelling official or state language policies which are difficult to change either because they do not depend upon internal regulations or are related to issues of identity and power which are not the object of consensus and would otherwise raise a lot of passion. This is also what the Senate underlined by stating that it was not easy to ignore the provisions of the law and that special regulations were needed to be able to run post-graduate programmes entirely in a foreign language. However, one can hardly see how, in the long run, such flexibility measures could be restricted to specific categories of students, disciplines or programmes.

When these proposals reached the university departments for comments, some academics reacted unfavourably because they felt that the proposal was aiming at introducing English as a semi-official language. They asked, in particular, that the initial statement concerning the possibility of supervising dissertations in a foreign language be modified in order to make clear that the choice of the language should “depend on the research area and be in accordance with customary academic requirements for each discipline”. For instance, it would be possible to use German, and not English, for advanced Byzantine studies, since German is extensively used in this discipline. The academic body appeared divided on this issue; some academics were reluctant regarding the possibility of introducing English in post-graduate programmes, whereas others were constantly requesting permission from the Committee for post-graduate studies to allow English-taught curricula in post-graduate studies.

Some three years later, the Senate discussed again the issue of the use of foreign languages, this time in relation to Erasmus students (122nd meeting, 17 January 2001) and decided to allow the introduction of courses in a foreign language wherever necessary in order to assist Erasmus students. Two days after notifying the departments of this decision, the Secretary of the Senate clarified that the decision concerned “*additional* courses planned for exchange students exclusively” [emphasis in the text]. In other words, these courses were not to be introduced in replacement of those in Greek, and most of all, did not concern local students. In this way, the use of a language other than Greek as a medium of instruction was to be an *ad hoc* decision of departments and faculties and not a directive emanating from university authorities affecting the *de jure* language policy.

Flexibility measures and official language policy

As Cyprus became increasingly involved in the broad European higher education market, some people felt that these flexibility measures needed to be replaced by a general statement about language use approved and endorsed not only by the various bodies inside the university, where agreement was already not easy to obtain, but also, and more importantly, by people outside the university such as political leaders, the government and the Cypriot Parliament. This approval became necessary as flexibility measures were gradually extended to local students and under graduate courses, and academic linguistic practices were at the point of breaking the 144/1989 law provisions about the official languages. Therefore, either academic practice needed to be revised in order to conform to the officially endowed policy or the 1989 law needed to be changed. The university authorities aimed for the second solution.

The first attempt to approach the issue was made in May 2002 when a private bill was introduced in Parliament, modifying the initial law “to allow teaching in English in post-graduate courses in order to attract foreign students”. In July 2002, while the above-mentioned bill was still pending, the Ministry of Education and Culture introduced a new bill that enabled the use of any language other than Greek and Turkish in post-graduate courses or programmes if a programme or an area of study required such a use. At the end of the discussions that took place in the Parliament (18 December 2003), it was agreed that foreign languages were to be used as teaching languages in inter-university courses and post-graduate programmes *only if these programmes were already offered in one of the official languages*. At the same time, foreign students should attend at least one course of Greek language and culture (law 199(I)/2003). During the discussion it became clear that the main concern of those who introduced and voted for this bill was to prevent the creation of programmes *offered exclusively* in English.

At the same time, in a note addressed to the Deans and Heads of departments (18/04/2004), the Vice-Rector of the University reminded them of the regulation concerning the use of foreign languages in university courses. She also informed the academic staff that the Committee for post-graduate studies was working on several aspects of the regulation which needed to be clarified. Meanwhile, she urged the departments to scrupulously observe the existing regulation so as to avoid suspicion on the misuse or abuse of the above-mentioned flexibility measures.¹

Conclusion

What is our conclusion then?

The linguistic landscape in higher education today continues to be divided between the English-speaking institutions and those where teaching is done in Greek. Some among this last category recognise both Greek and Turkish but have Greek as their *de facto* official lan-

¹ In order to do so, she proposed that the following procedure be observed: (a) departments should clearly state the number of students to be admitted in each language version of the programmes offered and justify any differences in number; (b) they should explicitly define the requirements for admission in a curriculum taught in a foreign language. These requirements should be the same for any languages other than the official languages. Finally, she stressed that it could be possible to run a programme in a foreign language in conjunction with the same programme in Greek, or in a foreign language alone if no admissions to the Greek version of the programme were made possible.

guage. At UCY only two departments today offer post graduate courses in a language other than Greek, namely English.² Both are within the School of Economics:

- a Professional MBA in Business & Administration offered by the department of Public and Business Administration (also offered in Greek),
- a M. Sc. in Financial Economics offered jointly by the department of Economics and the department of Public and Business Administration (offered only in English)

Despite the fact that the language of instruction in private universities and in several public educational institutions like the Cyprus Forestry College, the Higher Hotel Institute³ or the Cyprus International Institute of Management (CIIM)⁴ is English; even though English is still prevalent in many areas of academic life: most textbooks and scientific publications are in English, English is a necessary qualification for academics and students if they want to keep up to date with advances in their area of specialisation, and a necessity for international collaboration; and, finally, although the academics' evaluation itself lies with their capacity to contribute to internationally recognised journals and fora where English is the main language, we could say that the position of Greek as a language of instruction not only at the University of Cyprus but also at the newly founded Open University⁵ is still quite strong. Furthermore, Greek has replaced English as a medium of instruction at the former Technological Institute which has now been incorporated into the Technological University of Cyprus, where the medium of instruction is *de facto* Greek.

Academic authorities at UCY are very careful when dealing with language issues, as they need to prevent any negative reactions to teaching practices that could be perceived as deviations from the approved language policy. Accusations against the University being a place of anti- or un-ethnic teaching have been voiced at times by various nationalist circles (see for instance the daily newspaper *Filelefteros*, 24-25 October 1995, 28 December 1997). Since language stirs ethnic feelings, it is obvious that any attempt to side-step the obligation to use Greek as a language of instruction would be perceived as a premeditated effort to influence Greek Cypriots' loyalty *vis-à-vis* the Greek language and culture, ultimately aiming at altering their sense of ethnic belonging (Karyolemou 2001).

The fact that language remains associated with notions of ethnicity and identity in a politically fragile state is perhaps what guarantees the strong position of the Greek language in the public higher education of Cyprus. This can also explain why - although political parties admit the need to introduce foreign languages in higher education in order to keep up with European and international concurrence - they are (at the present moment) reluctant to consent to any development that would confer (or give the impression to confer) supremacy to some foreign languages in general and to the English language in particular.

² At the exception of the departments of English and French studies where the use of English and French in post graduate (and even graduate programmes) respectively is expected.

³ Both the College and the Institute offer short, intensive and/or professional courses.

⁴ CIIM offers only post graduate courses in •Business Administration (MBA) •Public Sector Management (MPSM) •Finance and Banking •Human Resource Management and Organizational Behaviour •Educational Leadership and Management •Shipping Management •Marketing Management.

⁵ The Open University of Cyprus is a distance learning institution. It offers only one programme in Greek civilization as from the current academic year.

References

- Alderman, G., 2001: The globalization of higher education: Some observations regarding the free market and the national interest. *Higher Education in Europe XXVI* (1). 47-52.
- Ammon, U. (ed.), 2001: *The dominance of English as a language of science: Effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ammon, U., McConnell, G. (eds.), 2002: *English as an academic language in Europe: A survey of its use in teaching*. *AILA Review* 20. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Ammon, U., 2007: Global scientific communication: Open questions and policy suggestions. *AILA Review* 20. 123-133.
- Ammon, U., Carli, A. (eds.), 2007: *Linguistic inequality in scientific communication today: What can future applied linguistics do to mitigate disadvantages for non-anglophones?*. *AILA Review* 20.
- European Higher Education* (coll.), 2002. Brussels: Academic Cooperation Association.
- Karoulla-Vrikki, D., 2001: English or Greek language? State or ethnic identity: The case of the courts in Cyprus. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 25(2). 259-288.
- Karyolemou, M. 2001: From linguistic liberalism to legal regulation: The Greek language in Cyprus. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 25(1). 25-52.
- Karyolemou, M., 2002: When language policies change without changing. *Language Policy* 1(3). 213-236.
- Karyolemou, M., 2003: 'Keep your language and I will keep mine': Politics, language and the construction of identities in Cyprus. D. Nelson, M. Nelson Dedaic (eds.): *At war with words*. Amsterdam/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 359-384.
- Karyolemou, M., 2007: La langue turque à Chypre: Gestion d'une diglossie à bilinguisme de minorité. Baider Fabienne (ed.), *Emprunts linguistiques, empreintes culturelles: Métissage orient-occident*. Paris: L'Harmattan. 125-140.
- Karyolemou, M., 2008: Promoting bi/multilingualism in Europe: Language use and language teaching in higher education. S. Pavlidou (ed.): *Studies for the Greek language* 28. Thessaloniki: Instituto Neoellinikon Spoudon. 194-205.
- Kinisi politon gia ta ethnika themata [Movement of Citizens for National Issues], *To panepistimio ofeilei na prostatevsei tin politistiki klironomia tou topou* [The University ought to protect the cultural heritage of the country], *Fileleftheros* 28 December 1997.
- Lanzendorf, U., Teichler, Ul., Murdoch, J., 2005: *Student mobility in secondary and tertiary-level education and in vocational training* (NATMOB). Presented to the European Parliament Directorate-General for Internal Policies of the Union, Directorate B, Structural and Cohesion Policy. [IP/B/CULT/ST/2004-010].
- Omada Protovoulia gia to panepistimio kyprou [Initiative Group for the University of Cyprus], *Peri ton kata to panepistimio kyprou skaion* [Concerning the so-called accusations against the University of Cyprus], *Fileleftheros* 24 October 1995.
- Papapavlou, A., 2001: Linguistic imperialism of English in Cyprus. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 25(2). 167-176.
- Persianis, P., 1994-95: The Greek-Cypriot educational policy in Cyprus as an expression of conflict at the political, cultural and socio-economic levels. *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 10-11. 89-116.
- Vlk, A., 2006: *Higher Education and GATS: Regulatory consequences and stakeholders' responses*. Ph. D., University of Trente, Enschede: CHEPS/UT.

Croatian in Higher Education – an Instrument of Language Integrity and a Means of Standardising National Terminology?

MAJA BRATANIĆ, ANA OSTROŠKI ANIĆ

Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics, Croatia
mbratan@ihjj.hr | aostrosk@ihjj.hr

The status of the Croatian language in the European context and effects of globalisation on the system of higher education in Croatia are briefly analysed. Lack of clear-cut language policy and the role of the Croatian Standard Language Council are discussed. A possible impact of the current situation on the standardisation of Croatian terminology is addressed.

V prispevku na kratko analiziramo status hrvaškega jezika v evropskem kontekstu in vpliv globalizacije na sistem visokošolskega izobraževanja na Hrvaškem. Prav tako razpravljamo o premalo jasno opredeljeni jezikovni politiki in vlogi Sveta za hrvaški knjižni jezik. Sprašujemo se o možnem učinku današnjega stanja na normiranje hrvaške terminologije.

U radu se sažeto analizira status hrvatskoga jezika u europskome kontekstu i utjecaj globalizacije na hrvatski sustav visoke naobrazbe. Raspravlja se i o nedovoljno eksplicitnoj jezičnoj politici i ulozi Vijeća za normu hrvatskoga standardnog jezika. Propituje se mogući učinak današnjega stanja na normiranje hrvatskoga strukovnog nazivlja.

1. Introduction

Most European countries, not only those in which lesser known languages like Slovene or Croatian are spoken, find themselves today, from a linguistic point of view, in a situation of conflicting interests and priorities – the challenge of globalisation manifested, among other things, in the dominance of English in a number of domains on the one hand, and the necessity to defend and preserve the national linguistic identity (or identities) via various legislative, educational, cultural and political mechanisms on the other. The process of European unification can therefore be seen as a potential cause of tension between national and supranational interests, often yielding conflicting language ideologies, policies and practices (Mar-Molinero, Stevenson 2006: 1–12).

The example of the Croatian language and its position within various types of unions it found itself in – in the more or less recent past – could alone provide ample evidence to substantiate this thesis in a wider perspective. The question we intend to tackle briefly here is how far this situation has changed (especially in the area of higher education) since Croatia and its national language gained independence in the last decade of the past century, and whether the parallel globalisation trend has interfered with anticipated developments

towards linguistic consolidation. The common pattern that can be observed in many of the new EU Member States reflects, thus, a similar tendency towards further standardisation and homogenisation at the national level along with efforts to find themselves a reasonably secure place in the multilingual constellation of the new union. This process is often accompanied by a not at all unfounded scepticism towards the language policies stated by the Council of Europe and the EU, which to the new states seem to be largely rhetorical rather than applied in day-to-day practice. Meeting the challenges of multilingualism, mobility, international communication and knowledge transfer is, ironically, most commonly reduced to choosing English as the medium for realising the newly acquired opportunities.

Some language communities have, however, been more adept than others in using the occasion of “going multilingual” for consolidating their terminology resources and solving open questions related to language planning – most efficient, as it seems, being the minority and regional languages like Catalan, Basque, Irish, etc. In spite of its long-awaited independence, Croatian is not yet anywhere close to a coordinated or clearly articulated language policy on the national level. Apart from a rather general and symbolic declaration issued by the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts in 2005, the main guardian of the Croatian standard and the prime proponent for some important initiatives (among them the national project of standardising terminology) has been the Croatian Standard Language Council.

2. Current situation

In some aspects the position of the Croatian language resembles the status of Slovene as discussed by Marjeta Humar in one of her articles (Humar 2007: 93-101). However, the question of whether national terminology “should continue to be developed or [...] be adapted to globalisation trends through the use of English in science” has never been seriously raised. The fact remains that most prominent scientists and researchers continue to publish primarily in English, and that many prestigious Croatian scientific journals are published in English. Recently, nevertheless, those journals financed by the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports have been obliged to include summaries of articles and keywords in Croatian as a step towards unifying and standardising Croatian technical and scientific terminology.

It should also be mentioned that, even if students are expected to be able to use the required literature in foreign languages, the majority of textbooks continue to be published in Croatian, thus directly or indirectly contributing to the standardisation of Croatian terminology in various fields. Yet another positive trend can be observed: more and more university institutions have been introducing explicit instructions on the subject of the Croatian language into their curricula.

According to the Croatian Constitution, Croatian is the official language of the Republic of Croatia. Still, while the law clearly stipulates the use of the Croatian language in elementary and middle schools, its status has not been legally regulated for higher education. An appeal from the Croatian Standard Language Council, addressed to the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports, demanding that the Law on Research and Higher Education should be amended to specify the official status of Croatian and the exceptional circumstances under which the language of instruction may be other than Croatian, has not yet entered the necessary procedure.

3. The University of Zagreb

We have not been able to establish the actual percentage of English-taught higher education programmes, but in spite of the fact that Croatia adopted the “Bologna process” system of studies in higher education some five years ago, it seems considerably lower than in most European countries. Whether this is due to inertia or a conscious national strategy, it is hard to tell at this point. The programmes in English are, as a rule, optional and primarily geared towards foreign students studying in Croatia. What follows is a more detailed account of the current situation at the level of higher education in Croatia (based mainly on analysing the University of Zagreb, as the most representative example).

In the academic year 2009/2010 ten faculties at the University of Zagreb offered courses or programmes in English at undergraduate and graduate levels.¹ There are altogether 75 courses taught in English at six institutions, and six programmes – two at the undergraduate and four at the graduate level – organised at five institutions at the University of Zagreb. Apart from the English Language and Literature programme at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, there is also a 12-semester MD programme at the School of Medicine², an Advanced Master of European Studies programme at the Faculty of Political Science, a Bachelor Degree in Business within the Faculty of Economics and Business, and a Master’s study programme partially taught in English at the Faculty of Teacher Education.

The MD study programme at the School of Medicine has been offered to students since the academic year 2003/2004.³ The Bachelor Degree in Business was introduced last year at the Faculty of Economics and Business as a 4-year undergraduate study program, and is the only Economics and Business study program taught fully in English in Croatia.⁴ Both programmes have been organised in an attempt to attract more international students to Croatia, but they still need to set up an exchange network with other institutions that hold similar programmes. On the other hand, the Master of European Studies Programme at the Faculty of Political Science is primarily oriented towards Croatian students. It started in the year 2006/2007 as an interdisciplinary graduate programme developed in cooperation with international partners and sponsored by the Danish government, and is designed for future policy-makers and people who intend to work in the national public administration, at various European institutions or in international consultancies.⁵

Along with university programmes, there are a number of privately owned faculties and colleges that offer courses in English as part of their MBA programmes; however, there are still very few all-English study programmes in Croatia. One of possible reasons for such a situation is that there are not many students from other European (or non-European) countries who would be interested to study in Croatia. The existing programmes have yet to show their cost-effectiveness and prove that it would be useful for the Croatian educational system to open up to non-Croatian students.

¹ http://international.unizg.hr/international_students/coursesprogrammes_in_english.

² The English name of *Medicinski fakultet* is not clear from the School of Medicine’s web page. Sometimes it is *Medical School*, and on other sites *School of Medicine* is used. We use the name *School of Medicine* according to the School’s homepage and the list of institutions from the International Relations Office homepage.

³ <http://mse.mef.hr/link1.php?grupa=07000000#492>.

⁴ <http://www.efzg.hr/default.aspx?id=10661>.

⁵ <http://www.fakultet.fpzg.hr/engleski/index.aspx>.

4. Croatian for academic purposes

As a language for special purposes, English is being taught at all faculties of the University of Zagreb and is, whether as a regular or an optional programme, the language students usually take. Unlike English, Croatian is rarely taught at the university level. Out of 35 faculties and academies of arts at the University of Zagreb, Croatian is being taught as a regular or an optional programme at only six of them.⁶

Among the faculties where Croatian for academic purposes is taught, usually as an optional programme, the Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computing stands out as the only one belonging to the field of technical sciences. The aim of the course *Croatian in engineering practice*, taught as an optional programme at the graduate level, is “to learn the orthographic, morphological and syntactical norm of standard Croatian and to improve oral and written skills within the engineering profession.” Special attention is also paid to “language and communication competence within the engineering profession.”⁷ Ironically, at the same faculty English for Special Purposes is not taught at all, since it is understood that all students should be proficient in English. Such a practice of teaching Croatian to students of engineering or natural sciences should be encouraged because it is also an opportunity to standardise the terminology that students use in their course of study, and which in certain expert domains lacks Croatian equivalents.

Other institutions offering classes on Croatian are: Academy of Dramatic Art, Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, Faculty of Political Science, University Centre for Croatian Studies, and Catholic Faculty of Theology. However, teaching at these higher education institutions is all in the fields of arts, humanities and social sciences, and in their programmes Croatian language and linguistics has a somewhat different relevance. In conclusion, even if the situation in Croatia does not presently seem alarming in terms of the prevalence of English in higher education, it definitely calls for a more clear-cut strategy.

5. STRUNA – a national terminology project

The Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics has recently started the STRUNA project for coordinating Croatian specialised terminology financed by the National Foundation for Science, Higher Education and Technological Development of the Republic of Croatia. The aim of the project is to set up a national terminology data bank and establish a system of coordination among terminological activities in, ideally, all professions in Croatia. All STRUNA partner projects are led by university professors and are carried out at various Croatian university institutions.

⁶ Language study programmes at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and the programme of Croatian Culture at the University Centre for Croatian Studies were not taken into consideration.

⁷ Course description taken from <http://www.fer.hr/en/course/ciep>.

6. References

- Humar, M., 2007: Terminology and Terminography Work in Slovenia. F. Ní Ghallchobhair and B. Nájera (eds.): *Minority languages and Terminology Policies*. Vienna: TermNet Publisher. 93-101.
- Mar-Molinero, C., Stevenson, P., 2006: Language, the National and the Transnational in Contemporary Europe. C. Mar-Molinero and P. Stevenson (eds.): *Language, Ideologies, policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-12.
- http://international.unizg.hr/international_students/coursesprogrammes_in_english
(last accessed 27 October 2009).
- <http://mse.mef.hr/link1.php?grupa=07000000#492> (last accessed 26 October 2009).
- <http://www.efzg.hr/default.aspx?id=10661> (last accessed 26 October 2009).
- <http://www.fakultet.fpzg.hr/engleski/index.aspx> (last accessed 27 October 2009).
- <http://www.fer.hr/en/course/ciep> (last accessed 27 October 2009).

The Role of the University in Sustaining Linguistic Minorities – an Irish Case Study

SEOSAMH MAC DONNACHA

The National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland
Seosamh.MacDonnacha@oegaillimh.ie

The paper deals with the endeavours of the National University of Ireland, Galway (NUI Galway) to meet the requirements of the Irish-speaking community, particularly by encouraging higher education programmes at NUI Galway, which has had a statutory obligation to provide third level courses through the medium of Irish since 1929. In the year 2000 the University decided to review its approach to the provision of third level courses in Irish. The result of this review was the University's adoption of a development strategy for the Irish language in university education and the establishment of a new Irish-medium Academy – *Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge*. The paper includes a brief introduction to the current status of the Irish language and the history of NUI Galway's promotion of Irish-medium studies. The paper concludes with an outline of the main principles which underlie *Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge* and the challenges it faces in the future.

Prispevek obravnava prizadevanja Irske nacionalne univerze Galway (NUI Galway), da bi zadostila potrebam irske jezikovne skupnosti, zlasti s spodbujanjem visokošolskih programov v irskem jeziku na NUI Galway. Statut univerze že od leta 1929 določa, da morajo biti univerzitetna predavanja na voljo tudi v irskem jeziku. Leta 2000 je NUI Galway na novo preučila univerzitetne programe v irskem jeziku in na podlagi te revizije sprejela razvojno strategijo za irski jezik v visokem šolstvu ter ustanovila novo Akademijo – *Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge*, kjer predavanja potekajo v irskem jeziku. Prispevek na kratko predstavi trenutno stanje irskega jezika in zgodovino spodbujanja visokošolskih programov v irskem jeziku na NUI Galway. Na koncu so predstavljena še glavna načela *Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge* in njeni izzivi v prihodnosti.

1. Introduction

The National University of Ireland, Galway (NUI, Galway) has had a statutory obligation to provide third level courses through the medium of Irish since 1929. In the period 1929-2003 this obligation was fulfilled by encouraging and facilitating staff members who were competent in Irish to teach their courses through the medium of Irish where demand existed among the student body. In addition, a small number of scholarships were provided to high achieving students who opted to follow their course through the medium of Irish. By the year 2000, the University had a total of 204 students following courses or part of their course through the medium of Irish in the faculties of Arts, Science and Commerce. In addition, the University provides undergraduate and postgraduate courses in Irish language and literature and provides a diploma course in applied Irish language skills that students can take on a voluntary basis.

In the year 2000, the University decided to review its approach to the provision of third level courses through Irish. In undertaking this review it was decided to adopt an external customer led approach and to review the current needs of the Irish-speaking community and how NUI, Galway as a third level institution could best meet these needs. The result of this review was the adoption by the University of a development strategy for Irish-medium University Education (NUI, Galway 2000), and the establishment of a new Irish-medium Academy – *Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge* (NUI, Galway 2003).

The underlying philosophy of the new development strategy and of *Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge* is

‘the desire of NUI, Galway to provide for the specific needs of Irish speakers and Gaeltacht [Irish-speaking districts] communities, through the promotion of academic programmes, courses and research activities in subject areas that are seen as being of over-riding importance to their future development, and through initiatives in other related areas. The Development Strategy aims to increase the Irish-medium educational opportunities available to Irish speakers, in the Gaeltacht and throughout the country, and to contribute in a positive manner to the social, economic, cultural and linguistic life of their communities and of the country.’ (NUI, Galway 2003: 44-45).

A key part of the University’s approach in this area is its desire to create stronger educational linkages with other institutions working with linguistic and other minorities. Within this context one of the objectives of its new approach is the creation of ‘a third level education model that can be emulated by other minority language communities as a vehicle for their sustainable development.’ (NUI, Galway 2003: 45)

This paper will go over the background that led NUI, Galway to adopt this particular third-level Irish-medium model. It will include a brief introduction to the current status of the Irish language and the history of NUI, Galway’s promotion of Irish-medium studies. The paper concludes with an outline of the main principles which *Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge* (*An tAcadamh*) sees as central to its future success and development.

2. The Irish Language

With the establishment of the Irish Free State in 1922, the Irish Language was accorded the status of ‘National language’ (with English being equally recognised as an ‘official language’) under Article 4 of the Constitution of the Irish Free State (*Saorstát Éireann*) Act, 1922. A new constitution, *Bunreacht na hÉireann*, enacted in 1937, declares that ‘The Irish language as the national language is the first official language,’ with English being declared as ‘a second official language.’

However, by 1926, the number of Irish-speakers in the Irish Free State was only 543,511 (18.29%), out of a total population of 2,971,992. By 1936, a year before *Bunreacht na hÉireann* was enacted, the number of Irish-speakers had increased to 666,601 (23.75%), out of a total population of 2,140,324. This dichotomy between the constitutional status of Irish and its de facto position as a minority language is, perhaps, best explained in a reference from a 1934 court case in which Justice Ó Cinnéide, in referring to the constitutional status of Irish in the 1922 constitution, stated:

'The declaration by the Constitution that the national language of Saorstát Éireann is the Irish language does not mean that the Irish language is, or was at that historical moment, universally spoken by the people of the Saorstát, which would be untrue in fact, but it did mean that it is the historic distinctive speech of the Irish people, that it is to rank as such in the nation and, by implication, that the State is bound to do everything within its sphere of action ... to establish and maintain it in its status as the national language and to recognise it for all official purposes as the national language.' (Ó Foghludha V McClean (1934) IR 469 68 ILTR 189 (1934)).

And indeed the Irish State has invested heavily in the intervening years in efforts to maintain Irish as a living language in those areas where it is still spoken and to revive it in the rest of the country. This investment has had mixed results. Census returns show that language ability amongst the population, when defined as the number of people who can speak the language to some degree of competence, has increased steadily, from 18 per cent in 1926 to almost 42 per cent in 2006 (Census 2006). In one sense this represents quite a considerable achievement. However, the census returns of the number of Irish-speakers, are an insufficient indicator with which to analyse the success or otherwise of any language planning effort. A clearer indication of the sustainability of language planning outcomes can be achieved by looking at the census data relating to language usage. Census 2006 reported that of the 42% of the population age 3 years and over who were reported as being able to speak Irish, just over 72,000 persons, representing 4.4 per cent of all those who could speak Irish, spoke it on a daily basis outside school.

These numbers include a large number of people living outside the traditional Irish-speaking (Gaeltacht) districts who are capable of speaking Irish to various levels of competence. While some of these participate in various social and organisational language networks, Irish has not taken hold again as a social and community language in any place outside of the traditional Gaeltacht districts. Within the Gaeltacht districts it appears that the pattern of language shift to English continues unabated and is now at a critical stage (Ó Giollagáin, Mac Donnacha *et al* 2007).

3. National University of Ireland, Galway

The National University of Ireland, Galway (NUI, Galway), was founded in 1845 as Queens College Galway. It was one of the three Queen's Colleges founded under the provisions of The Queen's Colleges (Ireland) Act, 1845, the others being located in Belfast and Cork. The College was opened for students in 1849 and functioned as a constituent college of the Queen's University from 1850 until that institution was dissolved in 1882, with the establishment of the Royal University. The Royal University was dissolved under the provisions of the Irish Universities Act, 1908, which created two new universities – The Queen's University of Belfast (into which Queen's College, Belfast was converted) and the National University of Ireland – a federal University with its seat at Dublin and with three constituent colleges, at Dublin, Cork and Galway. Thus, under a new charter issued in December 1908 the College became University College, Galway. Under the Universities Act, 1997 University College Galway was reconstituted as a University under the name of *Ollscoil na hÉireann, Gaillimh*/National University of Ireland, Galway and became a constituent University of the National University of Ireland (together with the National University of Ireland, Dublin; the National University of Ireland, Cork; and the National University of Ireland, Maynooth).

4. NUI, Galway's commitment to the Irish Language

Under the University College Galway Act, 1929¹ the Governing Body of the College committed to providing an increasing proportion of its courses through the medium of Irish and to making better provision for the study of the Irish language and literature in return for a commitment by the Government to provide extra resources for such activities. This Act also made it incumbent on the College authorities to appoint people to positions in the College who are 'competent to discharge the duties thereof through the medium of the Irish language: provided a person so competent and also suitable in all other respects is to be found amongst the persons who are candidates or otherwise available for such appointment.'

With this legislative provision in mind, the College in the intervening years committed itself to increasing the use of Irish across a broad range of its administrative and academic activities. In pursuit of this aim the University provided courses through the medium of Irish in a number of disciplines and provides a broad range of courses in the Irish language for members of staff and students.

However, the development of Irish-medium courses in the University did not keep pace with the development of the range of English-medium courses and the number of students taking them. This was particularly so in the period of the late 1980's and early 1990's, when the number of students attending Irish universities increased rapidly, but when no 'strategic plan was implemented, nor even outlined, to ensure that third-level education through Irish would be developed proportionately, concurrently and in parallel with third-level education through English.' (Ó Cinnéide 2004).

5. Strategic Review

In the year 2000 the University decided to review its approach to the provision of courses through the medium of Irish. This review was brought about partly by the movement towards a strategic approach to planning in Irish Universities generally.

Underlying this review, was the knowledge that although the University had continued to provide courses through the medium of the Irish language in the period since 1929, the responsibility for this activity was left mainly at the departmental level and, in many cases, the commitment to Irish language provision was dependent more on the commitment of individual members of staff than on any coherent strategy at University level. Within this context, the provision of courses through the medium of Irish within the University had become ad hoc and while courses were being provided through the medium of Irish in a range of academic departments it had become increasingly difficult for students to access a sufficient number of Irish-medium modules/courses to allow them to complete a full degree course through the medium of Irish.

Under this system, for teaching staff, the decision to teach through the medium of Irish was in the main a personal commitment that invariably led to an extra workload, and often the decision to teach through Irish was seen to be in conflict with the need to commit time

¹ This Act was amended in 2006. The amended act now contains a provision to ensure that the 'governing authority of the College shall ensure that one of the principal aims for the operation and development of the College set out in each strategic development plan prepared after the commencement of this section is the provision of education at the College through the medium of the Irish language.'

to academic research. Within academic departments, debates regularly ensued around the issue of whether staff should be using scarce departmental resources to teach a small number of students through the medium of Irish, when those same resources might be better utilised teaching a much larger body of students through the medium of English.

This *laissez faire* approach to Irish-medium studies within the University also meant that no structure existed to support staff committed to teaching through the medium of Irish. Very little was done in developing Irish-medium teaching resources, or in providing training for staff teaching through Irish, or to ensure sufficiently attractive career paths existed for staff wishing to commit to teaching through Irish on a long-term basis. Neither could it be claimed that what was being provided was ‘an Irish-medium university’ model, as, with a small number of notable exceptions, the Irish-medium activities were, in the main, restricted to the provision of courses only, with very little provision for encouraging research and facilitating publication of academic material through the medium of Irish. These misgivings culminated in the knowledge that although the University was providing a reasonably broad range of services through the medium of Irish it did not add up to a coherent strategy for meeting the needs of the Gaeltacht and Irish-speaking community.

Some considerations were foremost in underpinning the University’s review of 2000. These included issues related to:

- The role of the University in Society.
- The needs of the Gaeltacht/Irish-speaking community with regard to the third-level sector.
- Current developments within the Gaeltacht.

5.1 The role of the University in society

The University was concerned that one of its primary roles was to serve the needs of the society of which it is part. This role has been given a legislative basis in Section 12 of the Universities Act, 1997, which states, for example, that the objects of Universities shall include the promotion of learning in society generally; the promotion of the cultural and social life of society; and the promotion of the official languages of the state, with special regard to the preservation, promotion and use of the Irish language.

Within this context, the University felt, that given its obligations under the University College Galway Act, 1929, and in view of its location in proximity to one of the strongest Irish-speaking Gaeltacht districts, that it should play a leading role in facilitating the sustainable development of the Irish-speaking community.

5.2 The Needs of Gaeltacht/Irish-speaking community with regard to the third-level sector

The review identified several specific issues relating to the Gaeltacht and Irish-speaking community generally which it felt were relevant and should be the focus for the development of Irish-medium studies in the future:

- The large number of Irish language and Gaeltacht institutions/organizations involved in various aspects of language planning has led to a corresponding need to educate and train students and language planning practitioners through the medium of Irish in a broad range of related linguistic, administrative, planning and managerial disciplines.

- The continued development of Gaeltacht based business organizations and the shift from manufacturing to knowledge based industries within the Gaeltacht required the University to provide degree level and life-long learning opportunities through the medium of Irish in related disciplines for individuals working or available to work in these sectors.
- The development of Irish-medium education at primary and second level in the Republic of Ireland and in Northern Ireland was being hampered by:
 - (i) A lack of a similar comprehensive provision at third level.
 - (ii) The lack of appropriate education and training programmes for teachers wishing to teach in Irish-medium and Gaeltacht schools.
- A predicted increase in demand from all public sector organizations for fully qualified employees who are competent in Irish, as a result of the enactment of the Official Languages Act, 2003.

5.3 Current developments within the Gaeltacht

Major changes have taken place in the Gaeltacht in recent years. A 1997 ESRI report (Watson, Fahy 1997), showed that those sectors with obligations in relation to planning and policy issues in the Gaeltacht (including the third level sector) faced many new challenges if we were to provide Gaeltacht communities with the instruments in terms of education, skills and leadership, necessary to enable them to fulfill their personal, social and cultural aspirations, while at the same time maintaining Irish as the primary home and social language of the community.

One of the main points highlighted by the Report was the number of young people leaving the Gaeltacht in search of employment opportunities elsewhere which were commensurate with their educational qualifications and with their aspirations. Referring to this the Report stated:

'Recent emigrants from the Gaeltacht over five years numbered in the region 6,000 in total, or 1,200 per year...These emigrants are heavily comprised of well-educated young people who get good jobs elsewhere in Ireland or abroad. Gaeltacht students coming to the end of their education number up to 1,500 per year...over half of these say that they expect to leave the Gaeltacht to find jobs, even though the majority say they would be happy to live in the Gaeltacht on social grounds.' (Watson, Fahy 1997).

The Report also stated that:

'The groups who depart are a major loss to Gaeltacht economic and social life, particularly when the cumulative effect over the years is taken into account.' (Watson, Fahy 1997).

This report suggests that although young people in the Gaeltacht were availing of the third level opportunities available to them, this is happening in a social and economic context, which results in young Gaeltacht people being educated for employment opportunities that exist mainly outside of their own communities. Thus Gaeltacht communities, despite having invested heavily in their youth, end up being deprived of the input of these young people in the social, economic, and cultural life of the community. This further reduces the

viability of these communities and increases the likelihood that the Gaeltacht will not survive as a distinct language community unless these issues, which are essentially planning issues, can be resolved.

In this context, NUI, Galway, came to the conclusion that there was a need for a third level education strategy for the Gaeltacht:

- (i) Which could deal with the challenges facing the Gaeltacht of today and in which the Irish language is seen as a central factor.
- (ii) Which could be integrated with an appropriate economic development strategy.
- (iii) Which would ensure that a high proportion of Gaeltacht students have access to third level education which is being delivered within the Gaeltacht, thereby increasing the likelihood that they will undertake a venture or a profession within the Gaeltacht at the end of their third level education period.

6. Strategic Development Plan

The University published its *Strategy for the Development of Third Level Education in the Gaeltacht* in May 2000 and started the process leading to the establishment of *Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge* (Academy for Irish-medium University Studies), a new academic and administrative structure charged with the future development of Irish-medium University Studies under the auspices of NUI, Galway. *An tAcadamh's* brief would include three distinct elements:

- The development of a broad range of University courses through the medium of Irish, with priority given to meeting the particular needs of the Irish-speaking/Gaeltacht community.
- The development of a range of research activities through the medium of Irish, again with priority being given to covering the research needs of the Irish-speaking community.
- The development and implementation of a capital investment programme that would allow *An tAcadamh* to deliver on its academic commitments on campus and within the Gaeltacht. This includes a proposal to develop five Irish-medium university centres – one of which is located on the University campus, with two located in the Connemara Gaeltacht and with one each located in the Gaeltacht districts of Donegal and Kerry.

Within this context, the following ten academic areas were proposed for prioritization in relation to course development and research activity:

- Translation Studies.
- Language Planning.
- Education Studies.
- Information Technology.
- Communication Studies.
- The Arts.
- Courses in applied Irish language skills.
- Community development studies.
- Studies in the development of natural resources.
- Managerial and business studies.

In the next section I give a brief introduction to the first six areas of priority identified above, with an outline of the reasoning that lies behind their identification as areas of priority and the type of activity being undertaken in relation to each area.

6.1 Translation Studies

The demand for translation services from English to Irish, and for other services in which a high standard of written Irish is required has grown considerably in recent years. The existing companies providing translation services have experienced a large increase in demand for their services as a result of the provisions of the Official Languages Act enacted in 2003, which places an onus on all public sector organizations to produce a range of documents and reports bilingually, and the decision to recognize Irish as an official language of the European Union with effect from January 2007. There is, therefore, a high level of demand for qualified translators and good employment opportunities exist for young graduates as well as opportunities for young entrepreneurs who want to start their own business. *An tAcadamh*'s current suite of courses in the discipline of translation studies includes a degree programme, two MA programmes (one in text based translation studies and one in Conference Interpreting) and a part-time Diploma (see Table 1).

6.2 Language Planning

The Irish State has invested a lot of effort in the preservation and promotion of Irish over the past 80 years. As a result of this a lot of experience and expertise has been developed in relation to many aspects of language planning. A broad range of organizations are involved in language planning of one kind or another. These include public sector organizations, voluntary organizations, private sector organizations, third level institutions and other organizations in the education sector. The number of individuals working in the public sector with direct responsibility for various aspects of language planning shall increase significantly as a result of the Government's recently enacted language act, as all public sector bodies will have to develop a strategy that will enable them to ensure that their services meet the needs of Irish speakers and can be delivered through the medium of Irish. *An tAcadamh* is of the view that a key element in ensuring the overall effectiveness of the language planning effort lies in the education and training of both current and future language planning practitioners.

An tAcadamh is already active in research into language planning issues in Ireland and have been successful in winning a number of major research commissions, leading to the publication of two important research reports: a baseline study of Gaeltacht schools (Mac Donnacha *et al* 2005) and a sociolinguistic study of the Gaeltacht (Ó Giollagáin, Mac Donnacha *et al* 2007).

An tAcadamh currently provides an MA in Language Planning which is run on a part-time basis and is targeted at professionals currently working in the sector. Further developments currently being planned include the provision of a fulltime MA programme and a new diploma programme in Language Planning.

6.3 Education Studies

The Irish-medium education sector has grown considerably since the early seventies. In addition to the 171 Gaeltacht schools, there are 168 Irish-medium primary schools and 43 Irish-medium secondary schools operating in non-Gaeltacht areas. As evidenced by the continuous growth of new Irish-medium schools over the past twenty years, this sector is likely to continue to grow. Despite this growth there is still a huge gap between the level of supply and potential demand. Currently only c. 6% of primary school children are receiving their education through the medium of Irish. However, research by Institiúid Teangeolaíochta Éireann (Ó Riagáin, Ó Gliasáin, 1994), shows that up to 30% of parents would be willing to send their children to an Irish-medium school if such a school was available locally. Given these figures it seems likely that there will be a continuous demand for teachers and services in this sector in the foreseeable future.

An tAcadamh's objectives in this area are to support the continued development of Irish-medium education by providing support services and by ensuring that teachers are available who are qualified to teach through the medium of Irish in gael scoileanna (Irish-medium schools in non-Gaeltacht districts) and in Gaeltacht schools. The University currently provides a postgraduate diploma in education through the medium of Irish. In addition *An tAcadamh* has developed a part-time Diploma in Language Acquisition and Child Development for people working as language assistants in Gaeltacht schools and a part-time MA in Language Teaching for teachers already working in the sector. Further courses envisaged in this area include teacher training programmes at degree level, and courses in preschool education, remedial education, career guidance and school management and development.

6.4 Information Technology

In order to ensure that the Gaeltacht and the Irish language can take advantage of the information era, continuous investment is necessary to ensure that the necessary information, concepts and skills are available in Gaeltacht communities to enable them to avail of the opportunities that new information and communication technologies provide. *An tAcadamh* has already invested successfully in this area, through projects initiated on its Gaeltacht campuses. Projects undertaken to date include a post-graduate course in software development, and two diploma courses in Applied Computer Skills.

6.5 Media and Communications

The Irish speaking community currently has access to a broad range of Irish language media, which includes broadcast and print media. These play an important role in the future of the Irish language and of the Gaeltacht. They provide recreation, education and information for the community through the medium of their own language, and they act as a forum in which community organizations, elected representatives, journalists and other experts can communicate and debate their views and opinions on various issues which relate to the life of the Gaeltacht and of the country. They provide a platform for Gaeltacht and Irish speaking artists – actors, writers, musicians, dancers etc. - which enables them to perform and celebrate their art. It is estimated that between them Irish language broadcast

and print media provide fulltime employment, of a kind attractive to young graduates, for in excess of 500 people.

A broad range of professional skills is needed by these media services. In addition they need professionals who have excellent spoken and written Irish and they also need access to people with the necessary management and strategic planning skills. *An tAcadamh* currently offers a BA in Communication Studies, a Higher Diploma in Applied Communications and diploma courses in radio and television broadcasting. We have also established a television production company on one of our Gaeltacht campuses, which has produced programmes for TG4, the Irish language television service.

6.6 The Performing Arts

The arts are an important element in the life of all communities. This is especially so in the case of a linguistic community like the Gaeltacht and Irish speaking community. The arts provide them with an opportunity to enquire into and make sense of their own lives, their own imaginations and their own concepts of identity and spirituality and to open them up for examination by the community and the rest of the world. Heretofore, Gaeltacht communities have held onto their traditional art forms as a defense and as an escape from the constant stream of global cultures and linguistic pressures to which they are exposed through the access which they have to national and international media. Performance arts which are seen as being of particular importance in their own right and which have an important role in sustaining the community identity of the Gaeltacht include:

- The Performing Arts: Drama, *agallaimh beirte*, work songs.
- Music: Traditional and modern music, singing and dancing.
- Literature: Prose, poetry, radio and television writing.
- Folklore: Storytelling.

The support structures for these Gaeltacht art forms are to be found in voluntary/ community organisations such as: *An Comhlachas Náisiúnta Drámaíochta*, *An tOireachtas*, *Pléaráca*, *An Cumann Scoildrámaíochta*, and *Comhaltas Ceoltóirí Éireann*. Raidió na Gaeltachta has been a champion of Gaeltacht art forms since its establishment in 1972, and TG4 represents new opportunities for their exposition, development and presentation. An important factor in the value of these arts is their facilitation of the development of relationships between artists from the Gaeltacht and other Irish speaking artists, with artists from other linguistic and minority communities.

An tAcadamh is currently developing its suite of programmes in this area and currently provides a Higher Diploma in Drama Studies, a Diploma in the Staging of Traditional Music and a part-time Diploma in Acting.

Courses offered by Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge
MA/Diplóma Iarchéime i Léann an Aistriúcháin (<i>MA/Postgraduate Diploma in Translation Studies</i>)
MA in Ateangaireacht Chomhdhála (<i>MA in Conference Interpreting</i>). Commencing September 2008.
MA i dTeagasc Teangacha (An Ghaeilge) (<i>MA in Language Teaching</i>). Part-time programme.
MA sa Phleanáil Teanga (<i>MA in Language Planning</i>). Fulltime and Part-time programme.
Ph.D/M.Sc. (trí thaighde) sa Teicneolaíocht Faisnéise (<i>Ph.D/M.Sc. (by Research) in Information Technology</i>)
Dioplóma Iarchéime san Oideachas (<i>Postgraduate Diploma in Education</i>)
Ard-Dioplóma i gCumarsáid Fheidhmeach (<i>Higher Diploma in Applied Communications</i>)
Ard-Dioplóma sa Dramaíocht (<i>Higher Diploma in Drama Studies</i>). Part-time programme.
BA sa Chumarsáid (<i>BA in Communications Studies</i>)
BA i Léann an Aistriúcháin (<i>Translations Studies as part of Omnibus BA programme</i>)
BA (Gaeilge agus Léann an Aistriúcháin) (<i>BA in Irish and Translations Studies</i>). Denominated degree programme commencing in September 2008.
BA sa Riarachán Gnó (<i>BA in Business Administration</i>). Commencing in September 2008 in collaboration with Letterkenny Institute of Technology.
Dioplóma sna Dána (Scileanna Raidió) (<i>Diploma in Radio Broadcasting</i>). Full time programme.
Dioplóma sna Dána (Scileanna Teilifíse) (<i>Diploma in Television Broadcasting</i>). Full time programme.
Dioplóma sna Dána (Ríomhaireacht don Riarachán Gnó) (<i>Diploma in Business Computing</i>). Full time programme.
Dioplóma sna Dána (Cóiriú agus Stáitsiú an Cheoil Thraidisiúnta) (<i>Diploma in the Staging of Traditional Music</i>)
Dioplóma sna Dána (Scileanna Aistriúcháin) (<i>Diploma in Translation Studies</i>). Part-time programme.
Dioplóma i dTeicneolaíochtaí Gnó (<i>Diploma in Business Computing</i>). Part-time programme.
Dioplóma sna Dána (Aisteoireacht) (<i>Diploma in Acting</i>). Part-time programme.
Dioplóma sa Ghaeilge (C1) (<i>Diploma in Irish (Level C1)</i>). Part-time programme.
Dioplóma sa Ghaeilge (B2) (<i>Diploma in Irish (Level B2)</i>). Part-time programme.
Dioplóma sa Ghaeilge (A2) (<i>Diploma in Irish (Level A2)</i>). Part-time programme.
Dioplóma i Léann an Traidisiúin (<i>Diploma in Folklore</i>). Part-time programme.

Table 1: Current suite of programmes offered by Acadamh na hOllscolaíochta Gaeilge (as of september 2008).

7. Conclusion

As of September 2008 *An tAcadamh* will be providing a total of seven post-graduate programmes, three undergraduate degree programmes, four fulltime undergraduate diploma programmes and seven undergraduate diploma programmes. In the current Academic year (2007-2008) *An tAcadamh* has 78 post graduate students and 119 fulltime undergraduate degree and diploma students. In addition a total of 797 students are registered on *An tAcadamh*'s suite of part-time diploma programmes.

For the future we see several principles as being critical to the way in which we wish to develop *An tAcadamh*. Firstly the focus of *An tAcadamh* will not be on the provision of courses through the medium of Irish. Our focus will be on providing courses that meet the needs and requirements of the Irish-speaking community. By definition, this means that the courses will be delivered through the medium of Irish – and this is not a debatable issue. However, a focus on meeting the needs of the language community rather than focusing on providing courses in the target language, in our view, allows for a more strategic approach to the provision of university education in lesser-used languages and results in more sustainable outcomes.

Secondly, the focus of *An tAcadamh* will not be limited to the provision of university courses through the medium of Irish. A key element of its development will be the nurturing of research activity and the development of consultancy type services which allow *An tAcadamh* to share its expertise with other public, private and community organizations active in the Irish-speaking community. We want to be an Irish-medium university institute in the broadest sense of what a university should be – encompassing both research and teaching activities.

Our purpose, as an Irish-medium institute is not simply to ensure that the major ideas, issues, theories and practices of the day are borrowed from the rest of the world and considered, discussed and debated in Irish, important and all as this may be. Our major challenge is to ensure that we as an Irish-medium university academy have the self-confidence to create, develop and inspire new ideas, theory and practice and thereby contribute to the intellectual diversity of the world rather than simply borrowing from it.

An tAcadamh will provide a significant proportion of its courses on our Gaeltacht campuses, thereby ensuring that a significant proportion of Gaeltacht residents have access to third level education without having to leave their own community – to ensure that they are educated to benefit their own community rather than being educated out of their community.

Finally, *An tAcadamh* will seek to make a difference – and that is how we shall measure our success in the future. Have we made a difference? Have we made a significant contribution to the creation of a sustainable future for the Irish language community? Have we made a significant contribution to the development of language planning theory and practice – not just in Ireland but internationally? And have we created a university model that can be emulated in other places as a means of ensuring that other indigenous communities have access through the medium of their own language to the full range of benefits that a university can bestow?

8. References

- Census of Population*, 2006. Dublin: Central Statistics Office.
- Mac Donnacha, S., Ní Chualáin, F., Ní Shéaghdha, A., Ní Mhainín, T., 2005: *Staid Reatha na Scoileanna Gaeltachta*. Dublin: An Chomhairle um Oideachas Gaeltachta agus Gaelscolaíochta.
- National University of Ireland, Galway, 2000. *A Strategy for the Development of Third Level Education in the Gaeltacht*.
- National University of Ireland, Galway, 2003. *Strategic Plan for NUI, Galway: 2003-2008*.
- Ó Cinnéide, M., 2004: University Education in Irish with particular emphasis on the requirements of the Gaeltacht. C. Nic Phóidín, D. Uí Bhraonáin (eds.): *University Education in Irish: Challenges and Perspectives*. Dublin: Fiontar Dublin City University.
- Ó Giollagáin, C., Mac Donnacha, S., Ní Chualáin, F., Ní Shéaghdha, A., O'Brien, M., 2007: *Staidéar Teangeolaíoch ar Úsáid na Gaeilge sa nGaeltacht*. Dublin: An Roinn Gnóthaí Pobail, Tuaithe agus Gaeltachta.
- Ó Riagáin, P., Ó Gliasáin, M., 1994: *National Survey on Languages 1993: Preliminary Report*. Dublin: Institiúid Teangeolaíochta Éireann.
- Watson D., Fahey, T., 1997: *Survey of Employment Needs in Gaeltacht Areas: Report to Údarás na Gaeltachta*. Dublin: ESRI.

Slovenščina ali angleščina?

ALOJZIJA ZUPAN SOSIČ

Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani, Slovenija
alojzija.zupan-sosic@guest.arnes.si

Položaj nacionalnih jezikov v visokem izobraževanju je odvisen od jezikovne in izobraževalne politike posamezne države in celotne Evropske unije. V Sloveniji sta vstop v EU in uvedba bolonjske deklaracije trčila ob ne/pričakovane ovire, ki ogrožajo rabo znanstvene slovenščine. Te so predvsem tri: zaradi izmenjave tujih študentov in profesorjev poteka bolonjski proces pri nekaterih predmetih kar v angleščini; rabo angleščine kot znanstvenega novoreka podpira s predlogom dokumenta *Merila za volitve v nazive visokošolskih učiteljev, znanstvenih delavcev in sodelavcev* tudi slovenska univerza, v katerem slovenske znanstvene dosežke ovrednoti le s polovičnimi točkami. Tretjo oviro predstavlja nedemokratično vključevanje slovenskih raziskovalcev v nekatere mednarodne projekte, ki v imenu evropeizacije drsijo v tiho asimilacijo, ko z enojezičnostjo (angleščino) zanemarijajo večkulturnost.

The situation of the national language in higher education depends on the language and education policy of the state as well as the EU. The Slovenian EU entry and the adoption of the Bologna Declaration resulted in (un)expected obstacles put before the use of Slovenian in science, mainly the following three: due to exchange of foreign students and professors the Bologna process in certain classes is carried out in English; the use of English as the newspeak of science is supported by the Slovenian University with proposal of the document entitled *Measures for the election in the title of university teachers, scientific workers and university co-workers in which Slovenian scientific achievements only get half of all available points*. The third obstacle is the non-democratic inclusion of Slovenian researches into some of the international projects, which in the name of Europeanisation slowly slide into silent assimilation by neglecting multiculturalism with monolingualism, i.e. using only English.

December 2019. Slovenska univerza praznuje že stoto obletnico svojega obstoja, slovesnost poteka v angleškem jeziku; ta je kot svetovni novorek nadomestila slovenščino tudi v znanstvenem tisku.

Zgornji antiutopični scenarij ni plod moje znanstvene domišljije, ampak tesnobna vizija dogodkov oz. stanj nedavne preteklosti, ki zahtevajo premislek o položaju nacionalnih jezikov v visokem izobraževanju. Ker je ta položaj povezan s širšo jezikovno in izobraževalno politiko in je v tem smislu zelo obsežen in razplaten, bom v prispevku orisala samo najbolj pereče probleme znanstvenega jezika tukaj in zdaj, navezane na vstop v Evropsko unijo in sprejem bolonjske deklaracije. Čeprav imata oba procesa, evropeizacija in bolonizacija, veliko pozitivnih lastnosti, bom za položaj slovenščine kot znanstvenega jezika osvetlila samo njune negativne značilnosti.

Ena izmed njih je večkulturnost, ki bi se morala v obeh procesih uresničevati kot osnovna dobrina novega tisočletja, saj obljublja združeni Evropi enakopravnost vseh kultur in s tem posledično tudi jezikov. S stališča gradnje evropske zavesti kot nove identitete v »novi« Evropski uniji naj bi bila večkulturnost prepletanje in součinkovanje kultur starih in novonastalih (oz. družbenopolitično spremenjenih) držav. Da temu ni tako, nas poučujejo različna nagovarjanja k nadnacionalnosti, v kateri naj bi opustili svojo nacionalno identiteto in tudi svoj jezik, ter mednarodna gibanja, ki opozarjajo na ogroženost ali izumiranje majhnih jezikov. Strinjam se z mislijo Borisa Pahorja,¹ da naj se ekologija razširi še na področje jezikov in postane jezikovna ekologija; posegi jezikovnih ekologov bi bili namreč nujni pri usmerjanju bolonjskega procesa. V njem zahteva po izmenjavi (tujih) študentov in profesorjev ni problematična, je pa alarmantno njeno izvajanje v Sloveniji. Praktično ta zahteva pomeni, da se lahko univerzitetni učitelj kot nosilec določenega predmeta po lastni presoji odloči za tuji jezik ali pa mu to namigne njegova tržno usmerjena fakulteta, ki pričakuje od visokošolskega izobraževanja v angleščini večji obisk tujih študentov in s tem posledično večjo »glavarino«,² pri privatnih univerzah pa večji delež vpisnine. Slovenske fakultete so tujim študentom pripravljene ponuditi celotna predavanja v tujem (beri angleškem) jeziku, čeprav jih k vpisu ne bo prepričala angleščina, pač pa zgledne študijske razmere. Te naj bi zagotovile uvodna predavanja v angleščini, vzporedno pa s tečaji slovenščine zagotovile vključitev tujih študentov v slovenski znanstveni prostor, kar je pogosto tudi njihova želja. Globalizirajoča, torej zgolj tržno in enokulturno razumljena bolonjska zahteva po izmenjavi znanja, študentov in profesorjev, krši 11. člen slovenske Ustave, Zakon o visokošolskem izobraževanju in Statut univerze, ki določajo kot učni jezik na univerzi slovenščino.

Ne samo da univerza v Sloveniji tovrstno dvojezičnost podpira, v prihodnosti namerava slovenščino kot znanstveni jezik skoraj izkoreniniti in jo nadomestiti z enojezičnostjo oz. uvedbo angleščine. Tovrstno nakano izraža predlog³ univerzitetnega dokumenta z naslovom *Merila za volitve v nazive visokošolskih učiteljev, znanstvenih delavcev in sodelavcev* (v nadaljevanju *Merila*). Predlagana habilitacijska merila so prezrla prizadevanja univerzitetnih učiteljev in sodelav-

¹ Boris Pahor (2001: 15) v prispevku *O zvestobi svoji biti* razmišlja, da bi se moralo reševanje flore in favne pri Unescu razširiti še na zaščito ogroženih jezikov, tj. na jezikovno ekologijo: »Da, seveda, naš jezik zdaj še ni v taki nevarnosti kot nemajhno število drugih jezikov, vendar pa ga mi sami večkrat po krivdi spravljamo v nevarnost. In ne bi smeli. Zakaj tudi ko ne bi imeli ne Trubarja ne Prešerna, ne Levstika ne Župančiča, ne Cankarja ne Ketteja in ne Murna, ne Gradnika, ne Preglja, ne Gregorčiča in ne Kosovela, tudi ko ne bi imeli ne Jakopiča ne Plečnika ne sto drugih umetnikov in znanstvenikov evropskega slovesa, bi morali biti skrbni varuhi jezika, s katerim vsak dan sproti oblikujemo življenje, v katerem izražamo svoje veselje in svojo žalost, v katerem ljubimo in pojemo, s katerim se vsak trenutek legitimiramo kot enkratni, samosvoj, samobiten narodni osebek.«

² V Sloveniji prevladujejo državne fakultete, ki so brezplačne; država jih financira glede na število študentov (glavarina), medtem ko privatne fakultete zaračunavajo vpisnino.

³ Zaposleni na Filozofski fakulteti v Ljubljani smo prejeli habilitacijska merila, predlog za *Merila za volitve v nazive visokošolskih učiteljev, znanstvenih delavcev in sodelavcev* in Amandmaje k tem *Merilom*. Visokošolski učitelji in ostali so prispevali pripombe predvsem glede točkovanja in zahteve po 30-dnevnem neprekinjenem bivanju v tujini, ena izmed njih je bila tudi želja po zagotovitvi enakopravnosti slovenskih revij iz baze AHCI s tujimi, saj v preteklosti objave v slovenščini niso štele. Slovenisti smo svoje pripombe zbirali na spletni diskusijski skupini oz. virtualnem časopisu »SlovLit«, med katerimi je svoje opombe B. Krakar Vogel objavila tudi v *Slovenščini v šoli*. Objava odlomka iz moje študije *Kolonizacija slovenske literarne zgodovine* (2009b) je sprožila na SlovLitu (od 11. 5. do 22. 5. 2009) odzive različnih intelektualcev, ki so se zavzeli za ohranitev znanstvene slovenščine; nekaj odmevov je povzročil tudi članek v Delu *In English We Trust* (2009a). Znanstveniki smo ob tej priložnosti posredovali svoje pripombe dekanu FF, opremljene tudi s spremnim pismom Slavističnega društva Slovenije – dokončna usoda *Meril* je v času pisanja tega članka še nejasna.

cev Katedre za novinarstvo Fakultete za družbene vede v Ljubljani ter Oddelka za slovenistiko in Oddelka za slavistiko Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani, ki so v dokumentu *Strategija univerze ter slovenščina kot znanstveni in učni jezik* leta 2006 na javnost in univerzo naslovili listo odprtih vprašanj, nato pa celo sprejeli *Resolucijo nacionalnega programa za jezikovno politiko 2007–2011*. V omenjenih *Merilih* je tako slovenski znanstveni jezik vrednoten le polovično: znanstvena monografija, tiskana v tujem jeziku, bo najbrž vredna 30 točk, domača le 20, del tuje monografije se točkuje z 8 točkami, domače le s 4 točkami. Podobno polovično razmerje bo veljalo tudi za obljubljeni vabljena predavanja, kjer so mednarodna označena s 5 točkami, domača le z 2 točkama. *Merila* ocenjujejo slovenske dosežke s polovičnimi točkami tudi pri strokovni in uredniški dejavnosti, saj je domača strokovna dejavnost ovrednotena s 3 točkami, tuja s 6, uredništvo/souredništvo domače revije, knjige ali zbornika konference le s 3 točkami, medtem ko si urednik ali sourednik tuje revije, knjige ali zbornika lahko pripiše kar dvakratno število točk, tj. 6 točk.

Glede položaja jezika se ta dokument približuje nevarnosti, da se bo evropeizacija spremenila v tiho asimilacijo »majhnih« znanosti, kakršna je tudi slovenska. Ali se odgovorni zanj ne zavedajo, da bo zahteva po konkurenčnosti zavrnila slovensko znanost in z izumrtjem znanstvene slovenščine spremenila slovenski jezik (nazaj) v kuhinjski jezik? Uvedba slovenščine in angleščine ali samo angleščine za znanstveni jezik vrača slovensko znanost v čas pred nastankom slovenske univerze, v čas diskriminatorne jezikovne in izobraževalne politike in tako briše stoletni zgodovinski spomin – prizadevanje za slovensko univerzo je namreč staro skoraj petsto let.

Večkulturnost in uradna zahteva po znanstveni slovenščini sta največkrat kršeni tudi z osnovno pravico vključevanja v mednarodne projekte. Če zanemarimo ukrojenost tem po meri anglo-ameriškega prostora, je skrb vzbujajoče predvsem dejstvo, da smo k projektom povabljeni praviloma v angleščini, v kateri se tudi sporazumevamo in zaključimo projekt z zbornikom ali knjigo. Tako je npr. projekt *Colonialism Across Europe: Colonial History and European Postcolonial Memory in Transnational Perspective* (organizator HERA) nagovarjal tudi mene kot literarno zgodovinarico, naj raziščem kolonizacijo v Sloveniji. Tega nisem storila, ker je bil projekt za naše razmere zastavljen preveč superiorno in diskriminatorno, saj je razumel Slovenijo kot kolonijo v avstro-ogrski monarhiji oz. žrtev kolonizacije bivše Jugoslavije. Vključevanje slovenske znanosti v mednarodni prostor je ustvarjalno in tvorno le, če rahlja ozke nacionalne okvire, a pri tem upošteva kriterij vzporednosti in enakopravnosti različnih nacionalnih znanosti. Če ne želimo, da se izpolni antiutopični scenarij iz prvega odstavka mojega razmišljanja, se je potrebno upreti persuasivni viziji znanstvenega jezika. Zapeljavna različica omenjenega antiutopičnega scenarija nam namreč vabljivo šepeta na uho, da bomo z uvedbo znanstvene angleščine končno del »velike« evropsko-ameriške znanosti in njeni neposredni soustvarjalci. V svojih sofizmih pa namerno ne razloži, da bomo tako postali le poceni znanstvena sila in šolski primer manjvrednostnega kompleksa.

Izguba⁴ znanstvenega jezika sicer še ne pomeni razkroja celotne slovenščine, pomeni pa izgubo njene najbolj žlahtne in temeljne identitetne sestavine ter sprijaznjenje z drugorazrednostjo nacionalnega značaja. Da ne bi izgubili najbolj žlahtne prvine svoje identitete in se znašli v antiutopičnem scenariju na začetku tega prispevka, predlagam tri izboljšave: pestra in poceni (zastonj?) ponudba tečajev slovenščine za tuje študente, popravek habilitacijskih *Meril* v korist znanstvene slovenščine in resna skrb za večkulturnost in večjezičnost (v nasprotju s sedanjo enojezičnostjo) mednarodnih projektov.

⁴ Pri vpeljavi angleščine v visokošolski študij bi se morali poučiti o negativnih posledicah tega početja iz podobnih potez: npr. fakultete na Nizozemskem, ki so sprejele angleščino za znanstveni jezik, niso več zadovoljne z lastnim ukrepom.

Literatura

- Golob Kalin, M., Stabej, M., 2007: Sporazumevanje v znanosti in na univerzi: uboga slovenščina ali uboga jezikovna politika? *Jezik in slovstvo* 5. 87–91.
- Krakar Vogel, B., 2009: Habilitacijska merila. Podcenjujoča in nestvarna. *Šolski razgledi* 8 (17. 4.). 3.
- Melik, V., 1989: Predhodniki in začetniki ljubljanske FF. *Zbornik Filozofske fakultete 1919–1989. 70 let Filozofske fakultete*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Pahor, B., 2001: *Tržaški odzivi. Eseji, govori in ugovori*. Celovec - Ljubljana - Dunaj: Mohorjeva založba.
- Polec, J., 1929: Ljubljansko višje šolstvo v preteklosti in borba za slovensko univerzo. *Zgodovina slovenske univerze v Ljubljani do leta 1929*. Ljubljana: Rektorat Univerze kralja Aleksandra prvega.
- Razvoj visokega šolstva v Sloveniji*, 2001. B. Stanovnik, L. Golič, A. Kralj (ur.), Zbornik referatov na posvetu 27. novembra 2001. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Šumi, N. (ur.), 2000: *Zbornik Filozofske fakultete 1919–1999*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Vidovič Muha, A., 2007: Aktualna vprašanja slovenske univerze in znanstvene razprave v slovenščini. I. Orel (ur.), *Razvoj slovenskega strokovnega jezika: Obdobja 24*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za slovenistiko, Center za slovenščino kot drugi/tuji jezik. 3–11.
- Vidovič Muha, A., 2007: Slovenščina kot jezik znanosti in univerze – da ali ne. *Jezik in slovstvo* 5. 91–93.
- Zbornik Filozofske fakultete 1919–1989. 70 let Filozofske fakultete*, 1989. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Zgodovina slovenske univerze v Ljubljani do leta 1929*, 1929. Ljubljana: Rektorat Univerze kralja Aleksandra prvega.
- Zupan Sosič, A., 2009a: In English We Trust. *Delo* 108, Književni listi 21.
- Zupan Sosič, A., 2009b: Kolonizacija slovenske literarne zgodovine. M. Stabej (ur.), *Infrastruktura slovenščine in slovenistike: Obdobja 28*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za slovenistiko, Center za slovenščino kot drugi/tuji jezik. 429–435.

Univerza, ali več svoj dolg?

MONIKA KALIN GOLOB

Fakulteta za družbene vede univerze v Ljubljani, Slovenija
monika.kalin-golob@fdv.uni-lj.si

Prispevek obravnava vprašanje jezika slovenske znanosti in univerze, zlasti s stališča meril za habilitacije univerzitetnih učiteljev in sodelavcev na Univerzi v Ljubljani. Opozorjeno je na dosedanja prizadevanja za enakopravno obravnavo znanstvenih objav v slovenščini. Zapostavljanje objav v slovenščini je škodljivo vsaj z dveh vidikov: razvijanja slovenskih terminologij ter slovenščine kot jezika visokošolskega in univerzitetnega izobraževanja.

The paper deals with the issue concerning the language of Slovenian science and the Slovenian University, particularly from the standpoint of requirements for Habilitation of university professors and colleagues at the University of Ljubljana. The endeavours to achieve equal treatment of scientific publications in Slovenian are presented. Neglect of publications in Slovenian is detrimental from at least two perspectives – the development of Slovenian terminology and the development of Slovenian as a language of higher education.

Letos praznujemo 90-letnico Univerze v Ljubljani (UL): prvo predavanje na ljubljanski univerzi je imel 3. decembra 1919 profesor Fran Ramovš, in sicer na temo zgodovinske slovnice slovenskega jezika. Da je bil za ta izjemen dogodek izbran Prešernov rojstni dan, jezikoslovec kot predavatelj in slovenski jezik kot téma, ni naključje. Ljubljanska univerza je nastala tudi zato, da bi dokazala enakopravnost in odličnost slovenskega jezika ter njegovo sposobnost, da lahko deluje in izpolnjuje svojo polnofunkcijskost na najbolj zahtevnem področju človekovega delovanja in mišljenja – v znanosti. In: letos praznujemo obletnico Univerze v Ljubljani, ki je 90 let kasneje z novo sprejetimi merili za habilitacije univerzitetnih učiteljev in sodelavcev izničila stoletna prizadevanja slovenskih intelektualcev po enakovredni rabi slovenščine na vseh področjih družbenega delovanja. Kljub opozorilom in razpravam.

Ob vprašanjih mednarodne izmenjave na Univerzi v Ljubljani smo namreč zadnja leta govorili tudi o vprašanjih jezika slovenske znanosti in univerze: najprej junija 2006, ko smo Katedra za novinarstvo (FDV), Oddelek za slovenistiko in Oddelek za slavistiko (FF) naslovili listo odprtih vprašanj slovenski javnosti in univerzi, nato s prof. dr. Ado Vidovič Muha na Radiu Slovenija (oddaja Intelekt, julij 2006) in skupaj z Univerzo v Ljubljani na posvetu o jeziku znanosti in visokega šolstva (8. 12. 2006, Teden ljubljanske univerze). Na podlagi teh razprav sva s kolegom Stabejem 17. 4. 2007 na rektoratu prorektorici Julijani Kristl in prorektorju Ivanu Svetliku predstavila izhodišča za operativno razpravo o jezikovnih vprašanjih na Univerzi v Ljubljani. Eden izmed sklepov tega srečanja je bil, da se o mnenju razpravljal-

cev seznanj tudi habilitacijska komisija UL. Zato sva 3. 10. 2007 poslala predsedniku habilitacijske komisije UL pismo, v katerem sva opozorila na potrebo po enakopravni obravnavi slovenskih znanstvenih objav in ponudila svojo pomoč pri strokovnih vprašanjih.

Temeljno izhodišče za posvete o znanstveni in visokošolski vlogi slovenskega jezika je bila domneva, da želi Univerza v Ljubljani ohraniti in nadalje razvijati slovenščino kot znanstveni in učni jezik visokošolskega izobraževanja, hkrati pa si želi zagotoviti nemoteno mednarodno razsežnost svojega delovanja. Merila za volitve v nazive visokošolskih učiteljev, znanstvenih delavcev in sodelavcev ter razprave ob njihovem spreminjanju so rezultat zavedanja (zgolj) slednje prvine, torej mednarodne razsežnosti.

Gledano razvojno, je seveda poudarjanje potrebe po objavljanju v tujih revijah in tujem jeziku razumljivo, saj so Merila in z njimi univerzitetna habilitacijska politika hotela preseči omejenost slovenskega znanstvenoraziskovalnega dela na domači prostor in ga kakovostno sopostaviti tujemu ter tako povečati odličnost raziskovalnega dela zaposlenih na Univerzi v Ljubljani. V časih, ko so bile tuje objave prej izjema kot pravilo, se je Univerza smiselno odzvala s poudarjanjem nujnega objavljanja v tujem jeziku.

Ta politika pa je žal povzročila zapostavljanje objav v slovenščini, kar je škodljivo vsaj z dveh vidikov: razvijanja slovenskih terminologij ter slovenščine kot jezika visokošolskega in univerzitetnega izobraževanja. Habilitacijska pravila so že v svoji stari različici (iz leta 2001) povzročala, da je slovenščina v strokah postajala obrobni jezik. To pa gotovo ni naključje, temveč logična posledica vrste dejavnikov, zlasti meril, po katerih se meri znanstvena uspešnost in se dosega uglednost posameznikov v znanosti in raziskovanju. Univerza tako med merili za pridobitev najnižje stopnje univerzitetnega učitelja in učiteljice na primer nima merila »obvladovanje slovenščine kot jezika stroke«, med merili za raziskovalno odličnost pa so objave v tujih jezikih veljale nesorazmerno več kot tiste v slovenščini, in sicer celo tam, kjer obstajajo kakovostne slovenske znanstvene revije. Zato se dogaja, da mnogi mladi kolegi sploh več ne računajo na potrebo po pisanju v slovenščini, če je le mogoče, pišejo doktorat v angleščini, ker je tako hitreje mogoče objavljati v tujini in ker ni treba ob pisanju razmišljati o slovenskih poimenovanjih ter tako odgovorno prispevati k razvoju slovenske terminologije.

Večina ljudi, ki redno študira v Sloveniji, bo po diplomi svoje znanje uporabljala predvsem v slovenskem jezikovnem prostoru in je torej obvladovanje stroke v slovenskem jeziku temeljni pogoj njihovega poklicnega delovanja. Ali jim bodo to znanje lahko dali profesorji, ki o svetu stroke pišejo samo še v tujem jeziku?

Če je v preteklosti Univerza morala spodbujati pisanje v tujem jeziku, je danes situacija obrnjena: zaradi razvoja slovenščine v znanosti mora spodbujati kakovostno objavljanje v slovenskem jeziku. Prav zato bi morali razmerje med mednarodno in domačo »odmevnostjo« uravnotežiti. Na to smo (med drugim) opozorili tudi na skupini družboslovno-humanističnih fakultete ob prvi reakciji na predlog meril za habilitacije, ki ga je posredovala UL junija 2008, ter zahtevali, da se eksplicitno določi tudi količina kakovostnih objav v slovenskem jeziku za vsa področja. Prav prek habilitacijske politike bi UL namreč morala vzpostaviti spodbude za smotrno objavljanje znanstvenih in strokovnih besedil v slovenščini.

UL je januarja 2009 pripravila nov predlog habilitacijskih meril, ki ni upošteval temeljnih pripomb usklajenega predloga družboslovja in humanistike, zato je moral biti umaknjen s senata. Poleti 2009 so bila merila sprejeta in zadovoljni smo morali biti z besedilom 48. člena: »Za objavo z mednarodno odmevnostjo se šteje besedilo, objavljeno v enem od svetovnih jezikov v eni od revij, indeksiranih v SSCI ali SCI z IF > 0 ter AHCI, ali v revijah, ki so po mnenju stroke po kakovosti in mednarodni odmevnosti primerljive s temi revijami.

Seznam teh revij na predlog članice, ki kot matično goji področje, na katerem se kandidat voli v naziv, po predhodnem mnenju HK potrdi Senat UL (Priloga 5).« Razumeli smo ga kot ohranjanje kakovostnih objav v slovenskem jeziku, torej prek seznama kakovostnih slovenskih revij omogočiti, da se znanstvena besedila v slovenskem jeziku (sicer v 3. skupini in le z do 6 točkami!) še vedno vrednotijo kot ustrezni nujni pogoj. Tem sprejetim merilom so sledila navodila rektorice za pripravo seznama revij, iz katerih pa je vsaka slovenska objava pri nujnih pogojih izključena: »Za vsako habilitacijsko področje (ali podpodročje) naj članica določi 10 do 15 revij v enem od **svetovnih jezikov**.« (Poudarila M. K. G.)

Resignirano je mogoče ugotoviti, da je ob svoji 90-letnici Univerza v Ljubljani zapečatila usodo znanstvene slovenščine. Nastala je z zavestjo dokazati enakovrednost slovensko izražene znanstvene misli takrat predvsem nemški. Danes, ko habilitacijska politika pozablja na to pomembno razsežnost, je treba o izvornem poslanstvu slovenske univerze razmisliti znova. Ali kot je v svojem prispevku na posvetu 8. 12. 2006 menila Ada Vidovič Muha: »Tako kot je absurдна zaprtost in samozadostnost, je absurдна tudi naivnost, da bo opustitev slovenščine kot jezika znanstvene razprave rešila slovensko znanost oz. ji dala celo pečat univerzalne vrednosti.«

Hungarian as the language of education in the universities of the Carpathian Basin

ÁGOTA FÓRIS

Károli Gáspár University in Budapest, Hungary
aforis@t-online.hu

The aim of the paper is to present which languages of instruction can be used by Hungarian-speaking students in Hungarian or other linguistic environments, what influences the selection of the language of instruction, and how, and what kind of consequences the language of higher education has for the individual and the community. Besides the Hungarian situation the paper also discusses the problems of selecting the language of instruction in the neighbouring countries. In Hungary the language of instruction in higher education is mainly Hungarian, in some study programmes also English, German and French. The Hungarian-speaking population in the neighbouring countries is able to study in the official language of the state, while in Romania and Slovakia the choice is also Hungarian, mostly at bilingual, foundation or Hungarian state-financed universities. Both in Hungary and the neighbouring countries humanities are usually the field in which one can study a language or study in the language different from the official language of the state.

Namen prispevka je predstaviti jezikovno izbiro madžarskih študentov, ki študirajo na Madžarskem ali v sosednjih jezikovnih okoljih, kateri mehanizmi vplivajo na njihovo izbiro ter kakšen vpliv in posledice tovrstna izbira jezika izobraževanja v visokem šolstvu predstavlja tako za posameznika kot za skupnost v celoti. Poleg situacije na Madžarskem prispevek obravnava tudi izbiro jezika izobraževanja v sosednjih državah. Na Madžarskem je jezik poučevanja v visokem šolstvu v glavnem madžarščina, v nekaterih programih pa tudi angleščina, nemščina in francoščina. Madžarsko govorečemu prebivalstvu v sosednjih državah je omogočen študij v jeziku države, v Romuniji in na Slovaškem pa tudi v madžarščini, v glavnem na dvojezičnih univerzah ali pa na univerzah s fundacijsko podporo ali podporo madžarske vlade. Tako na Madžarskem kot v sosednjih državah je običajno humanistika tisto področje, ki omogoča študij jezika oz. študij v jeziku, ki ni uradni jezik države.

1. Introduction

The topic of the conference was the language of instruction in higher education, notably national languages in higher education. The theme of my paper is higher education in the Hungarian language. I will put aside historical data and analyses, although it is useful to be aware of past events in order to reflect on the situation (cf. Tóth 2005). The volume entitled *Higher Education in Hungary* includes the milestones and important structural changes of Hungarian higher education in English (Tarróssy 2000). There are several books and articles on the Hungarian policy on the language of instruction at the university level and the situa-

tion and language of tertiary education in the countries of the Carpathian Basin (e.g. Demény 2002, Péntek 2004, Kontra 2005, Kozma–Rébai 2006, Hollósy 2008). The Carpathian Basin has always been a multinational area; though consisting of nation-states, these states are not homogenous but multiethnic and multilingual.

When it comes to Hungary it is important to mention that the official language of the state is Hungarian and that the mother tongue of the majority of the population (approx. 98.5%) is Hungarian. The language of education is Hungarian, yet education in any other language is permitted. According to the Act CXXXIX of 2005 on Higher Education 2005:

***Section 8.** “(2) The language of instruction in higher education shall be Hungarian. National or ethnic minority students may pursue studies in their native language, or in their native language and Hungarian, or in Hungarian, as defined in this Act. Instruction in higher education – in part or in whole – may be provided in a language other than Hungarian.” (AHE 2008/2005)*

The Constitution of the Republic of Hungary also includes protection of national and ethnic minorities and their right to vernacular education (68.§).

2. Aims and methodology

The aim of the paper is to present which languages of instruction can be used by Hungarian-speaking students in Hungarian or other linguistic environments, what influences the selection of the language of instruction, and how, and also what kind of consequences the language of higher education has for the individual and the community.

Apart from the Hungarian situation the paper also presents problems of choosing the language of instruction in neighbouring countries.

3. Hungarian as the language of instruction in higher education

Native speakers of Hungarian live in the following countries of the Carpathian Basin: Hungary – approx. 9.9 million; Romania – approx. 1.3 million; Slovakia – approx. 0.5 million; Serbia – approx. 260,000; the Ukraine – approx. 150,000; Austria – approx. 45,000; Croatia – approx. 13,000; Slovenia – approx. 5,000 (Hablicsek–Tóth 2005). In these countries the language of instruction in higher education is the official language of the state. Apart from Hungary, the opportunity to study in the Hungarian language is also provided in Slovakia, Romania, the Ukraine and Serbia.

3.1. The languages of instruction in Hungarian higher education (Hungarian, English, German, French)

The language of instruction in Hungarian higher education is Hungarian, which is also true at the MA and BA levels. Instruction in English, German and French is available, but only alongside education in Hungarian, especially for foreign students.

Two universities provide instruction only in a foreign language: (1) the Gyula Andrásy German Language University of Budapest (established in 2001) provides instruction in German, and (2) the Central European University provides instruction in English.

Instruction in a foreign language in Hungary is regarded as an element of internationalisation. It is therefore considered very important to have education in foreign languages at the university level, which is partly seen as a means of increasing the number of students and the income, and partly as a thing of honour. Still, universities provide relatively scarce information in English, and much information is missing from the websites in English according to a conference lecture entitled *A nemzetköziesedés folyamata a felsőoktatásban* (*The process of internationalisation in higher education*), organised by the Tempus Foundation (Nagy 2009).

I also have experienced that there is no complete list concerning instruction in foreign languages in Hungary; the available forms of training at each university must be read through in order to gather information. (In answer to my query, the Education Office affirmed that there was no such list providing information about instruction in foreign languages in Hungarian higher education.) At present 70 public and other higher educational institutes offer training (www.felvi.hu), therefore I cannot present the overall picture of the situation. In 68 institutes the main language of instruction is Hungarian, apart from German and English in the two examples mentioned above.

Below I am going to highlight those universities and institutions where students are instructed in a foreign language.

English

Instruction in English is available at the University of Pécs at the medicine, dentistry, economy and management study programmes; in the fields of medicine and pharmacy at the University of Szeged; in the field of social studies at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest; at the economy science, IT, economics, sociology study programmes and agriculture at Corvinus University, Budapest; at the international management, commerce and marketing, tourism-marketing, finance and accountancy study programmes of the Budapest Business School; at the engineering-IT programme and all fields of science of the Budapest University of Technology and Economics; at the medicine, IT, science and agriculture fields of the University of Debrecen; in economy and management, finance and accountancy at the International Business School; and at the financing management study programme of the University of Győr.

At the Central European University, experts are trained in English in humanities, law and management, economics and social sciences.

German

Instruction in German is available at the medicine and dentistry study programmes of the Universities of Pécs and Szeged, and in commerce, marketing and tourism-marketing at the Budapest Business School.

The Andrásy Gyula University of Budapest offers education in humanities, economics and social sciences in German.

French

Instruction in French is available at the international financing study programme of the Budapest Business School.

This list shows that in Hungarian higher education instruction in foreign languages is available primarily in English, with a few majors available in German and French.

Other languages

I must add that the faculties of humanities and teacher training foreign language programmes traditionally provide instruction in foreign languages, i.e. the language of instruction is the studied foreign language (e.g. English at the English study programme, Japanese at the Japanese programme, etc.). Minorities living in Hungary can major in so-called “nationality study programmes”; e.g. there are German, Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian and Romanian study programmes at certain universities.

It seems that at present what is aimed at is internationalisation, and most of education is available only in Hungarian. Only a few universities have taken the step of providing education in other languages.

3.2. Hungarian as the language of higher education in Romania, Slovakia and the Ukraine

Romania

After the political events of 1989 one of the most important demands of the Hungarian population in Transylvania was the establishment of an autonomous Hungarian public university. This has still not yet been achieved, though the quality of public higher education in the Hungarian language has improved. In Romania, instruction in Hungarian is available at the Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca (Kolozsvár), the Medical University and the University of Theatre in Târgu Mureş (Marosvásárhely). Two non-public institutions provide instruction in the Hungarian language – the Partium Christian University in Oradea (Nagyvárad) and Sapientia Transylvanian Hungarian University.

The Hungarian division of the **Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca** (Kolozsvár) was established gradually after 1993. Here more than 50 study programmes offer studies in Hungarian, and more than 6,000 students study in the Hungarian language. Speakers of Hungarian can also study in Romanian. This institution is a public Romanian University.

Some of the data and information available are contradictory, e.g. the Romanian and Hungarian divisions offer an entirely different discourse about the history and bilingualism of the university (although both versions are “official”). The Hungarian division offers education in most of the usual European fields from IT to anthropology, from political science to religious education, environmental studies, philosophy, library science and journalism (<http://www.ubbcluj.ro/hu/linia-hu/maghiara.html>, wikipedia).

Sapientia University (EMTE) is a Hungarian language university in Romania, which is mainly supported by the Hungarian state. It was established in 2000, its centre is Cluj-Napoca (Kolozsvár), but it also offers some education in Târgu Mureş (Marosvásárhely) and Miercurea Ciuc (Csíkszereda) at about 20 study programmes. In **Cluj-Napoca** (Kolozsvár) one can study environmental geography, photography, film, media, interna-

tional relations and European studies at the Sciences and Arts Faculties. In **Miercurea Ciuc** (Csíkszereda) there are five study programmes at the Faculties of Economics and Humanities, namely accountancy and economic IT, agriculture and food economics, general economics, environmental economics, and Romanian and English languages and literatures. At the Faculties of Technology and Social Studies in Miercurea Ciuc training is available in sociology, communication, PR, environmental engineering, and food technology. At the **Târgu Mureş** (Marosvásárhely) Faculty of Technology and Humanities there are translation, pedagogy, communication and public relations, IT, mechatronics, computer science, automation, applied IT and horticulture study programmes (<http://www.sapientia.ro>, wikipedia).

The **Partium Christian University**, Oradea (Nagyvárad, 2000) offers education for more than 600 students at 11 study programmes. (It started with the reorganisation of the Sulyok István College – this institution was established by the Genevan diocese of Királyhágómellék in 1990). The financial background for the operation of the university is provided by the Sapientia Foundation. It has three faculties – Humanities, Economics and Arts (<http://www.partium.ro>).

Slovakia

In the state-financed higher education only Hungarian pedagogues are trained in the Hungarian language in Slovakia; studying in Hungarian in other areas is not available. Around 10-20 teachers of the Hungarian language and literature graduate each year at the Faculty of Humanities of the **Comenius University**, Bratislava (Pozsony).

The **Selye János University** of Nitra (Nyitra) is the first autonomous Hungarian-language university in Slovakia established in 2004. It is supported by the Hungarian state. Its faculties are Economics, teacher training and Genevan Theology (Wikipedia, <http://www.selyeuni.sk/>).

The Ukraine

In the Ukraine, as in Slovakia, only training of teachers of Hungarian is available in the Hungarian language, though not in state-financed universities. The **Transcarpathian Hungarian College named after Ferenc Rákóczi II.**, Beregovo (Beregszász, 1996) is run by a foundation (<http://kmf.uz.ua/>)

This college is also a training site for two universities of the motherland – the horticultural study programme of Corvinus University, and the financing programme of the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences of the Nyíregyháza College.¹

Hungarian Language and Literature study programmes

There are Hungarian language and literature study programmes in Slovenia (Maribor), Slovakia (Banská Bystrica, Bratislava, Nitra), Serbia (Beograd, Novi Sad), Romania (Bucureşti, Cluj-Napoca / Kolozsvár), Croatia (Osijek, Zagreb) and Austria (Wien) (www.bbi.hu).

¹ In early 2009 in the Ukraine the minister for education asked the rectors of colleges and universities in a letter to support only Ukrainian language instruction in tertiary education. To date, the language of instruction can still be chosen in the Ukraine.

4. Conclusions

This review has shown in which languages Hungarian-speaking students can study in Hungarian and other linguistic environments.

I came to the conclusion that in Hungary the language of instruction in higher education is mainly Hungarian, and also English, German and French in certain study programmes. The Hungarian-speaking population of the neighbouring countries can study in the official language of the state, while in Romania and Slovakia they can also study in Hungarian, mostly at bilingual, foundation or Hungarian state-financed universities. Both in Hungary and in the neighbouring countries mainly humanities are the field where one can study a language or in a language different from the official language of the state.

In the field of teaching in vernaculars, especially teaching language for professional purposes, the most urgent problem is the creation of Hungarian terminology as well as a lack of vernacular resource materials concerning traditional sciences and professions in a foreign language environment. In the multilingual environment of the Carpathian Basin monolingual and bilingual teaching aids are equally important, i.e. it is not enough to provide course books and monolingual aids for education – bilingual or multilingual resources would be helpful to use the mother tongue confidently.

Multilingualism, especially for special purposes, is an advantage when it comes to success in the society. To achieve this we do not only need to have a good command of the vernacular and foreign language(s), our professional communication as well should be at a high level in both languages; to achieve this we need textbooks, dictionaries and terminological databases.

5. References

- Demény, Gy., 2002: Kisebbségek oktatási jogai és a magyar tannyelvű felsőfokú oktatás Romániában. *Magyar Kisebbség VII (2)*, (24.) sz.
- Hablicsek, L., Tóth P. P., 2005: *A Kárpát-medencei magyarság demográfiai helyzete és előre-számítása, 1991-2021*. <http://www.demografia.hu/Kutjelek/KJ78eloresham.pdf> (11. 11. 2009).
- Hollósi, H., 2008: A kisebbségi (magyar) felsőoktatás helyzete Szatmárnémetiben. *Új Pedagógiai Szemle (1)*. 106-114.
- Kontra, M. (ed.), 2005: *Sült galamb? Magyar egyetemi tannyelvpolitika*. Somorja–Dunaszerdahely: Lilium Aurum Könyvkiadó.
- Kozma, T., Rébay, M., 2006: *Felsőoktatási akkreditáció Közép-Európában*. Budapest: Felsőoktatási Kutatóintézet – Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó.
- Nagy, G., 2009: *Nemzetköziesedés a honlapok tükrében*. In: A nemzetköziesedés folyamata a magyar felsőoktatásban. A 2009. május 5-i Bologna műhelykonferencia előadásai. *Bologna füzetek 3*. www.tpf.hu (11. 11. 2009).
- Péntek, J., 2004: A romániai Magyar felsőoktatás helyzete és kilátásai. *Kisebbségkutatás (1)*. http://www.hhrf.org/kisebbségkutatás/kk_2004_01/cikk.php?id=1018 (11. 11. 2009).
- Tarrósy, I., 2000: *Higher Education in Hungary – in the year of the millennium*. Budapest: Ministry of Education.
- Tóth, Á. (ed.), 2005: *National and Ethnic Minorities in Hungary, 1920–2001*. Boulder: Social Science Monographs.

6. Sources

AHE 2008/2005 = Consolidated version of Act CXXXIX of 2005 on Higher Education (Hungarian abbreviation: 'Ftv'), effective as from 1 January 2008. www.okm.gov.hu (11. 11. 2009).

Constitution of the Republic of Hungary 1949.

<http://www.bbi.hu> (11. 11. 2009).

<http://www.emte.ro> (11. 11. 2009).

<http://www.partium.ro/> (11. 11. 2009).

<http://www.sapientia.ro> (11. 11. 2009).

<http://www.ubbcluj.ro/hu/linia-hu/maghiara.html> (11. 11. 2009).

<http://kmf.uz.ua/> (11. 11. 2009).

<http://www.selyeuni.sk/> (11. 11. 2009).

Wikipedia: www.wikipedia.org (11. 11. 2009).

Language diversity and research on education in France: The case of ICT

GEORGES-LOUIS BARON¹, ERIC BRUILLARD²

University René Descartes¹, France
georges-louis.baron@univ-patis5.fr

École normale supérieure de Cachan², France
eric.bruillard@stef.ensc.fr

In the French academic community there is an agreement (and sometimes submission) regarding the fact that English is no longer a language of choice and that everyone has to publish, at least to some extent, in it. However, using the national language in science is important, particularly when research is highly sensitive to cultural factors and when empirical qualitative data is available only in it. We will present the case of French-speaking research on ICT in education. In this field, which is open to international communities, researchers of “hard” and social sciences work together. They have different attitudes to writing and probably a different perception of national cultural heritage and modernity. The domain structuration is sustained through intervention of institutions that are capable of legitimising the work that is being done. Among them, the scientific association ATIEF has published from 2003 an on-line, peer-reviewed journal in French entitled *Sciences et technologies de l’information et de la communication pour l’éducation et la formation* – STICEF. This journal has found its place in the French-speaking community and is currently facing two major challenges; first, how to succeed in staying multidisciplinary in the framework of high stake disciplinary evaluation and second how to continue being recognised as such despite the fact that French-speaking scientists under the pressure from institutions favour international (i.e. English) publications.

V francoskem akademskem krogu obstaja soglasje (in občasno zgolj sprejemanje dejstva) o tem, da raba angleščine ni več stvar izbire in da moramo vsi vsaj do neke mere objavljati v tem jeziku. Kljub temu je raba nacionalnega jezika v znanosti velikega pomena, predvsem takrat, ko je raziskava močno povezana s kulturnimi dejavniki in ko empirični kvalitativni podatki obstajajo samo v nacionalnem jeziku. Predstavili bomo poseben primer raziskave o informacijski in telekomunikacijski tehnologiji v izobraževanju, pripravljene v francoskem jeziku. Na tem področju, ki je odprto mednarodni skupnosti, sodelujejo raziskovalci eksaktne znanosti in družbenih ved, ki imajo različne poglede na pisanje in verjetno tudi drugačno zavest o nacionalni kulturni dediščini in modernosti. Za ohranjanje jezikovnega ravnovesja med strokovnimi področji so posegle vmes ustanove, ki lahko upravičijo opravljeno delo. Znanstveno združenje ATIEF od leta 2003 objavlja recenzirano spletno revijo v francoskem jeziku: *Sciences et technologies de l’information et de la communication pour l’éducation et la formation* – STICEF. Revija je pridobila vidno mesto v francosko govoreči skupnosti, danes pa se spopada z dvema velikima izzivoma. Prvi je, kako uspeti v drugih interdisciplinarnih projektih v smislu visokega vrednotenja disciplin. Drugi izziv pa je iskanje načina, kako ostati prepoznaven kot francosko govoreči znanstvenik kljub pritiskom institucij, ki dajejo prednost mednarodnim (tj. angleškimi) objavam.

1. Context

a) France: a rather privileged situation?

Like many other European countries France, too, is confronted with a globalisation process that pervades every sector of society and has specific consequences in the field of research. Of course its situation is highly peculiar because the French language is still an important tool of communication. *L'organisation internationale de la francophonie* (International Organisation of La Francophonie) joins 70 states (56 member states and 14 observers) and covers around 200 million French speakers, which is why we can say there is a large market for cultural goods in using this language.

Regarding higher education, French remains almost exclusive, at least in public universities, but there is an obvious trend towards English. In recent competitive tenders issued by the National Agency of Research, tenders in English are overtly considered and so is reporting to the National Agency for the Evaluation of Higher Education and Research, now a central regulatory figure in higher education. In some scientific disciplines, publications in English are far more appreciated than publications in French journals, while in others (mainly in social sciences), those latter remain a central reference.

The 2008 report of the institution in charge of protecting the French language *Direction générale à la langue française et aux langues de France, DGLFLF*¹ (General Delegation for the French language and the languages of France) reported that a study was directed towards 2,000 heads of French public research labs. Results show that researchers concurred on the predominance of English as an international language:

“Only 22% of directors in Human and Social sciences deem that French is prevalent in their discipline (27% in the humanities and 15% in social sciences). In exact and natural sciences, the supremacy of English as an international language is overwhelming... Asked on measures for supporting francophony, all labs agree on the idea of encouraging the circulation of francophone scientific works on the Internet and on the idea of supporting bi-lingual journals” (DGLFLF, 2008, p. 7-8).

We shall now present a case study concentrating on a small field on the border of the computer science and social sciences: information and communication technology (ICT) for education.

An aggravating factor in this field is linked to the European language policy: at a time when more and more French researchers are becoming fluent in English, particularly among younger generations, European projects present a very important source of funds and legitimacy and also partially shape the agenda of research teams.

What transpires is that despite the European Commission's position towards multilingualism, European projects and deliverables are now almost exclusively written in English, perhaps because they are thought to facilitate the dissemination of results to a potentially wider public.

However, several issues can be raised. Firstly, expressing one's ideas in a foreign language easily leads to a simplification of one's thoughts, minimises specific features intimately linked with one's culture and neglects references that are not translated into English. From this point of view professional translators, who know both cultures well, are in a far better position.

¹ <http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr>.

Secondly, there is a problem regarding the dissemination of results towards practitioners since they seldom speak and even understand English, and therefore a great deal of translation is needed. Unfortunately, funds for translation, at least in my experience, are scarce.

Apart from that we are also dealing with issues of national identity that are closely linked to one's own language.

Before proceeding to the presentation of an endeavour to maintain linguistic diversity and promote publication in French, we will briefly present the situation of ICT in education in France.

b) ICT in French higher education

As in many countries, computers and the internet are now very common in France. They are familiar tools for children, are present in almost every school, even if they are hardly integrated in the curricula (Baron, Bruillard 2007). At the university level, the common tools of students are ICT related. They are mainly used for writing texts, searching information online and exchanging it with others. There is also a growing tendency in universities towards offering on-line resources through the use of content management systems, called in French *Environnements numériques de travail* (ENT).

Software is mainly the same as everywhere else in the world, but has generally been localised into French. Perhaps the main debate now in the academic community concerns proprietary and free software. Microsoft in particular through its Windows and Office packages has a prominent position and shows a real interest in education and partnerships with universities. Apple is also very interested in teaching and is, to a lesser extent, present on campuses. Yet there is a growing interest in free software among both academics and teachers, probably on account of underlying ideas (copyleft, free document, creative commons, fewer direct costs ...). A series of learning platforms have been produced nationally.

A very common problem we encounter is what Phillipson (2008) nicely calls “a largely uncritical adoption of englishisation”, which permits English to be a “*lingua tyrannosaura*” (a language that gobbles up other languages, linguistic cannibalism).

For terms that have a broad range of use in the public new terminology is created and recommended to people, in particular by the DGLFLF (the 2009 report of this institution tells us that “276 terms have been published in the *Journal officiel* in 2009”, (DGLFLF 2009)); this, however, is not the case when it comes to words that circulate in a scientific community and have a far narrower range of use.

A recent example will be provided here: the idea of “game” (*jeu*) is very important in education, because, in particular for children, a great deal of learning occurs through a game, and its proximity to serious matters has long been theorised. Célestin Freinet, for example, spoke of “*travail-jeu*” et “*jeu-travail*” (Freinet, 1993). In the field of educational technology, games have always held a notable place (even if not a central one).

Recently, at a time when computer-assisted learning has come to be considered as lesser by researchers because what really develops for learning and education purposes is a large set of new software instruments that have not been designed for education, a new “concept” has begun to appear and spread in French scientific journals, i.e. “serious games” (sic)². Of course, “serious game” is easily translated as “*jeu sérieux*”, but for some reason it does not gain wider recognition, probably because it sounds less “chic”.

² A historical analysis of what this phenomenon covers shows that it is closely linked with ideas expressed in the 1980s about what was then called “author languages”.

2. French research on ICT in education in a nutshell

a) A multidisciplinary research and practice field

In France, as in other countries, ICT for education has stimulated the emergence of academic research. There is currently a multidisciplinary francophone field of research that is closely linked to the field of innovation and, to some extent, decision makers.

In this field French researchers are mainly affiliated with education, information sciences and computer science. Research operates in cycles: inventing new uses of newly arisen artefacts (and even designing new artefacts in order to achieve a better educational effect), testing usage in experimental and innovative settings and, finally, analysing what happens in learning and education when the innovation ceases.

It is important to stress that there is not a single scientific community but rather a milieu. Research interests are in effect notably different; designing new functions for a software designed to promote reading skills is not the same as studying new forms of sociability in e-learning groups, investigating didactical changes in ways of teaching and learning statistics with spreadsheets at the high school level or researching the forms of digital literacy needed for primary teachers (Baron 2007).

The identity of different disciplinary sub-communities is founded on sharing either a theory or a common methodology and similar objects of research. Theories are often short ranged and deeply rooted in cultural contexts, which renders the possibility of their transfer more difficult. Consultations with colleagues from other countries that have different references written in different languages may be enriching, yet in education hybridisation of theories is never a simple matter. There is also a divide between those who advocate “pure” research and those who claim that interactions with practitioners are essential.

The milieu is open to international communities; its structuration, evaluative as is always the case, is sustained through the intervention of institutions legitimising the work done. Among those institutions are ministries or international bodies, and associations that organise scientific manifestations and publish journals (Baron, Dané, Thibault 2007). The principal association in the field is ATIEF - *Association des technologies de l'information pour l'éducation et la formation* (Association of Information Technologies for Education and Training), and is an important element in the structuration of the milieu.

b) Structuring elements

Conferences in French that aim both at animating a scientific community and disseminating research results towards practitioners have existed for a long time. In the 1990s two such conferences were jointly launched by researchers from the informatics and education communities. The first one *Journées EIAO de Cachan* was rooted in the community dealing with artificial intelligence. The second *Hypermédiats et apprentissages* was explicitly aimed at making the practitioners more interested in the field. In the beginning of the new millennium hybridisation took place on the notion of “informatized environments for human learning (EIAH)”, which was supported by the ATIEF. Since then EIAH international conferences in French are organised every two years. Computer scientists represent a majority in this community.

At the same time another multidisciplinary community constituted itself around the people from the educational and information sciences: *Journées communication et apprentissage instrumenté en réseau JOCAIR*. These conferences are still held in French. Other confer-

ences appear periodically, addressing specific publics (e.g. the didactics of informatics, like the DIDAPRO conferences, or TICE, addressing the education of engineers).

Conferences represent only one element structuring a milieu, another important one is the journal. In 1991, the ATIEF's predecessor the AFCET founded a multidisciplinary journal in French *Génie éducatif*. This journal changed its name and publisher after five issues and became *Sciences et Techniques éducatives* – STE. Interestingly enough, at that time women held a majority in the editorial board. In 2003 the journal evolved and the board decided to have it published online under the title of *Sciences et technologies de l'information et de la communication pour l'éducation et la formation* - STICEF³.

The journal, which keeps publishing papers in French, belongs to the Directory of Open Archive Journals⁴ and is recognised in France by both computer scientists and educationalists. It maintains a multidisciplinary editing board (in 2008 it had 17 members among whom seven were women) with members not only from France, but also from Quebec. Papers are published online, both in html and in pdf forms. Once a year, there is an annual volume printed on paper by the National Institute for Pedagogical Research – INRP. A survey performed in 2007 showed that the journal was consulted all over the world and that around 600 persons had voluntarily identified themselves on the web site (Dané, Bruillard 2007). It has also strengthened the link between people seeking recognition in the computer science and readers from the field of social sciences. A characteristic opinion is represented by the following comment from a young associate professor in the field of computer science: “It is strategically wise to spend time publishing in EIAH, while it is not much recognised and that [researchers] will be confronted one day or the other with this problem (project financing, lab financing, recognition of publications ...)”.

3. Discussion

Globalisation has an unavoidable impact on every sector of our lives, and the academic world is no exception. The field of research on ICT in education has interesting features because both researchers of “hard” and social sciences have interest in it, with different attitudes to writing and probably different awareness towards national cultural heritage and modernity. At present two major challenges can be recognised.

First, we work in a context of high stake disciplinary evaluation where journals and quantitative indicators, however simple, play a key role (Gingras 2008, Van Leeuwen 2008). Success in preserving multidisciplinary is not easy; it is, however, possible (the fruitfulness of disciplinary exchange is often even praised in discourses) but there is a price to pay – being different in one's community is never easy. Perhaps it is easier in those fields that are themselves constituted as federating researches working on a common object. For example, in France educational sciences (that are legitimised by the study of a practice field) are far more open to researchers from informatics than the other way around, yet conversely the global reputation of informatics as a scientific field is much higher. What allows communities to exist is the existence of supporting institutions among which peer-reviewed journals play a crucial role, provided they are recognised by evaluation agencies. This is today the case for STICEF, but the situation is fragile.

³ <http://www.sticef.org>.

⁴ <http://www.doaj.org>.

Second, finding ways of continuing to being recognised as a French-speaking scientist under the pressure from institutions favouring international (i.e. English) publications.

A preliminary remark is in order: whatever the language of academic restitution, empirical data, mostly qualitative data, when linked to education, will remain in the local language only. Furthermore every research in education is highly sensitive to cultural factors.

Periodically there are heated discussions in the communities about the necessity of publishing primarily in English. In brief, people from the informatics community have a propensity towards advocating a switch to English, because, in their field, evaluation is mostly done on production in this language. On the other hand, people from social sciences tend to be more in favour of the idea of continuing to publish in French.

Here hope is allowed, because agencies in charge of evaluating research are sensitive to the problem and listen to what researchers claim. The problems turn more acute, of course, when researchers become happy with publishing only in English. And “strategic” researchers have long understood that there is sometimes, regarding evaluation bodies, confusion between a high profile journal and a foreign journal in English.

Finally, the challenges met by the French milieu of people who perform research on ICT are most likely not very novel. Perhaps one of the key issues is the fact that the milieu strives to be recognised both by national institutions funding and evaluating research and, at the same time, strives to preserve links with practitioners.

For that only one solution is possible: continuing to be creative and open-minded to diversity. The STICEF editorial board seeks ways of innovating and promoting discussion, as well as being a forum of exchange and offering access to data underlying contributions.

4. References

- Baron, G. L., 2007: Communautés et milieux de recherche en TICE - [Adjectif]. *Site Adjectif*. Retrouvé de <http://www.adjectif.net/spip/spip.php?article2>.
- Baron, G. L., Bruillard, E., 2007: ICT, educational technology and educational instruments. Will what has worked work again elsewhere in the future? *Education and Information Technologies*, DOI : 10.1007/s10639-007-9033-9. 71-81. Retrouvé de <http://www.springerlink.com/content/57624839542n5872/>.
- Baron, G. L., Dané, E., Thibault, F., 2007: La recherche francophone sur les tice: pluralisme référentiel et diversité de pratiques. *Journées Rés@tice*. Rabat: Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie. Retrouvé de <http://edutice.archives-ouvertes.fr/edutice-00293537/fr/>.
- Dané, E., Bruillard, E., 2007: Résultats et analyse d’une enquête sur la revue STICEF. 14. Retrouvé de http://sticef.univ-lemans.fr/num/vol2007/10r-dane/sticef_2007_dane_10.htm.
- DGLFLF, *Bilan 08. Un tournant dans les politiques de la langue*, 2008. Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France. Retrouvé de <http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/publications/Bilan08.pdf>.
- DGLFLF, *Bilan 09. de nouveaux enjeux pour le français*, 2009. Direction générale à la langue française et aus langues de France. Retrouvé de <http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/publications/Bilan09.pdf>.

- Freinet, C., 1993/1947: *Education through work: a model for child-centered learning*. Translated by John Sivell. 2nd ed. Education du travail. English Lewiston : E. Mellen, 438 p.
- Gingras, Y., 2008: *La fièvre de l'évaluation de la recherche. Du mauvais usage de faux indicateurs*. Québec: Centre international de recherche sur la science et la technologie, UQAM. Retrouvé de http://www.cirst.uqam.ca/Portals/0/docs/note_rech/2008_05.pdf.
- Phillipson, R., 2008: Is there any unity in diversity in language policies national and supranational? English as an EU lingua franca or lingua frankensteinia? G. Stickel (ed.), *National and European Language Policies. Contributions to the Annual Conference 2008 of EFNIL in Riga*. Duisburger Arbeiten zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, 73. Bern: Peter Lang. 145-154. Retrouvé de <http://www.cbs.dk/content/download/98849/1275313/file/EFNIL%20Phillipson.pdf>.
- Van Leeuwen, T., 2008: Testing the validity of the Hirsch-index for research assessment purposes. *Research Evaluation*, 17(2). 157–160. Retrouvé de <https://frodon.univparis5.fr:443/http/search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=32514008&site=ehost-live>.

Language in higher education: A Danish view

NIELS DAVIDSEN-NIELSEN

The Danish Language Council, Denmark
ndn.isv@cbs.dk

The paper discusses the language situation in Danish higher education in which Danish is being increasingly replaced by English. Classes in English are not parallel with classes in Danish and often represent the only choice. We discuss the dangers of domain loss – which is something that endangers the totality of the Danish language – as well as the frequent overestimation of how well the Danes really speak English and the problems of disseminating knowledge to the broader public.

Prispevek opisuje jezikovno situacijo v danskem visokem šolstvu, kjer angleščina vse bolj izpodriva danščino. Predavanja v angleščini niso vzporedna s predavanji v danščini in pogosto predstavljajo edino izbiro. Opozorjeno je na izgubo strokovnih področij, ki ogroža polnofunkcionalnost danščine, na pogosto precenjevanje znanja angleščine pri Dancih in na težave pri prenosu znanja v širšo javnost.

In many parts of the world national languages are today under pressure from English. This can be observed in certain domains, not least in the academic world. For a long time the predominant language of research has in many countries been English, particularly in the natural sciences. And more recently the language of instruction has also often become English, not only in MA programmes but also in BA programmes, in spite of the fact that the command of English among students is not normally impressive at the lowest level of tertiary education.

To give you an example from Denmark: at the Copenhagen Business School (CBS), where I was a professor of English for twenty years, 25 percent of the students are taught in English at the BA level, and 56 percent at the MA level. If we look at the number of study programmes, the figures are like this: at the BA level ten programmes are taught in Danish and seven in English. And at the MA level 11 programmes are taught in Danish and 19 in English. According to the CBS these figures show that Danish still holds a strong position, and in answer to linguists who are worried about the decline of Danish at the universities, the CBS claims that “there is no smoking gun at our university”. To me, however, it came as a bit of a shock that Danish as a language of instruction has lost so much ground in such a short time. English is rapidly taking over, and this is also the case at the other Danish universities. The same trend can be observed in Sweden and Norway, and undoubtedly also in other countries of the EU. So we appear to have a common problem. How should we strike the proper balance at our universities between English and our national language?

The proper question to ask is whether in an increasingly globalised world it is possible to stem the tide and insist on the continued use of our national language in the academic world. In reply to this I would argue that although it is certainly difficult to control the use of different languages, it is, however, not impossible. Changes in the linguistic landscape are not controlled by fate or by natural laws but by people. Fortunately it is therefore up to ourselves what direction this landscape should be steered into. Something can be done if we really want it.

Let me mention in passing that it is not only our national languages that have lost ground to English but also other non-English foreign languages. This is certainly the case in Denmark and undoubtedly in other European languages as well. There are fewer students of languages like German, French and Italian at the Danish universities, and in primary and secondary education these languages hold a much weaker position than they did before. In fact their decline has been so great that it is questionable whether multilingualism is in fact pursued as a goal, and whether we are not pursuing bilingualism instead. I feel rather certain that the sorry state of affairs in foreign languages other than English is not restricted to Denmark but can be observed in other European countries as well.

Now why should we wish to hang on to our national languages in tertiary education? What's wrong with switching to English, which can then become the universal academic language the way Latin was in the old days?

There are several strong reasons why it is problematic to choose English as our only language of instruction. In the first place, giving up using our own language in university teaching represents a considerable loss of domain. The result is that our own language can no longer be used for all purposes. In the 1990s a comprehensive Danish encyclopaedia was published, and in this encyclopaedia the natural scientists could still write their articles on scientific topics in Danish. Not without problems, for many of their terms were already then in English, but they did it. Today this would hardly be possible, for Danish is used much less by students and staff alike. So in this domain Danish no longer suffices. We can therefore no longer claim that Danish is a language of culture in the sense that it can be used for all purposes.

In addition to resulting in a major loss of domain, the use of English in tertiary education to the exclusion of our own language is connected with the following **drawbacks**:

Dissemination of scientific results obtained at the universities to the public is bound to suffer because the academics will be untrained in talking about their subjects in their own language, not least because the terminology is largely missing.

Secondly, the academic level in university teaching is bound to fall because neither the students nor their teachers have as good a command of English as of their own language. In many cases they will say what they are capable of saying rather than what they want to say. That such a lowering of the level will take place must be self-evident. But there are also empirical investigations which show that it takes place. If there is time for it, I can return to this in the discussion.

In Denmark, nevertheless, there are many globalists who claim that English is a relatively easy language and that it is only a question of time before we can raise our command of English to a satisfactory level. To me this is quite naïve. No languages are easy, so if we really were to use English in more and more domains, it would require a huge effort and probably take generations. Strolling in the foothills? What Alexander Pope wrote in his *Essay on criticism* about the acquisition of learning can also be applied to the acquisition of English:

So pleased at first the tow'ring Alps we try,
Mount o'er the vales, and seem to tread the sky,
Th'eternal snows appear already past, and the first clouds and mountains seem the last;
But, those attained, we tremble to survey
The growing labours of the lengthened way...

Thirdly, transition to English creates a democratic problem in that the gap we already have between the elite who can handle English and a large group of common people who cannot will be further widened. Ordinary Danes will get less insight into what kind of research is going on at the universities.

And finally, transition to English will result in a cultural loss in that Danish will disappear as a scientific language.

For these reasons Danish ought not to be replaced by English as the language of instruction in tertiary education. What we need is a both-and language policy (and not an either-or policy). This was the opinion of a language committee which the Danish government set up in 2006, and which as chairman of the Danish Language Council I was a member of. Our report was published in 2007 and in this report we proposed that parallel use of Danish and English should be introduced in university teaching. Not mechanically in the sense that all courses should be doubled, but in a more overall sense. The crucial point was that Danish should not be permitted to disappear as a language of instruction and research at the universities. What we could not agree on, however, was whether retention of Danish should be legally binding for the universities. Some members argued that the universities could handle this balance without being legally required to retain Danish. Others – a majority to which I belonged myself – recommended that it should be written into the University Act that Danish would not be permitted to disappear. Our reason for insisting on legally binding retention of Danish was that in the language policy put forward by the Danish government in 2004 it was stated that Danish should be the major language of instruction in tertiary education, but that the universities had largely ignored this statement (which was not legally binding).

Today the Danish government – a conservative coalition government – still wants to leave the decision to the universities. The opposition, however, appears to go in for a legally binding solution this time. In the Danish parliament it has not yet been decided which way it is going to be.

Shortly after the Ljubljana conference was held, the Danish parliament decided that Danish should be retained as a language of instruction and research at the universities, but that this retention should not be made legally binding. Only one political party voted against this proposal and wanted it written into the University Act that Danish would not be permitted to disappear.

Language Use in Higher Education Establishments in Latvia

INA DRUVIETE, JĀNIS VALDMANIS

University of Latvia, Latvia
ina.druviete@saeima.lv | janis.valdmanis@valoda.lv

The paper deals with the role of tertiary education in the development of individual and societal multilingualism and its effects on economic growth and social cohesion. The positive and negative aspects of a common European area of education – the Bologna process in particular – have been analysed. The risks of the development of subtractive bilingualism may have consequences in various dimensions including domain loss and may represent problems in the functioning of official languages in all phases of education. The paper also analyses the Latvian Law on Higher Education as a model for the development of additive multilingualism which also protects Latvian as the main language in tertiary education.

Prispevek obravnava vlogo terciarnega izobraževanja pri razvoju individualne in družbene večjezičnosti ter posledic za gospodarsko rast in družbeno povezanost. Pod drobnogled so vzeti pozitivni in negativni vidiki skupnega evropskega izobraževalnega prostora, še posebej bolonjski proces. Nevarnost razvoja subtraktivne dvojezičnosti ima lahko posledice na več ravneh, npr. izguba strokovnega področja in ovire pri uporabi uradnega jezika na vseh ravneh izobraževalnega procesa. V prispevku prav tako analiziramo latvijski zakon o visokem šolstvu, ki predstavlja model razvoja aditivne večjezičnosti in obenem latvijščino štiti kot glavni jezik terciarnega izobraževanja.

Education plays a pivotal role in the development of individual and societal multilingualism. Early language learning as well as context and language integrated learning are being used throughout Europe and provide greater opportunities within the school curriculum for exposure to other languages. In secondary education students acquire the essential skills that will serve them throughout their lifetime. Most of the EU Member States unanimously agree that students should master at least two foreign languages and have the linguistic capacity to enter the labour market or continue their education in other states.

Tertiary education may help in raising the awareness of multilingualism's potential contribution to economic growth and social cohesion. During the past decade, numerous programmes, activities and projects have been preparing the ground for the creation of a European Area of Education, which is still a vision, but already has sound base – the Bologna Process in higher education, the provisions for a European Qualifications Framework and a European Research Council as well as plans for creating new areas, such as an Area of Information, are important elements of the revised Lisbon Strategy for 2010. Higher or tertiary level of education is very important not only for achieving goals of the Lisbon Strategy, but also for enabling new specialists to function in a multilingual environment.

Many universities in countries where English is not an official language have in the last decades added English as a teaching language. This process has been favoured by the Bologna Process, which promotes the European dimension in higher education. The objectives of the Bologna member states are to consolidate the European higher education area by 2010. More than 40 countries have agreed to implement structural uniformity – general implementation of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), the introduction of the Diploma Supplement and the “three-cycle structure”. However, not all aspects of the Bologna Process have been well thought out, in particular the linguistic aspect. The European Language Council states:

“One of the side effects of growing student mobility within and into Europe, the creation of joint programmes, is the increased use of English as a medium of instruction in universities in non-English speaking countries. The adoption of English as a vehicular language in higher education is widely reported as being carried out without specific educational-linguistic attention being given to ensuing impact on teaching and learning” [Nancy Declaration “Multilingual Universities for a Multilingual Europe Open to the World”. European Language Council, 2006].

However, the risks of developing the so-called subtractive bilingualism (the acquisition of a second language at the expense of the mother tongue or an official language) are becoming greater and are mostly associated with education through the English-medium. In the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and even Germany more and more graduates are becoming fluent in English while at the same time failing to function as professionals in the official language of the state. The European Commission has been forced to admit that *“it needs to be recognized that the trend in non-English-speaking countries towards teaching through the medium in English, instead of through the national or regional language, may have unforeseen consequences for the vitality of those languages” [A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, 2005].*

These unforeseen consequences may appear in various dimensions. If a language poorly functions in a certain sociolinguistic domain (in this case higher education), this domain loss has a direct impact on several other domains (e.g. science) and the quality of the respective language in general (e.g. terminology processes, academic writing, scientific popular literature, etc.). Taking into account the hierarchically structured educational system (pre-school, elementary, secondary, vocational, higher, lifelong education), linguistic transformation in one phase would inevitably be followed by changes in language teaching and learning ideologies and practices throughout the system. For this reason sociolinguists – being aware of the detrimental effects of subtractive bilingualism in higher education – urge governments to take appropriate steps in order to protect full-fledged functioning of official languages in all phases of education.

Latvia as an EU Member State and one of the most successful member states of the Bologna Process is also subjected to the developing multilingualism and the changes in its linguistic environment. On the one hand, European integration provides renewed chances for further development of the Latvian language (translation, interpretation, terminology development), but on the other, there are a lot of factors (e.g. globalisation, integration, tendencies

towards linguistic homogeneity, distribution of international mass media, ideology which evaluates languages from the point of view of market economy, asymmetrical supranational cooperation) that favour the more widely spoken languages like English, French and German. The processes of Europeanisation could have negative effects on the use of Latvian in several sociolinguistic functions (e.g. banking, entrepreneurship, entertainment, etc.), and higher education and science in particular. Recent changes in the Law on Institutions of Higher Education (2006) allows Latvian universities to develop additive multilingualism while protecting Latvian as the main language of education. Section 56 states:

“(3). The study programmes of State-founded institutions of higher education shall be implemented in the official language. The use of foreign languages in the implementation of study programmes shall be possible only in the following cases:

- 1) *study programmes which are acquired by foreign students in Latvia, and study programmes, which are implemented within the scope of co-operation provided for in European Union programmes and international agreements may be implemented in the official languages of the European Union. For foreign students the acquisition of the official language shall be included in the study course compulsory amount if studies in Latvia are expected to be longer than six months or exceed 20 credit points,*
- 2) *not more than one fifth of the credit point amount of a study programme may be implemented in the official languages of the European Union, taking into account that in this part final and State examinations may not be included, as well as the writing of qualification, bachelor and masters works; and*
- 3) *study programmes, which are implemented in foreign languages are necessary for the achievement of the aims of the study programme in conformity with the educational classification of the Republic of Latvia for such educational programme groups: language and cultural studies and language programmes. The licensing commission shall decide the conformity of the study programme to the educational programme group.”*

This formulation allows Latvia not to repeat the experience of most European states which have almost lost their official languages in higher education and science and are now trying to restore their functions. We completely agree with the European Federation of National Institutions for Languages:

“English is used as a working language in certain professional, educational and other social contexts in Europe, and while the practical value of this is acknowledged, it is considered of the utmost importance to maintain, strengthen, and further develop all national/official languages of the European countries in all their functional domains” [Brussels Declaration on Language learning in Europe. Amsterdam: EFNIL, 2006].

Des langues pour les savoirs ou une langue pour la science

MANUEL CÉLIO CONCEIÇÃO

Université de l'Algarve, Portugal
mconcei@ualg.pt

There is a contrast between the need for linguistic diversity and the imposition of monolingualism, under the pretext of internationalization and globalization. Questions of verbalization and knowledge transmission, combined with linguistic / cultural / identity contexts and scientific and social needs, will be referred from a binary perspective of language (just as a vehicle or also as part of the cognition process?).

Obstaja nasprotje med potrebo po jezikovni različnosti in vsiljevanjem enojezičnosti pod pretvezo internacionalizacije in globalizacije. Vprašanja ubesedenja in prenosa znanja, v povezavi s kontekstom jezika / kulture / identitete in znanstvenimi ter družbenimi potrebami, bodo obravnavana z dvojne perspektive jezika (zgolj kot sredstvo ali tudi kot del miselnega procesa?).

L'expression de l'existence humaine et de nos différentes identités est, avant tout, un acte communicatif langagier. La connaissance est le résultat d'une interprétation du monde qui n'existe que quand elle est communiquée. Ces deux affirmations montrent que les langues, parmi d'autres fonctions, non seulement véhiculent des savoirs mais, surtout, instancient l'homme dans la communauté. Le concept de langue servira de point central de cette contribution.

La communication, utilisant une ou plusieurs langues, est le seul moyen de faire circuler l'information, les connaissances produites ou les connaissances nécessaires pour chaque communauté. Considérant seulement les savoirs scientifiques, c'est-à-dire ceux sur lesquelles il y a eu un encadrement épistémologique et qui sont le résultat d'expertises, et sachant qu'ils sont produits / gérés / communiqués et qu'ils circulent au sein de groupes restreints dans lesquels les différents interlocuteurs ont différentes langues premières, la question qui alimente tous les débats est de savoir s'ils doivent se traduire en une ou en plusieurs langues. Dans la première possibilité, on crée une sorte de lingua franca; dans la deuxième on revisite Babel; dans les deux il y a un grand risque de bruit communicatif. Avant l'analyse de ces possibilités, il faut remarquer que la conception de langue (voire de langage) en tant qu'instrument qui sert de véhicule des savoirs est une conception passive et discutable. Elle met hors de la langue la construction du savoir et des connaissances. Considérant que la cognition ne peut se faire que avec un langage et en une(des) langue(s), notre conception de langue ne peut être aussi passive puisque les connaissances et les savoirs se construisent en discours dans le processus communicatif. La langue utilisée pour les faire exister doit donc être une langue

bien connue par les intervenants dans la communication pour qu'ils puissent dans l'acte communicatif faire intervenir non seulement cette compétence linguistique mais aussi leur identité, leur compétence stratégique et leur authenticité, particularités qui difficilement sont mobilisées lors de l'utilisation d'une langue qui ne soit pas sentie comme première. Ceci pose le problème de la circulation internationale, d'un côté, et du prestige social et académique de l'autre. Si chaque communauté scientifique fait connaître son travail dans sa langue, comment atteindre l'internationalisation tant voulue dans les institutions universitaires ? Si tous communiquent en anglais (quel anglais ?), y-a-t-il vraiment production de savoirs, étant donnés les différents niveaux de connaissances des interlocuteurs ?

Si l'on restreint cette discussion à l'univers de l'enseignement supérieur, tel que le dit le titre de ce colloque, la discussion va entre le tout en anglais et le tout dans les langues locales / régionales / nationales. Au niveau de l'enseignement supérieur, pour des questions de pouvoir économique, de recette pour l'internationalisation et d'apparent garant de la mobilité, l'anglais gagne du terrain, puisque si ce n'est pas en anglais, ce n'est pas scientifique. Pour paraphraser Charles V qui aurait dit qu'il parlait différentes langues selon son interlocuteur (l'espagnol pour Dieu, l'italien pour les femmes, le français pour les hommes), on pourrait croire qu'aux universitaires il parlerait en anglais. L'anglais s'est imposé comme langue de la science mais ce statut doit être expliqué. Sous la conception de la langue en tant que véhicule de connaissances (conception passive), que l'on le veuille ou non, même si l'anglais n'est pas compris par près de 60% des habitants de la planète, il a des variantes internationales dans les sciences, des codes souvent très figés, par exemple, par les structures éditoriales des publications scientifiques et leurs comités de lecture et évaluation. Sous l'autre conception, celle de la langue en tant que partie intégrante de la construction des savoirs, même si beaucoup d'équipes de recherche « existent » en anglais, cette langue ne peut être la langue de la science ni la langue des connaissances.

Les apprentissages au niveau de l'enseignement supérieur se font au niveau des contenus et au niveau d'un ensemble de compétences (génériques ou spécifiques) qui contribuent pour la capacité de devenir autonome dans le monde du travail. Une de parties considérables de l'acquisition de connaissances et de compétences est la possibilité de partager des acquis et la capacité d'innovation attendue. La créativité et l'innovation exigent la mobilisation de stratégies de communication et des choix tactiques qui sont dépendants de la langue dans laquelle ils sont conçus et il est peu probable que ce soit possible en une lingua franca exclusivement. Des recherches sur les dynamiques langagières et en multilinguisme menées, entre autres au sein du projet Dylan¹, montrent l'importance de l'environnement multilingue pour le développement de la créativité et de l'innovation, ainsi que pour tous les mécanismes et création et partage de savoirs.

Le prestige attribué à l'anglais peut éventuellement favoriser l'affirmation internationale des équipes de recherche et des universités, bien qu'il faille être vigilant quant à la qualité de l'anglais. Il provoque surtout des pertes de domaine, de langue et de culture puisqu'on perd le pouvoir de créer / gérer les conceptions et les ressources linguistiques d'une langue particulière dans le domaine terminologique. Rappelons que toute conception est située, partagée et distribuée, c'est-à-dire qu'elle dépend du contexte où elle s'instaure collaborativement et elle est en représentation et transformation permanentes. Ces processus cognitifs ne peuvent être correctement verbalisés que dans des langues dont les locuteurs aient des

¹ <http://www.dylan-project.org>.

compétences bien plus que communicatives, ils en doivent aussi avoir des compétences métalinguistiques et métacognitives. Au sein du partage et de la collaboration, la possibilité de concevoir les phénomènes ou les faits de science en analyse en plusieurs langues enrichit la recherche, alors que la conception en lingua franca l'appauvrit inexorablement.

Un autre argument souvent cité pour le besoin du monolinguisme en sciences est celui la mobilité et de l'internationalisation. C'est un argument qu'il faut démonter et insister sur le fait que la diversité linguistique est un atout et non un problème. Comme le dit Maalouf (1998 : 53) : «si celui dont je parle la langue ne respecte pas la mienne, parler sa langue cesse d'être un geste d'ouverture et devient un acte d'allégeance et de soumission ». Des études faites sur les besoins linguistiques chez les entreprises et institutions en Europe, telles que celle que nous avons menée au sein du projet Languages for language-related industries and professions de TNP Languages III², montrent que la diversité linguistique et la différenciation des savoirs linguistiques des universitaires sont indispensables pour leur succès dans le monde du travail et pour leur mobilité internationale.

La science ne se fait donc pas en une langue, il lui en faut plusieurs. Le savoir ne peut être monolingue sous péril de devenir inaccessible et fragmentaire. Les langues sont plus que des codes et des ensembles des règles de grammaire. Elles sont aussi parties prenantes de la construction cognitive, de la communication et du savoir qu'elles mettent en scène différemment les une par rapport aux autres. La communication et les savoirs ne peuvent que s'enrichir s'ils sont construits en plusieurs langues, c'est-à-dire s'ils sont le résultat de parlars plurilingues (au sens de Lüdi, 2007) qui contribuent pour maintenir la diversité, respectant les identités, et pour promouvoir les progrès et l'équité. Sans plusieurs langues pour la science, les résultats de son activité seront presque inutiles et non durables car trop parcellaires et inaccessibles pour beaucoup d'entre nous.

Références

- Lüdi, G., 2007: Le "parler plurilingue": Une catégorie étique ou émique?. *Cahiers de l'ILSL* 23. 55–63.
- Maalouf, A., 1998: *Les identités meurtrières*. Paris: Poche.

² <http://www.celelc.org/>.

Preparing the future of national languages in higher education

JAN ROUKENS

Stichting Nederlands, ANV vzw, Babylonian WG, the Netherlands
janroukens@stichtingnederlands.nl

The paper discusses the disappearance of languages with particular reference to domain loss that is evident in many European languages. National languages as languages of higher education and science are being challenged primarily by English, which belongs to no nation and can be seen as a global language. Understanding the mechanisms that lead to domain loss due to predominance of English could perhaps stop this negative trend. The paper also presents the measures that could help preserve lost domains or at least prevent subsequent domain losses, particularly in the area of higher education, science and technology.

Prispevek obravnava izginjanje jezikov in pri tem posebej opozarja na izginjanje strokovnih področij, ki je opazno pri mnogih evropskih jezikih. Nacionalne jezike iz visokega šolstva in znanosti izriva zlasti angleščina, ki ne pripada nobenemu narodu in je pravzaprav globalni jezik. Razumevanje mehanizmov, ki pripeljejo do izgube strokovnih področij na račun angleščine, bi morda lahko pomagalo ustaviti negativne trende. Predstavljeni so tudi ukrepi, ki bi lahko pomagali ohraniti izgubljena strokovna področja ali vsaj preprečiti nadaljnje izgube, zlasti na področju visokega šolstva, znanosti in tehnologije.

Today many languages in the economically deprived societies of the indigenous peoples in the Americas, Australia and Africa are under pressure, and more recently also in the rich countries of Europe. The difference is, however, that on other continents languages disappear ‘with the last speaker’, whereas in Europe languages do not disappear but lose domains of application, because language change cannot cope with the pace of societal and cultural development in certain dynamic domains.

The pressure does not come from just any dominant language, but from English, or rather international English which I call *English*¹. English is not a standard language; it is neither typically British nor typically American English, but typically global. For speakers of English the language is non-native by definition, it is an *interlingua* used by several hundred million speakers worldwide in a great variety of circumstances. Tourists and their interlocutors use it, as well as scientists active internationally or even nationally in certain countries. And traders and employees of multinational enterprises as well as international governmental bodies. The language is defined *ad hominem*, everybody speaks her/his personal English, and every speaker is convinced that he or she speaks it well or even very well. Obvious commu-

¹ Jan Roukens mentioned *English* for the first time in a paper published in 2002 (in Dutch).

nication problems arise if English is used by people with diverse cultural backgrounds. These are not merely a matter of misunderstanding, often it is a matter of not understanding at all, particularly in domains that require deep prior knowledge.

Globalisation is a vague concept, for some people it is a religion that is used and misused as an argument to push development in one or the opposite direction. From the diversity point of view, there is bad and good globalisation. Bad globalisation is pushed by powerful political and industrial groups that strive towards worldwide 'level playing fields'. Barriers to the expansion of political power for those who are already powerful should be 'levelled out'. Similarly, this should be the fate for barriers to trade, industrial and agricultural products. Even moral convictions, economic theories and political systems should be freely exported on a barrierless globe.

Languages are among the various barriers, bad globalisation loves English.

Good globalisation respects cultures and traditions including languages, stimulates curiosity and enjoys the diversity of natural and human resources and products, and promotes the idea of taking stock of the differences and learn from them. Good globalisation is tolerant and humane, bad globalisation is impatient to get things done in the interest of the stakeholders pushing the movement. For reasons not fully understood, in the 1990s leading European academic figures began associating themselves with the bad globalisation movement, giving preference to harmonisation over diversification, quantity over quality, Europe-wide cloning of school systems and removal of national identities, English as a language that would replace national languages, very large over mid-size schools and universities, and also considered graduates as 'products' trained for the world market. These are the characteristics of the higher education system that emerged in Europe at the end of the 20th century and which was symbolically associated with Europe's oldest university - Bologna.

English is instrumental in allowing some mutual understanding on the global scale. This language² may be compared with the trade language Malay in S.E. Asia or Swahili in C.E. Africa. Whether English makes sense as a language of instruction in higher education or in scientific communication is not at all certain. It is particularly difficult for an *interlingua* to serve multicultural environments because there are great discrepancies on the conceptual level. Logically speaking, it is not possible to achieve the same level of understanding if French and Chinese scientists try to understand each other speaking their versions of English in comparison with two UK scientists speaking English, or 'their' English. The introduction of English on a grand scale in classrooms is therefore extremely risky, and short- and long-term effects of the transition are simply not known. Studies have shown that students need significantly more time to acquire knowledge via English than if they are educated using their native language (for example: Vinke, Jochems 1992).

It strikes us that the role of English comes close to what the self-declared Lithuanian Ludwik Lejzer Zamenhof had in mind when he developed and argued in favour of Esperanto in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Addressing the issues of how people communicate when their native languages are different, Zamenhof and others often referred to the role of Latin in the Middle Ages. Indeed,

² Some may question whether 'language' is a category applicable to English. We believe it is nowadays with the proliferation of alternative modes of language use, though it is entirely a matter of definition.

Latin served as an *interlingua*, at least for the elite of priests and *savants* or ‘knowledge people’. However, it also served as a *superlingua*; common people had no access to the knowledge contained in a language they did not understand. Many ‘modern’ people refer to Latin as the *interlingua* ‘lost’, often with an undertone of nostalgia. Neil Kinnock, a Briton and the European Commissioner responsible for EU translation, staff and administration around the year 2000 in an interview deplored the ‘loss’ of Latin. According to him if we kept Latin as a common language in Europe, we would not need to bother about the huge translation burden the EU is facing. We do not know whether Kinnock was serious, ironical or sarcastic. For a socialist he did not appear to be particularly concerned with EU transparency for those that will never have the opportunity to learn Latin. Maybe he merely meant to say that we better accept English in the role of Middle Age Latin.

There is much confusion about the absolute and relative roles of languages in our society, which is claimed to be in the process of globalisation. National and European politics should attempt to provide clarification and guidance. It is not enough to say that we should keep our various native languages and learn some more in order to communicate Europe-wide. Higher education and science, and international business, are domains claiming that they cannot live with this model. Increasingly, responsible authorities in higher education opt for English as a *superlingua*, partially or fully replacing the native languages. But this in turn will create socio-cultural tensions, political unrest and stagnation. For this reason the ‘Latin model’ was abolished about half a millennium ago. Removal of the Latin language barrier meant that significantly more young citizens could enter the universities, take up prominent functions in society such as those of a doctor, engineer or lawyer.

The observations about the societal implications of the roles of various languages should result in political initiatives to remedy unwanted consequences of some of today’s trends, or reverse such trends altogether. Initiatives on the political or strategic level should be supplemented by measures in a variety of areas facilitating policy implementation.

Such areas are terminology or specialised languages for specific scientific and technical fields. A language community deprived of adequate terminology in scientific fields will not be able to cope with the pace of development in those fields and will increasingly lag behind.

The same observation applies to language technologies, including localised versions of general hardware and software. If language-specific technologies are not made available to users due to not being developed or because they have not been acquired by individual users or user organisations, the users will be severely handicapped and will not be able to function as efficiently as others benefitting from the use of such tools.

These fields of concern may be extended to the field of ‘language’ tools or ‘language infrastructures’, comprising dictionaries, corpora, all kinds of language tools and services that should be readily available to users in mono- or multilingual environments.

The area of scientific and technical communication gives rise to even greater concern. The increasingly exclusive use of English for communication in conferences and publications creates an environment that discourages the use of native languages. This is the cause why education staff yield to pressures to replace, rather than complement, national languages in higher education with English. Even tutorial materials prescribed by the staff to students are largely in English, ‘made in the UK’ or ‘made in the USA’. Governments are invited to ensure

that scientific publishing and communication in the national languages regain the position they enjoyed in the middle of the 20th century, complementing English for a truly international publishing. The publishers seem to have an interest in maintaining the situation by which scientific communication is performed in English, but they may be wrong: a multilingual STMH³ publishing sector provides better services to a variety of users and thereby creates new economic and employment opportunities.

Literature

Vinke, A. A., Jochems, W. M. G., 1992: *Switching from Dutch to English as the medium of instruction: An exploratory study into teacher experiences*. Delft: Delft University of Technology, Department of Communication and Education.

³ Science, Technology, Medicine, Humanities.

Kako je vključevanje v evropske integracije spodbudilo razvoj slovenske farmacevtske terminologije

ALEŠ OBREZA, JELKA ŠMID-KORBAR, MIRJANA GAŠPERLIN

Univerza v Ljubljani, Fakulteta za farmacijo, Slovenija

ales.obreza@ffa.uni-lj.si | jelka.korbar@ffa.uni-lj.si | mirjana.gasperlin@ffa.uni-lj.si

Razvoj slovenske farmacevtske terminologije po osamosvojitvi je bil povezan z vključevanjem države v Evropsko unijo in sprejemanjem veljavne *Evropske farmakopeje*. Zadnjih 12 let vsako leto izide *Nacionalni dodatek k Evropski farmakopeji – Formularium Slovenicum (FS)* ali njegovo dopolnilo, ki predstavlja osnovo izrazoslovja na vseh področjih farmacije, med drugim tudi v procesih izobraževanja. V pripravi je tudi slovenski farmacevtski terminološki slovar, v katerem naj bi bila zbrana najpomembnejša gesla s področja farmacije in bo zaokrožil dolgoletna prizadevanja strokovnjakov na področju izrazoslovja.

The evolution of Slovenian pharmaceutical terminology after the declaration of independence was largely stimulated by integration to European Union and the implementation of current European Pharmacopoeia. For the last twelve years the Slovenian National Formulary to the European Pharmacopoeia (*Formularium Slovenicum*) or one of its supplements is published annually and presents the basis for terminology in all fields of pharmacy, including the education process. Slovenian pharmaceutical dictionary, that would include the translation and interpretation of most important terms in the field of pharmacy, is also being prepared and will round up the many years of hard work.

Farmacija je interdisciplinarna znanstvena veda, v kateri se prepletajo številna področja naravoslovja in zdravstvenih ved, zlasti na področju socialne farmacije pa so vključeni tudi nekateri pristopi, značilni za družboslovne znanosti. Podobno kot na številnih drugih področjih je za strokovnjaka s področja farmacije nujno potrebno aktivno znanje vsaj enega iz skupine t. i. svetovnih jezikov, pri čemer med slovensko strokovno farmacevtsko populacijo prevladujeta angleščina in nemščina. Na ta način sta omogočeni izmenjava informacij na širšem geografskem področju in spremljanje novosti s prebiranjem znanstvene in strokovne literature. Po drugi strani je za razvoj določene stroke in nenazadnje tudi jezika samega nujno potrebno razvijati lastno strokovno terminologijo. Slovenščina je v farmaciji v prvi vrsti pomembna pri stiku strokovnjaka s pacientom, nadalje za medsebojno sporazumevanje, pripravo ustrezne dokumentacije o zdravilih ... Zaradi tega je izjemnega pomena tudi vključitev nacionalnega strokovnega izrazoslovja v učne programe farmacije na univerzi in skrb za ustrezno terminologijo v strokovnih revijah s področja farmacije (*Farmacevtski vestnik, Farmakon, Naša lekarna* ...). Slovenska farmacevtska terminologija se uporablja v vseh programih, ki se izvajajo na Fakulteti za farmacijo, saj je poznavanje ustreznega izrazoslovja potrebno za

bodoče farmacevte, ne glede na njihovo delovno mesto. Poleg tega se v času študija seznanijo tudi z vsemi najpomembnejšimi izrazi s področja farmacije v angleškem in nemškem jeziku, glede na tradicijo farmacije pa je potrebno tudi poznavanje osnov latinščine (Drinovec 2007, Obreza 2009).

Najpomembnejši dosežek na področju razvoja slovenske farmacevtske terminologije iz obdobja pred osamosvojitvijo sega v sedemdeseta leta prejšnjega stoletja (1972), ko je nastal prevod *Jugoslovanske farmakopeje* (*Ph. Jug. III, Pharmacopoeia jugoslavica tertia, Translitteratio slovenica*), ki je bila edina v slovenščino prevedena izdaja *Jugoslovanske farmakopeje*. Vse ostale izdaje (*I., II. in IV. jugoslovanska farmakopeja*) so bile tudi na območju Slovenije oficinalne v srbohrvaškem jeziku. Slovenski prevod je pripravil prof. dr. Aleš Krbavčič, mag. farm., skupaj s terminološko komisijo, ki jo je imenovalo Slovensko farmacevtsko društvo.

Leta 1993 je Republika Slovenija pristopila h Konvenciji o izdelavi *Evropske farmakopeje* ter Protokolu h Konvenciji o izdelavi *Evropske farmakopeje*, s čimer se je zavezala, da bo na svojem ozemlju sprejela in uveljavila *Evropsko farmakopejo*. Zaradi potreb zlasti farmacevtske industrije se je pojavila pobuda o ustanovitvi skupine strokovnjakov, ki bi poenotila strokovno izrazoslovje na področju farmacevtskih oblik, saj bi slednje močno olajšalo pripravo dokumentacije za registracijske postopke. Leta 1994 je bila na pobudo Tehnološke sekcije Slovenskega farmacevtskega društva ustanovljena Komisija za farmacevtsko-tehnološko terminologijo, ki je pripravila *Slovar farmacevtskih oblik* in leta 1996 še knjižico z naslovom *Standardni farmacevtsko-tehnološki izrazi*, v katero je vključila *Slovar farmacevtskih oblik*, *Slovar farmacevtske ovojnine* in prevod dokumenta Evropske farmakopejske komisije *Standardni izrazi za farmacevtske oblike, za načine uporabe, ovojnine, zapirala ter dodatno opremo*. Evropska unija je namreč objavila *Standard terms*, ki so jih vse članice *Evropske farmakopeje* morale prevesti v svoj jezik. Slovenski standardni izrazi so bili prvič objavljeni leta 1996 v posebni izdaji *Pharmeuropa*, glasila *Evropske farmakopeje*, in se od takrat nenehno dopolnjujejo. Istega leta je bil v Sloveniji sprejet tudi prvi *Zakon o zdravilih*, ki je določil, da morajo biti zdravila, ki so v pravnem prometu v RS, izdelana po metodah in zahtevah *Evropske farmakopeje* in v skladu z nacionalnim dodatkom k *Evropski farmakopeji*. S tem je bila postavljena pravna osnova za uveljavitev *Evropske farmakopeje* pri nas ter izpolnjena obveza naše države, ki izhaja iz podpisa Konvencije o izdelavi *Evropske farmakopeje*. Standardni izrazi so postali obvezni v postopkih pridobivanja dovoljenja za promet z zdravili. Poleg tega so standardni izrazi poenotili slovensko izrazoslovje in odpravili zmedo, ki jo je vnašala uporaba različnih izrazov za isti pojem, ki pa si med sabo niso bili povsem enakovredni in zamenljivi. Leta 2006 so bili standardni izrazi natančno pregledani in posodobljeni, tako da predstavljajo dobro podlago za delo farmacevtskih strokovnjakov. (Cvelbar 2003, *Standardni farmacevtsko tehnološki izrazi* 1996, *Formularium Slovenicum* 2005, Marinko 2007)

Prizadevanje za enotno slovensko farmacevtsko terminologijo je poleg izboljšane komunikiranja med strokovnjaki na tem področju predstavljalo tudi pomemben del priprave na to, da je 1. januarja 1997 v Republiki Sloveniji stopila v veljavo 3. izdaja *Evropske farmakopeje* (*European Pharmacopoeia Third Edition-Ph. Eur. 3rd Ed.*). Za razliko od predhodne izdaje je bila izraziteje industrijsko naravnana. Trenutno veljavna (od 1. 1. 2008) je *Ph. Eur. 6th Ed.* (Ph. Eur.).

Ob sprejetju *Evropski farmakopeji* se je tako pokazala tudi potreba po slovenskem dodatku k njej, zlasti zaradi usklajevanja določil lastne zakonodaje na področju zdravil in predpi-

sov na ravni *Evropske farmakopeje*. Junija 1998 je izšel *Formularium Slovenicum, Slovenski dodatek k evropski farmakopeji*. Izdala ga je Komisija za pripravo nacionalnega dodatka pri takratnem Uradu RS za zdravila Ministrstva za zdravje. Komisija, sestavljena iz priznanih strokovnjakov, vsako leto izda Dopolnilo k *FS*, hkrati pa organizira tudi vsakoletno strokovno posvetovanje ob izidu novega dopolnila. Oktobra 2009 je izšlo že četrto dopolnilo k drugi izdaji *Formulariuma Slovenicuma (FS 2.4)*. Vsebine v *FS* uveljavljajo uporabo enotne slovenske farmacevtske terminologije v farmaciji in njej sorodnih strokah, kot so medicina, kemija, veterina, mikrobiologija. *FS* vključuje prevode izbranih poglavij *Evropske farmakopeje* in določene vsebine, ki so specifično pomembne za slovensko farmacevtsko stroko. Določene vsebine so lahko povzete iz veljavnih farmakopej drugih članic *Evropske farmakopeje* z njihovim dovoljenjem. V celoti vključuje tudi *Slovar standardnih izrazov*. Posebej pomemben in uporaben je trojezični indeks zdravnih učinkovin in pomožnih snovi, ki vključuje njihova slovenska, angleška in latinska imena, poleg njega pa tudi angleško-slovenski slovarček farmacevtskih izrazov, v katerem so na enem mestu zbrani prevodi določenih angleških izrazov, ki jih je Komisija za pripravo nacionalnega dodatka k *Evropski farmakopeji* v sodelovanju z lingvisti in strokovnjaki drugih strok prevedla, revidirala ali sooblikovala. (Cvelbar 2003, *Formularium Slovenicum* 2005)

Nov pomemben mejnik predstavlja priprava farmacevtskega terminološkega slovarja, kjer bodo na enem mestu zbrani in razloženi najpomembnejši izrazi, ki se uporabljajo na ožjem področju farmacije. S pomočjo navedenega slovarja bi se vzpostavil pregleden in urejen sistem, ki bo v veliko pomoč farmacevtom in laični javnosti. Nosilec projekta omenjenega terminološkega farmacevtskega slovarja je Sekcija za terminološke slovarje Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša pod okriljem ZRC SAZU (Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti), ki delo koordinira in nudi tehnično podporo. Pri izvedbi pa sodelujejo še naslednje inštitucije: Fakulteta za farmacijo, Javna Agencija RS za zdravila in medicinske pripomočke, Slovensko farmacevtsko društvo in Lekarniška zbornica Slovenije. Na predlog ZRC SAZU bo nastali farmacevtski slovar prevajalni, razlagalni in normativni, pokrival pa bo področja farmacevtske tehnologije, analize in kakovosti zdravil, učinkovin s farmakoterapijo in pomožnih snovi, lekarniške farmacije, farmacevtske biotehnologije, farmacevtske regulative, farmakognozije, alternativnih metod zdravljenja ter klinične farmacije. Zaokrožil bo dolgoletno delo strokovnjakov pri postavljanju strokovne farmacevtske terminologije in pomembno doprinesel tudi k približevanju farmacije laični javnosti.

Literatura

- Ph. Eur. European Pharmacopoeia*, 6th Edition, 2008. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Formularium Slovenicum 2.0: slovenski dodatek k Evropski farmakopeji (FS 2.0)*, 2005. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za zdravje – Javna Agencija Republike Slovenije za zdravila in medicinske pripomočke, Zavod za farmacijo in za preizkušanje zdravil. In vsa dopolnila.
- Ph. Jug. III, Pharmacopoeia jugoslavica tertia, Translitteratio slovenica*, 1972. Beograd: Zvezni zavod za zdravstveno varstvo.
- Standardni farmacevtsko tehnološki izrazi*, 1996. Ljubljana: Slovensko farmacevtsko društvo.

- Cvelbar, M., Šmid-Korbar, J., Budihna, M., 2003: Farmacevtski zakoniki: Evropska farmakopeja in Formularium Slovenicum z dopolnili. *Zdravniški vestnik*, 72, 1. 25–26.
- Drinovec, J., 2007: Medicina, zdravstvo in slovenski jezik ter slovenska terminologija. *Zdravniški vestnik*, 76, 1. 68–69.
- Humar, M., 1997: Slovensko strokovno slovaropisje v obdobju po osamosvojitvi. M. Humar (ur.) *Slovensko naravoslovno-tehnično izrazje. Zbornik referatov s posvetovanja o slovenskem naravoslovno-tehničnem izrazju*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC SAZU. 19–26.
- Marinko, P., 2007: Farmacevtsko izrazje. I. Orel (ur.), *Razvoj slovenskega strokovnega jezika: Obdobja 24*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za slovenistiko, Center za slovenščino kot drugi/tuji jezik. 689–694.
- Obreza, A., 2009: Slovenska strokovna terminologija na področju Zdravstva. *Farmakon*, 30. 6.

Slovenski jezik v elektrotehniki

TADEJ BAJD

Fakulteta za elektrotehniko, Univerza v Ljubljani, Slovenija
bajd@robo.fe.uni-lj.si

Prikazan je kratek zgodovinski razvoj elektrotehniške slovenščine. Elektrotehniška terminologija se razvija predvsem v številnih slovenskih univerzitetnih učbenikih. Novi slovenski strokovni izrazi pa se ustvarjajo tudi v znanstvenih revijah in na strokovnih konferencah.

A brief historical overview of Slovenian electrotechnical language development is presented. Electrotechnical terminology is predominantly cultivated in abundant Slovenian student textbooks. New Slovenian electrotechnical expressions are created also in our scientific journals and professional conferences.

Začetki slovenskega elektrotehniškega izrazoslovja segajo v devetnajsto stoletje, ko je leta 1849 o »električnosti« pisal v knjigi *Naravoslovje ali fizika* Karel Robida. Leta 1875 je v Letopisu Maticе Slovenske izšel obsežen prispevek (58 strani) Simona Šubica z naslovom *Telegrafija. Zgodovina njena in današnji njen stan*. Kmalu zatem (1897) je pri Matici Slovenski izšla še knjiga Ivana Šubica *Elektrika*. Vsa tri besedila se odlikujejo s skrbno izbranimi slovenskimi strokovnimi izrazi, od katerih so se mnogi ohranili do današnjega dne.

Rojstvo Univerze v Ljubljani leta 1919 pomeni tudi začetek študija elektrotehnike. Prvi predavatelj je bil akademik Milan Vidmar, ki je objavil vrsto strokovnih knjig s področja elektrotehnike. Njegov temeljni učbenik *Vorlesungen über die wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen der Elektrotechnik* je leta 1928 izšel pri založbi Springer, slovenski prevod *Predavanja o znanstvenih osnovah delovne elektrotehnike* pa šele leta 1952.

Slovenski elektrotehniški učbeniki s področij močnostne elektrotehnike, elektronike, telekomunikcij in avtomatike tudi danes predstavljajo področje, kjer se na najbolj učinkovit način goji slovenska elektrotehniška strokovna beseda. Skupna založba Fakultete za elektrotehniko in Fakultete za računalništvo se lahko pohvali z več kot 150 knjižnimi naslovi. V zadnjih letih smo izdali tudi serijo izvirnih robotskih knjig, ki jih je v angleškem prevodu v svoj program vključila založba Springer.

Izrazi za isti pojav, sestavni del ali napravo se včasih od učbenika do učbenika razlikujejo. Še posebej so opazne razlike med mariborskimi in ljubljanskimi elektrotehniki. Razlike skušamo zgladiti v okviru strokovnih društev. Tako je Društvo avtomatikov Slovenije izdalo slovensko-angleško-nemški *Terminološki slovar avtomatike*.

Že osemnajst let poteka v Portorožu vsakoletna *Elektrotehniška in računalniška konferenca (ERK)*, ki pomeni najpomembnejšo priložnost za gojenje govornih strokovnih sloven-

ščine. Konference se udeležuje okrog dvesto referentov s slovenskih univerz, iz inštitutov, gospodarstva in industrije. Iz leta v leto se konference udeležuje tudi več tujih strokovnjakov, ki predavajo v angleščini. V okviru konference, ki je organizirana pod okriljem največje mednarodne strokovne organizacije IEEE (*Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers*), poteka tudi tekmovanje študentskih prispevkov. Slovensko strokovno besedo pa še v večji meri slišimo na univerzitetnih in visokošolskih predavanjih. Razen mednarodnih podoktorskih seminarjev in mednarodnih poletnih šol, vsa predavanja iz elektrotehnike potekajo v slovenščini. Menim, da bi ne bilo nič narobe, če bi se v bližnji bodočnosti začela uvajati angleška predavanja na drugi ali pa vsaj na tretji bolonjski stopnji.

Osrednja znanstvena elektrotehniška revija je *Elektrotehniški vestnik*, ki je lani praznoval petinsedemdesetletnico. Večina člankov je napisana v slovenskem jeziku, le povzetki so v angleščini. V uredniškem odboru se že nekaj časa pojavljajo misli, da bi morala biti v angleščini objavljena večina člankov, tako da bi si revija pridobila faktor vplivnosti. *Informacije MIDEEM* je naša revija za mikroelektroniko, elektronske sestavne dele in materiale, kjer je večina člankov objavljenih v angleščini. Revija ima nizek faktor vpliva (IF) v bazi podatkov JCR SE. Elektrotehniška slovenščina pa se goji tudi v strokovnih revijah, kakršna je *Elektrotehniška revija (ER)* in v poljudnih revijah, na primer *Svet elektronike*. Študentje Ljubljanske Fakultete za elektrotehniko izdajajo svojo revijo *Elektra*. Za razvoj lepe strokovne slovenščine pri študentih pa so posebej pomembna diplomska in doktorska dela, ki so v veliki meri napisana v slovenščini.

Slovenska terminologija in svetovni splet

TOMAŽ ERJAVEC

Odsek za tehnologije znanja, Institut »Jožef Stefan«, Slovenija
tomaz.erjavec@ijs.si

Prispevek poda primere informatizacije slovenskega jezika in smernice za večjo odmevnost terminoloških priročnikov in pripomočkov, in sicer z izkoriščanjem možnosti, ki jih ponuja svetovni splet.

The paper gives some examples of current informatisation efforts for Slovene, and argues that an increase of development for Slovene terminology will come with the utilisation of the opportunities offered by the World Wide Web.

1. Uvod

Angleščina že vrsto let vztrajno prodira v študijske vsebine in raziskovalno delo visokošolskih učiteljev v Sloveniji, proces pa se bo po vsej verjetnosti še pospešil z uvedbo bolonjske reforme. Naša teza je, da je to v splošnem pozitivno, saj tako študente kot profesorje opremi s potrebnimi kompetencami in spodbuja k spremljanju tujih ter predstavitvi svojih raziskav izven meja Slovenije, s čimer se njihovo delo izpostavlja bolj objektivni presoji kvalitete. Negativne plati tega pojava, predvsem zapostavljanje slovenskega strokovnega jezika, pa bi bilo mogoče omiliti s širšimi iniciativami za razvoj slovenskega jezika oz. slovenske terminologije.

Teze prispevka izhajajo z avtorjevega področja udejstvovanja, ki je računalniška obravnava (slovenskega) jezika, in sicer z dveh vidikov: pedagoškega in raziskovalnega. Pri predavanjih s tega področja je večina terminologije izvorno angleška, ki je bila samo v manjši meri že sprejeta v slovenski jezik – tako je treba sproti, bolj ali manj posrečeno, prevajati angleške termine v slovenščino. To seveda predstavlja obremenitev tako za profesorje kot tudi za študente, saj je večina sekundarne literature v angleškem jeziku in bodo študentje morali usvojiti tako slovensko kot angleško terminologijo. Po drugi strani se ukvarjamo z razvojem jezikovnih virov za slovenski jezik, kjer se trudimo vse vire narediti čim širše dostopne in s tem spodbujati razvoj jezikovnih tehnologij za slovenski jezik. Podoben pristop bi bil lahko uporabljen tudi pri referenčnih virih našega jezika, kot so pravopis, korpusi, pa tudi terminološki slovarji, s čimer bi nove termine naredili čim širše dostopne, s primernimi aplikacijami pa lahko omogočimo tudi sodelovanje širše javnosti pri razvoju terminologije. Prispevek v nadaljevanju bolj podrobno obravnava ti dve področji, najprej s pedagoškega, nato pa z informacijskega stališča.

2. Termini pri pouku

Pri predavanjih iz naravoslovnih znanosti, predvsem s področja računalništva in informatike, se srečujemo z izredno hitrim razvojem področja, s tem pa tudi nove terminologije. Ta skoraj izključno prihaja iz angleškega jezika, pri čemer se pojavi problem, kako jo uporabljati pri pouku v slovenščini. Vsak termin je seveda treba predstaviti (tudi) v angleškem jeziku, saj bodo študentje znanje, usvojeno na predavanjih, kdaj tudi uporabljali v praksi, pri čemer bodo soočeni z referenčno literaturo v angleškem jeziku, zaradi česar morajo biti seznanjeni tudi z angleškimi termini.

Seveda pa je termine potrebno tudi prevesti v slovenski jezik. Pri terminologizaciji nekega področja je znano, da se, vsaj kadar se termini uveljavljajo »od spodaj navzgor«, tipično najprej uvede kalk izvornega termina, nato pa, ob predpostavki, da termin postane zadosti pogost v uporabi, mogoče najde prava slovenska ustreznica. Zagovarjamo stališče, da je ta organski proces pozitiven, saj študentom olajša prehajanje med izvornim terminom in slovenskim prevodom.

Primer, sicer že razmeroma star, je spletna stran Batagelj (1995), ki je v Sloveniji in v slovenskem jeziku prva predstavila pomemben standard za računalniški zapis jezikovnih podatkov, in sicer standardni posplošeni jezik za označevanja – Standard Generalized Markup Language, SGML (ISO 8879:1986). SGML vsebuje veliko tehničnih terminov, s katerimi morajo biti uporabniki seznanjeni, da bi ga lahko učinkovito uporabljali. Batagelj je pomembnejše termine prevedel, vendar je zanje uporabil »prava« slovenska poimenovanja. Tako je npr. SGML termin *element* prevedel kot *značka*, *entity* kot *delec* in *Document Type Definition* kot *opis zvrsti spisa*. S tem je, po našem mnenju, preskočil naravni razvoj terminologije in brez potrebe obremenil študente, saj si morajo zapomniti tako angleški kot slovenski termin. Bolj naraven razvoj, ki je za študente tudi bistveno lažji, bi bil, da se uvedejo slovenske ustreznice, pri katerih se ohranijo izvorne latinske osnove, torej *element*, *entiteta* in *definicija tipa dokumentov*. Študentje in drugi uporabniki standarda v tem primeru sicer imajo na voljo slovenske termine, ob tem pa jim prehajanje med angleškimi in slovenskimi ne povzroča problemov.

Večji problem se pojavi pri terminih, ki nimajo latinske osnove, saj se ti težje kalkirajo v slovenski jezik; v teh primerih svetujemo prevod s slovensko ustreznico, vseeno pa tako, ki ohrani čim več elementov originala.

3. Informatizacija slovenskega jezika

Poleg bolj ozko usmerjenih pobud v učilnicah bi slovenski jezik, posebej strokovni, pa tudi sicer, lahko bolje zaživel ob izdatni informacijski podpori. S tem mislimo predvsem na dostopnost jezikovnih virov, kot so korpusi, slovarji in drugi jezikovni priročniki na spletu, ki bi moral biti na voljo brezplačno in brez registracije. Do neke mere v Sloveniji takšne storitve že obstajajo, kot npr. korpus Nova beseda oz. SSKJ,¹ vendar bi se na tem področju lahko še marsikaj naredilo, npr. s spletno dostopnostjo Slovenskega pravopisa.

Na področju terminološke podpore naravoslovju, pa tudi humanistiki, sta aktualni predvsem dve vrsti virov oz. storitev. Na prvem mestu so tu internetni terminološki slovarji, kot sta npr. *Islovar*² za področje informatike oz. *Računalniški slovarček*³ – koristno bi bilo, da je

¹ <http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/>.

² <http://www.islovar.org/>.

³ <http://dis-slovarcek.ijs.si/>.

takšnih slovarjev čim več, seveda pa se tu postavi problem pisanja in dopolnjevanja slovarjev, pa tudi, kako naj uporabnik najde primerne na spletu – tako npr. računalniškega slovarčka z Googlom ne najdemo, če vtipkamo »računalniški slovar«. Rešitev prvega problema je lahko omogočanje uporabnikom, da dodajajo gesla oz. prevode; mora pa biti prva izdaja slovarja zadosti velika, da uporabnike sploh pritegne. Problem najdljivosti se rešuje s postavljanjem »metastrani«, tj. seznamov povezav na posamezne (slovenske terminološke) slovarje, kot je npr. seznam spletnih slovarjev, ki ga vzdržuje Miran Željko.⁴ Na spletu sedaj obstajajo tudi aplikacije, ki zelo olajšajo postavitev takšnih strani, npr. *Delicious*.⁵ Način, kako povečati najdljivost strani, pa je seveda tudi medsebojno povezovanje; če bi na spletnih straneh *Islovarja* bila povezava na *Računalniški slovarček*, bi bilo tega brez dvoma lažje najti, tudi zato, ker Google pri gradnji indeksov upošteva predvsem stopnjo povezanosti posamezne spletne strani v internetu.

Vendar obstaja tudi drug, zelo enostaven način, kako maksimizirati uporabnost in najdljivost prevedenih terminov brez postavljanja lastnega strežnika ali velike začetne investicije. Posamezne termine, skupaj z razlago v slovenskem jeziku, lahko dodamo v Wikipedijo, Wikislovar ali kak drug vir Wiki.⁶ Zaradi popularnosti teh virov je termine v slovenskem jeziku zelo enostavno najti, s povezavo na članek v ostalih jezikih pa brez dodatnega truda dobimo tudi bolj podrobne razlage termina in seveda prevode v druge jezike. Se pa z zapisom gesla v Wikipediji odpovemo avtorskim pravicam, saj geselski članki tu niso avtorsko podpisani. Vendar je to razmeroma majhna žrtev za bistveno povečano odmevnost slovenskega strokovnega izrazja.

Drugi spletni vir terminov so korpusi, ki vsebujejo besedila s področja strokovnega izrazja; v Sloveniji je vedno več specializiranih korpusov, kot so npr. iKorpus⁷ (Vintar in Erjavec 2009) ali KoRP⁸ (Logar 2007), ki so na spletu dostopni preko konkordančnikov, vsebujejo pa npr. v prvem primeru računalniško in informacijsko izrazje, v drugem pa izrazje odnosov z javnostmi. Ker so termini v slovenskem jeziku (vsaj ob prvi uporabi v besedilu) tipično pospremljeni z angleškim izvornikom, je iskanje razmeroma enostavno. Seveda pa je bolje, če se potencialni termini avtomatsko izluščijo iz korpusov – za poljubno zbirko besedil pa je to tudi že možno narediti s prototipno različico luščilnika, dostopnega na Slovenskem terminološkem portalu.⁹

Korpusi, ki naj bi služili kot vir terminologije, pa žal tudi hitro zastarajo – namesto statičnih bi bilo treba delati spremljevalne korpuse, ki se osvežujejo z novimi slovenskimi publikacijami s posameznih področij. V te namene bi lahko služila besedila zbornikov (kot se že dela v iKorpusu) in revij, vir slednjih pa bi lahko vse bolj postala spletna knjižnica NUK dLib.¹⁰

Splet lahko tudi na druge načine služi za spodbujanje dela (ali, boljše, zabave) pri razvoju slovenščine, tako kar se tiče terminologije kot tudi širše. Pri nas je več primerov takšnih iniciativ: ljubitelji na dopisnem seznamu Linux društva LUGOS¹¹ se ukvarjajo s slovenjenjem odprtokodnih programov, skupina ŠUSS¹² na spletnem forumu ponuja odgovore na jezikovna vprašanja, projekti Mirana Hladnika pa omogočajo dodajanje avtomatsko zajetih, nato pa tudi ročno pregledanih besedil slovenske leposlovne klasike na Wikivir.¹³

⁴ <http://www.gov.si/cgi-bin/spl/slovar.html>.

⁵ <http://delicious.com/>.

⁶ <http://sl.wikipedia.org/>.

⁷ <http://nl2.ijs.si/dsi.html>.

⁸ <http://www.korp.fdv.uni-lj.si/>.

⁹ <http://lojze.lugos.si/stp/>.

¹⁰ <http://www.dlib.si/>.

¹¹ <http://www.lugos.si/>.

¹² <http://www2.arnes.si/~lmarus/suss/>.

¹³ http://sl.wikisource.org/wiki/Wikivir:Slovenska_leposlovna_klasika.

4. Sklep

Prispevek je poskušal podati nekaj smernic za poučevanje, predvsem pa za povečanje dostopnosti slovenske terminologije. Za razvoj slednje bi morali izkoristiti spletno revolucijo, predvsem možnosti, ki jih ponujajo razni vikiviri in drugi servisi družbenega spleta. Na ta način bi terminologijo naredili dostopno in spodbujali participacijo študentov in strokovnjakov s posameznih področij. Vendar pa bi ideološki impulz za premik iz mogoče zaprašene in težje dostopne tiskane knjige v prosto dostopne spletne vire moral priti od tistih, ki poučujejo na slovenskih šolah, in predvsem tistih, ki jim je slovenski jezik poklic.

Literatura

- Batagelj, V., 1995: *Uvod v SGML*. <http://vlado.fmf.uni-lj.si/vlado/sgml/sgmluvod.htm>.
- ISO 8879:1986: Information processing – Text and office systems – Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML).
- Logar, N., 2007: Spričevalo stroke: njen slovar. N. Postružnik, M. Kušar (ur.), *Zbornik 11. slovenske konference o odnosih z javnostmi*. Ljubljana: Slovensko društvo za odnose z javnostmi. 38–45.
- Vintar, Š., Erjavec, T., 2008: iKorpus in luščenje izrazja za islovar. T. Erjavec, J. Žganec Gros (ur.), *Zbornik Šeste konference Jezikovne tehnologije*. Ljubljana: Institut Jožef Stefan, 65–69.

Spletni viri

- Delicious social bookmarking: <http://delicious.com/>.
- Digitalna knjižnica Slovenije: <http://www.dlib.si/>.
- Društva uporabnikov Linuxa Slovenije – LUGOS: <http://www.lugos.si/>.
- iKorpus – Korpus informacijskega izrazja: <http://nl2.ijs.si/dsi.html>.
- KoRP – Korpus besedil odnosov z javnostmi: <http://www.korp.fdv.uni-lj.si/>.
- Računalniški slovarček – <http://dis-slovarcek.ijs.si/>.
- Seznam prosto dostopnih slovarjev na internetu:
<http://www.gov.si/cgi-bin/spl/slovar.html>.
- Slovar informatike islovar: <http://www.islovar.org/>.
- Slovarske, besedilne in slikovne zbirke na Inštitutu za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU: <http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/>.
- Slovenska Wikipedija: <http://sl.wikipedia.org/>.
- Slovenski terminološki portal: <http://lojze.lugos.si/stp/>.
- ŠUSS: Odgovori na jezikovna vprašanja: <http://www2.arnes.si/~lmarus/suss/>.
- Wikivir: Slovenska leposlovna klasika: http://sl.wikisource.org/wiki/Wikivir:Slovenska_leposlovna_klasika.

Knowledge of Languages in Contact – an Antidote to Domain Loss

GEORGETA CIOBANU

Politehnica University of Timisoara, Romania
gciobanu@cs.upt.ro

The paper approaches new facets of language diversity in reference to factors that influence it, namely the knowledge and findings of linguistics of languages in contact, quality and quantity in language dynamics, and their relation to terminology and domain loss.

Prispevek predstavlja nove vidike jezikovne različnosti s posebnim poudarkom na dejavnikih, ki na to vplivajo. Med njimi velja posebej izpostaviti znanje ter dognanja jezikoslovja jezikov v stiku, kakovost in količino v jezikovni dinamiki ter odnos do terminologije in izgube strokovnih področij.

Introduction

The paper approaches aspects of language that may contribute to the clarification of certain problems of language diversity:

- 1) In our opinion, knowledge of linguistics of languages in contact may be an essential factor in adding granularity to the study of language diversity;
- 2) Another issue under discussion relates to the qualitative and quantitative aspects of language dynamics;
- 3) Ways of approaching diversity in socio-economic contexts can nowadays be a source of inspiration for language as well;
- 4) Last but not least, conclusions resulting from the above pertain to terminology, with special reference to domain loss;
- 5) In our research the two languages in contact under discussion are English and Romanian; our research results are applicable to other languages in contact.

1. If contrastive linguistics focuses mainly on comparing and contrasting language structures, linguistics of languages in contact broadens the perspective by examining the way words borrowed from one language were adopted and adapted into the receiving language. One of its strong points is the global approach to the borrowing process as a natural long-lasting process against the development of the system of the receiving language, together with a granular approach to the adaptation and substitution stages (Filipović 1990). One of the key ideas is that speakers of a given language tend, in time, to adapt borrowed elements to their native language

and adjust their pronunciation, spelling, morphology and syntax to structures and patterns of their own mother tongue. Some borrowed elements take a shorter time to get adapted, some take longer, but in the end they fit into the language system that borrowed them. Some words remain unchanged, non-adapted, while others are no longer used. With such a logical approach, language influence does not necessarily represent a disastrous, dangerous impact, and any discussion of domain loss becomes redundant as the natural long-term development of language contact leading to final integration represents a natural antidote.

Two major large-scale European projects dominated the end of the last century, demonstrating the importance of linguistics of languages in contact and the consequences of its proper understanding – “The English Element in European Languages” directed by Acad. Rudolf Filipović and “English in Europe” directed by Prof. Manfred Görlach. Unfortunately, the results of these projects are not sufficiently known and disseminated.

Our research on the influence of English on the Romanian language followed the line of the former project and our research results were published within this project (Ciobanu 1991, 1996, 1997a, 1997b).

We have been in a privileged position that enabled us to continue our research for the last three decades, which provided the possibility to compare results in time and draw relevant conclusions. The final conclusion of our book *Adaptation of the English Element in Romanian* (Ciobanu 1997b) reads as follows: “All in all we can consider that most of the words borrowed from English have already been integrated or are going to be integrated in the system of the Romanian language” (Ciobanu 1997b: 212).

The research has been continued with an analysis of further, more recent lexicographic works published since 2000. The study of changes occurring in Anglicisms present in the latest Romanian dictionaries – DCR2, DOOM2, MDN – does not show new trends in the adaptation process.

2. It is important to emphasise that studies of languages in contact consider the broader context of linguistic contact, including the dynamics of the whole process from the qualitative and quantitative viewpoints in space and time. Romanian, under the influence of various languages, turned into a generous ‘receiver’ capable of assimilating words from diverse language families. This is not perceived as a drawback; on the contrary, it provided benefits derived from the international pool of words present in more languages and from the international pool of Anglicisms.

More recent Romanian studies (e.g. Avram 2003) underline the importance of including both gains and losses in the quantitative evaluation.

The most recent borrowings, most often unnecessary and unwanted, do not stand high chances of replacing existing words or surviving in the language. Consequently, they do not endanger the receiving language, Romanian in our case.

3. Since various domains nowadays borrow approaches, methods and solutions from other domains, speaking of language diversity we have to consider that many ‘recipes’ used in reference to social diversity could be applied to language as well. For instance, the integration component has been involved in the issue of managing diversity in corporations. Thus, corporation managers learnt that the best way to deal with diversity was to integrate the most diverse elements into a whole, maintaining and preserving the peculiarities of each integrated component and in this way benefiting from its strong points. Applying this to language diversity, integration proves to be the solution for many language diversity controversies.

4. The last issue under consideration is the way the above mentioned ideas can be related to terminology as well. Most of our recent terminographic works published since 2000 refer to domains that are highly exposed to the influence of Anglicisms, namely the Internet (2001), e-commerce (2003a), economics (2003b), mobile communication (2007) and branding (2009). The first two glossaries were based on a conceptual system, descriptors and basic terms provided in English and French for all the Panlatin languages involved. Beginning with English and French terms, the key recommendation given was to achieve a descriptive product, i.e. prescribe a Romanian equivalent for each entry and suggest a preferred term. This solution – descriptive/prescriptive – proved to be very convenient since usage of each entry term was recorded, and discussions on Romanian equivalents with domain experts helped in validating forms and outlining the preferred term. Even if the recorded Romanian equivalents were not always favoured or widely used by experts, the acceptable forms were kept in our glossary as possible candidates for future standardisation.

An examination of such Romanian term equivalents resulted in the following: the phenomena present at the English-Romanian language contact at the general language level were applicable in the case of terminology as well. Consequently, the general trend of gradually and naturally adapting borrowed English terms to the receiving language is the natural antidote for domain loss.

This understanding can be used in managing terminology in various domains taught at higher education institutes.

Conclusions

Considering what was mentioned above, we can draw the following conclusions:

- There is a clear necessity to approach language diversity like socio-economic diversity by integrating diverse elements into a global multilingual circuit, observing the peculiarities of individual languages.
- Any approach to language diversity should benefit from knowledge of linguistics of languages in contact at all language levels.
- Analysis of language phenomena and language planning designed as a long-term policy provide language ecology, thus avoiding domain loss.
- All the above aspects are to be used and related to terminology issues as well.

References

- Avram, M., 2003: Considerații asupra dinamicii limbii și asupra studierii ei în româna actuală. G. Pană Dindelegan (coord.) *Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii române actuale*. București: Editura Universității din București.
- Filipović, R., 1990: *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo, razvoj – značenje*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Ciobanu, G., 1991: The Phonological Adaptation of Anglicisms in Romanian. *The English Element in European Languages. Vol. 3*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb.
- Ciobanu, G., 1996: *Anglicisme în limba română* [Anglicisms in Romanian]. Timișoara: Editura Amphora.

- Ciobanu, G., 1997a: *Romanian Words of English Origin*. Timișoara: Editura Amphora.
- Ciobanu, G., 1997b: *Adaptation of the English Element in Romanian*. Timișoara: Editura Mirton.
- Ciobanu, G., 2001: *Lexicul Panlatin de Internet* [Panlatin Internet Glossary]. Canada: Terminology and Standardization Directorate – Translation Bureau, Public Works and Government Services. <http://www.bureaudelatradsuction.gc.ca>.
- Ciobanu, G., 2003a: *Lexicul Panlatin de Comerț Electronic* [eCommerce Panlatin Glossary]. Canada: Terminology and Standardization Directorate – Translation Bureau, Public Works and Government Services. <http://www.bureaudelatradsuction.gc.ca>.
- Ciobanu, G., 2003b: *Neologismes economics en los llengües romaniques a traves de la Premsa* [Economic Neologisms of Romance Languages in Press Pages]. Barcelona: Institut Universitari de Linguística Aplicada Pompeu Fabra. <http://obneo.iula.upf.edu/economia>.
- Ciobanu, G. (coord.), 2007: *Vocabular în domeniul telefoniei mobile român-englez-francez* [Vocabulary of Mobile Communications – Romanian-English-French]. Timișoara: Editura Mirton.
- Ciobanu, G. (coord.), 2009: *Termeni de branding în limbile engleză și română* [Branding Terminology in English and Romanian]. Timișoara: Editura Mirton.
- Dimitrescu, F., 1997: *Dictionar de cuvinte recente* (DCR2). București: Editura Logos ed.a 2-a.
- Dicționar ortografic, ortoepic și morfologic al limbii române* (DOOM 2), 2005. București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic ed.a 2-a.
- Marcu, F., 2000: *Marele dicționar de neologisme* (MDN). București: Editura Saeculum.

The role of terminology in the Swedish language policy 2009

ANNA-LENA BUCHER

Swedish Centre for Terminology, Sweden
anna-lena.bucher@tnc.se

In Sweden, a new Language Act entered into force on 1 July 2009. This Language Act is based on a current language policy, which includes objectives such as Swedish being the main language in Sweden and stating that **everyone has the right to their language. Swedish is envisioned to be safeguarded** so that it would continue to be the main language of Sweden in the future. The Act also includes one paragraph which defines the public institutions' particular responsibility for ensuring that "Swedish terminology within their respective domains is used, developed and made available" (literal translation of the paragraph). For the first time ever, public institutions' responsibility for their terminology is being expressed in a legal document. To this end, the Swedish Centre for Terminology (TNC) developed guidelines on how terminology work could and should become a reality in public institutions. The guidelines are based on TNC's experiences in cooperation with a number of Swedish public institutions.

Na Švedskem je 1. julija 2009 stopil v veljavo nov jezikovni zakon, ki je osnovan na trenutni jezikovni politiki, po kateri je švedščina glavni jezik na Švedskem ter po kateri naj bi bila vsakemu državljanu Švedske omogočena uporaba lastnega jezika. Švedščino je potrebno zaščititi, da bo tudi v prihodnje ostala glavni jezik Švedske. Zakon prav tako vsebuje odstavek, ki javnim ustanovam nalaga odgovornost za zagotavljanje dostopnosti, uporabe in razvoja terminologije v švedščini znotraj določenega področja. Prvič nasploh je namreč v kakem pravnem dokumentu zapisana odgovornost javnih ustanov do terminologije, ki jo te uporabljajo. S tem namenom je Švedski center za terminologijo (TNC) razvil smernice za terminološko delo v javnih ustanovah, ki so osnovane na izkušnjah omenjenega centra pri sodelovanju s številnimi javnimi ustanovami na Švedskem.

Until recently, no provisions existed in the Swedish legislation that determined the status of the Swedish language. However, a Language Act with new provisions entered into force on 1 July 2009. The main provisions contained in the Act are as follows:

- Swedish is the main language in Sweden, i.e. the common language in society which everyone needs to have access to and which can be used in all areas of society.
- Everyone living in Sweden has to be given the opportunity to learn, develop and use Swedish.
- The language of public services is Swedish.
- Public institutions have a particular responsibility for ensuring that Swedish terminology within their various specialist fields is used, developed and made available.
- The language of public services should be cultivated, simple and comprehensible.

- Swedish is the official language of Sweden in international contexts. The status of Swedish as an official EU language is to be maintained.
- Public institutions have a particular responsibility for protecting and promoting the Swedish sign language. Every deaf or hearing-impaired person or any person who needs sign language for any reason has to be given the opportunity to learn, develop and use it.
- The national minority languages in Sweden are Finnish, Yiddish, Meänkieli (Tornedal Finnish), Romany Chib and Sami; these languages have to be protected and promoted. Everyone belonging to a national minority has to be given the opportunity to learn, develop and use their minority language.
- Everyone who has a mother tongue that is not Swedish, i.e. sign language or a national minority language, has to be given the opportunity to develop and use their mother tongue.

The Language Act is based on a current language policy which includes objectives such as making Swedish the main language in Sweden and stating that everyone has the right to their language. The Act sends a clear signal regarding the importance of the Swedish language in society. Swedish is to be safeguarded so that it can continue to be Sweden's main language in the future. Linguistic diversity in Sweden and individuals' access to language are also to be safeguarded. It is very much a matter of democracy that everyone has the right to their language and that society has a common language that everyone can understand and use. The Language Act contributes to increased awareness of the importance of safeguarding the country's main language as a complete language, serving and uniting society.

Indeed, the most interesting paragraph for the Swedish Centre for Terminology (TNC) is the paragraph on public institutions' particular responsibility for ensuring that "Swedish terminology within its respective domains is used, developed and made available" (literal translation of the paragraph). For the first time ever, public institutions' responsibility for their terminology is being expressed in a legal document.

The Swedish Language Council is responsible for the implementation of the Language Act. However, it is, of course, not possible for the council to supervise and inspect every aspect of the Act in Swedish society as a whole. Thus the council decided to begin investigating how higher education institutions in Sweden were fulfilling their responsibility for ensuring that Swedish is used in higher education, i.e. do universities, etc. have an official "language policy"? How much of the curriculum is provided in English in relation to Swedish? In what way are the Swedish higher education institutions striving towards *parallellspråkighet*, i.e. a situation where two or more languages "live in parallel" to each other, or coexist, especially in domains predominant with English textbooks and teaching in English?¹

When it comes to the paragraph on terminology, the Language Council appointed TNC to provide information about the intention of the paragraph and support to public institutions in their terminology work.

To this end, TNC has developed guidelines on how terminology work could and should become a reality in public institutions. The guidelines are based on our experiences from cooperation with a number of Swedish public institutions.

¹ A report of the investigation was published in spring 2010. Title: *Engelska eller svenska? En kartläggning av språksituationen inom högre utbildning och forskning 2010*. (ISBN 978-91-7229-067-9)

Some of the main guideline “strategies” are:

Terminology coordinators

Each public institution should have a terminology coordinator as part of its staff. The coordinators’ major task is the coordination of terminology. They should therefore have both time and resources allocated for the fulfilment of this task. The role of TNC is to be the “spider in the web”.

Networking

A terminology coordinator should appoint a reference group that would include people with certain interests in and experts within the particular domain of the public institution (both from inside and outside the public institution). The terminology coordinator should take part in all network activities concerning language and terminological questions and turn to TNC if necessary, for example to ask for advice and methodological aid, for further training and participation in terminological projects.

Provision of information

A terminology coordinator is to inform internally about the fact that the function of a terminology coordination actually exists at the respective public institution and what that implies. Furthermore, he/she should provide answers to the employees’ terminological queries, document all provided inquiries and answers, and make sure that all of the public institution’s terminology is kept updated and easily accessible.

Working systematically

A terminology coordinator’s task is also to work systematically concerning the identification of the public institution’s various sub-domains and, if necessary, initiate projects for the investigation of their terminology, domain by domain. He/she is to make sure that the terminological project is well integrated into the authority’s general language policy (which in Sweden might imply writing in “clear and plain language”, translation, etc). When required, he/she should take part in creating new Swedish terms for specific EU concepts within the framework of the Swedish network *EU-språkvården*, i.e. experts within ministries and public institutions. Terminology coordination also includes harmonisation and coordination of different terminologies, for example in cooperation with other authorities.

The results of terminology projects are, in the ideal case, published and thus made easily accessible in Sweden’s national term bank Rikstermbanken (www.rikstermbanken.se).

TNC’s role in the coordination of terminology

TNC is prepared to provide training to terminology coordinators and to all other participants in various terminology projects. TNC also gives general introductions to the questions of “Why” and “How” in relation to terminology and terminology work; these are directed towards all employees at the relevant public institution.

In Sweden, almost all universities are public institutions and they have to implement the Act in many respects – developing a language policy is one, as mentioned before, developing

“their” terminology is another. And, of course, universities are not concerned only with one terminology which can be considered “their”. Every training programme has its terminology and therefore universities have to participate in the terminology work of certain domains in order to avoid duplication of work.

Two current examples of inter-university terminology work in Sweden:

A group with representatives from several universities is working on terminology within life sciences such as biotechnology, molecular biology and genetics. Their main task is to create Swedish terms, since most of the concepts enter Swedish via English.

Another example is history research. Historians from several universities in Sweden wish to develop English terminology that could be used to describe Swedish history. As the situation is now, Swedish historians have problems in writing in English in international, scientific journals about Swedish history and history research since many of the Swedish culture specific concepts do not have equivalents in English. Special attention has to be given in order to transfer the knowledge about Swedish history into English as well as possible.

These two terminology projects are demanding in various ways; they are, however, possible to implement if proper terminology principles and methods are used.

English and language diversity

FIDELMA NÍ GHALLCHOBHAIR

Foras na Gaeilge, Ireland
FNiGhallchobhair@forasnagaeilge.ie

The European Association for Terminology (EAFI) has aimed to form contacts with organisations or institutes working in the area of terminology throughout Europe since its foundation in Denmark in 1996. One of the topics that has consistently emerged at EAFI events is the growing concern about the dominance of English in many linguistic communities in Europe. Since this phenomenon has serious implications for terminology in various languages, the EAFI is interested in stimulating awareness and debate about the impact of domain loss, arising, at least in part, from using English (or any language other than one's mother tongue) as the primary medium of instruction, especially in specialist fields. One should realise that domain-loss is only the beginning, which is generally followed by a more vigorous and generalised penetration into the very fabric of the mother tongue and, ultimately, to a language shift. This conference has been organised in order to explore the situation in various European language communities in relation to language diversity and the state of national languages in higher education.

Evropska zveza za terminologijo (EAFI) že vse od ustanovitve leta 1996 na Danskem poskuša navezati stik z evropskimi organizacijami ali inštituti, ki delujejo na področju terminologije. Eno izmed perečih vprašanj, ki je na dogodkih, ki jih organizira EAFI, vedno znova izpostavljeno, je vedno večji vpliv angleščine na številne jezikovne skupnosti v Evropi. Ker ima ta resne posledice za področje terminologije v različnih jezikih, se EAFI ukvarja z osveščanjem in spodbujanjem razprave o vplivu izgube strokovnih področij zaradi, vsaj deloma, uporabe angleščine (ali katerega drugega nematernega jezika) kot primarnega sredstva poučevanja, še posebej na specializiranih področjih. Treba se je zavedati, da je izguba strokovnih področij zgolj začetek: navadno sledi bolj grobo in obsežnejše poseganje v materni jezik, na koncu pa pride do zamenjave jezika. Konferenca je namenjena seznanjanju z razmerami v različnih jezikovnih skupnostih v Evropi s poudarkom na jezikovni različnosti in položaju nacionalnih jezikov v visokem šolstvu.

The European Association for Terminology (EAFI) has aimed to form contacts with organisations or institutes working in the area of terminology throughout Europe since its foundation in Denmark in 1996. Our mission is to promote plurilingualism and terminology work in all European languages. Apart from organizing seminars, workshops and conferences, we work to raise awareness of the terminology work being carried out through disseminating newflashes, compilation of a directory of people and organizations involved in terminology work in Europe, organization of the biennial International Terminology Awards in association with TermNet. The 2010 Terminology Award Ceremony will take place on the occasion

of the Fifth Terminology Summit which will be held at the Károli Gáspár Univeristy in Budapest (Hungary) on November 12th and 13th, 2010.

At all of the EAFT events in which I have participated, one topic has consistently emerged in one form or another, that is the growing concern about the dominance of English in many linguistic communities in Europe. Part of the dynamic fuelling of this dominance is the increasing use of English as the language of instruction and scientific discourse. While it is always useful to have a lingua franca, there are consequences and a price to pay. We've had linguas francas in Europe before, namely Greek, Latin and French. We can bear witness today to the far-reaching linguistic consequences of Latin dominance, but the nature of the world has changed dramatically since the time of the Roman Empire, and even since the time of French linguistic dominance from the mid-seventeenth till the early twentieth century. Through accelerated and readily accessible forms of communication news travels very fast nowadays, and before we have time to translate or absorb it it is replaced by new news.

Domain loss is a term which I first encountered on joining the EAFT in 2004. I was, of course, very familiar with the concept and with its designation in our own language – Irish – but since terminological discourse was and still is carried out almost exclusively within the Irish-speaking community and through the medium of Irish in our country, we tend to be unfamiliar with the metaterminology of terminology work in English. The discovery that this English term was being repeatedly evoked – in relation to the dominance of English – since the late 1980's and particularly in the Nordic countries, filled me with a mixture of, on the one hand, surprise and concern, and on the other, relief and excitement. I was surprised and concerned because, at that time, I had no idea of the extent of the phenomenon in the Nordic languages and – it turns out – in numerous other languages. And I experienced relief and excitement because other language communities had identified and named the phenomenon with an English term – and were actively analysing and researching it. So it wasn't just an Irish problem after all. We Irish speakers, while being very familiar with this concept, tend to blame ourselves for the disintegration of our language and do not expect that major European and world languages could suffer the same fate as ourselves. Obviously, domain loss is not a new phenomenon – it has always existed since the beginning of language, or at least since the beginning of language shift. We need only consider for a moment the demise of previous lingua francas on the European stage such as Latin or French to see how language shift respects no prescribed loyalties or boundaries. And it may well come to pass that English too will meet its Rubicon. But not yet. As we have seen, even with the best of informed intentions, the organisers of this conference were forced to concede that interpreting into a 3rd or 4th language would be too expensive and that we are effectively from the outset the victim of the topic with which we want to engage.

The EAFT has paid some attention to this phenomenon at past conferences and seminars (Barcelona 2004, Brussels 2006, Dublin 2007, Québec 2008) and in each case the reaction of those in attendance has been highly animated because all recognized the phenomenon but most were too polite to point out the elephant in the room. I remember making some comment about this at 2004 Terminology Summit in Barcelona and the moderator, Professor Philippe Thoiron from France, responded "Only somebody from Ireland could get away with saying something like that!" This was when I realised the uniqueness of our situation as Irish speakers – we are all English speakers also but do not necessarily have the same loyalty or fear of questioning as many English speakers from further afield. So now the secret is officially out of the bag – there is a BIG elephant in the room and his name is English. Let us try and engage with the elephant.

Some facts about English

Although English has no official status in the UK, USA or Australia, and has no worldwide regulatory body with the power to change matters such as spelling, it is an official language in 53 sovereign states and 25 non-sovereign entities. It has 375 million native speakers and 1400 million second-language speakers, adding up to a total of 1.8 billion (not including 3rd, 4th or 5th language speakers). It is the third largest language in the world based on native speakers, after Mandarin Chinese and Spanish, but when you combine native and non-native speakers it is probably the most commonly spoken language on earth and is the most frequently taught second language in the world. As the lingua franca of the modern era, it is the dominant international language in communication, science, business, aviation, entertainment, radio and diplomacy. In India, where it has the status of ‘subsidiary official language’, it is used extensively in business and administration. Of the 11 official languages of South Africa, English is the most commonly used in official and commercial public life. In Pakistan, where it is the 5th recognized regional language, it is becoming the language of aspiring writers and English-medium education is to be extended to all schools. In Malta, it is the language of administration and the main medium of instruction at university. In Israel, where it has a *de facto* official language role, it is mandatory in all schools and universities. It is one of the 2 working languages of the UN, the main working language of ISO and of the International Olympic Committee.

English is increasingly becoming the main medium of instruction at 3rd level and of academic publications in many countries. The Swedish National Language Council was established in 2006 to monitor the development of spoken and written Swedish, and to monitor the use and status of all other languages spoken in Sweden and, under the title ‘The future of Swedish’ the Language Council states:

During the last decades, English has started to compete with Swedish in a growing number of fields in Swedish society – in large, international companies, in the educational system and in the media industry. This poses a threat to democratic values as many Swedes have insufficient knowledge of English.

Motivations for the spread of English

The British Empire, which began with the colonization of Ireland in the 16th century (already under Anglo-Norman rule since the late 12th century), continued to expand until after WW2; it covered 25% of the earth’s total area and held sway over 25% of the world’s population in 1921. The rise of the Empire and the growth of global trade served not only to introduce English to the world, but to introduce words into English. Hindi, and the other languages of the Indian subcontinent, provided many words, such as *pundit*, *shampoo*, *pajamas*, and *juggernaut*. Virtually every language on Earth has contributed to the development of English, from the Finnish *sauna* and the Japanese *tycoon*, to the vast contributions of French and Latin, each of which constitute 29% of the vocabulary of English.

During the 14th century, English replaced Latin as the medium of instruction in schools, and replaced French as the language of the courts and began to be used in Parliament. The Bible was first translated into English, Chaucer began to pen *The Canterbury Tales* and the linguistic phenomenon known as the Great Vowel Shift began about 1400.

The 15th century saw the arrival of the first English printing press. The invention of the printing press by Gutenberg in Germany around 1454 revolutionized written communication, including scientific discourse, and had a significant effect on languages in that printing helped to develop a 'standard' language and a more codified form of spelling. The first printing press was introduced in England by William Caxton in 1476, which led to the standardization of written English, the expansion of vocabulary and the development of inflection and syntax. Latin had been the scholarly and diplomatic *lingua franca* from the 7th-17th centuries, and French had been the everyday language of the aristocracy from the 11th-14th centuries. Old English, formed from Germanic dialects of Anglo-Saxons and spoken by the common people during the 5th-11th centuries, blended with Anglo-Norman and developed into Middle English during the 11th-15th centuries. The advent of printing advanced the development of English and led to the establishment of English as the national language of England.

The Reformation, embraced by King Henry VIII in the 16th century led to a new sense of pride among the population of England, whose attitude to English changed from one of inferiority in deference to Greek and Latin to one of national pride. The Authorized (King James) version of the Bible in 1611 was acclaimed by some as representative of the golden height achieved by early modern English.

Shakespeare was born in 1564, adding some 2000 words to the English lexicon, 40 years before Robert Cawdrey published the first English dictionary, *Table Alphabeticall*. A century later, 1702, saw the publication of the first daily, English-language newspaper, *The Daily Courant*, in London.

The English colonization of North America and the subsequent creation of a distinct American dialect further influenced the development of English. Some pronunciations and usages "froze" when they reached the American shore. The American dialect also served as the route of introduction for many native American words into the English language, e.g., *raccoon*, *tomato*, *canoe*, *barbecue*, *savanna*, and *hickory*. Spanish has also had a great influence on American English. *Armadillo*, *mustang*, *canyon*, *ranch*, *stampede*, and *vigilante* are all examples of Spanish words that made their way into English through the settlement of the American West.

During the 18th century, Samuel Johnson published his famous dictionary, and Cook discovered Australia, where a British penal colony was established.

The Industrial revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries began in England about 1760, resulting in the changeover from manual to mechanized work methods and a rapid concentration of people moving to cities from the countryside. The rise of the technological society necessitated new words for things and ideas that had not previously existed. For this, English relied heavily on Latin and Greek. Words like *oxygen*, *protein*, *nuclear*, and *vaccine* did not exist in the classical languages, but they were created from Latin and Greek roots. Such neologisms were not exclusively created from classical roots, however, and English roots were used for such terms as *horsepower* and *typewriter*. This burst of neologisms continues today, perhaps most visibly in the field of electronics and computers, e.g., *byte*, *cyber-*, *bios*, *hard-drive*, and *microchip*. English now has the largest vocabulary of any language on earth.

The motivation for OED (Oxford English Dictionary) project (which began in 1857) was fired partly by the religious zeal of founding members of the project to spread the Protestant faith and provide the faithful with the linguistic tools to read and understand the Bible.

With the breakup of the British Empire and move to independence of former colonies, many retained English as an official language.

The emergence of the USA as a world superpower, and the prominent role played by English-speaking nations in the aftermath of WW2, the information revolution and globalization have all contributed to galvanising the supremacy of English, which became the new academic *lingua franca*, the language of multimedia – film, popular music and culture, and the Internet. With more accessible world travel, and cheaper flights, commercial and tourism interests were served by a global language.

And so it came to pass that the elephant grew bigger and stronger, and went forth and multiplied.

The linguist and writer, David Crystal, considers that English was repeatedly in the right place at the right time, and that the biggest setback to English would be if Bill Gates had grown up speaking Chinese.

Vloga Inštituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU pri vsakdanjem jezikovnem in jezikoslovnem osveščanju

ANDREJA ŽELE

Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU, Slovenija
andrejaz@zrc-sazu.si

Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU s sekcijsko ureditvijo glede na različna področja in vidike obravnave slovenščine je državno središče za sistematično spremljanje in razlago slovenskega jezikovnega gradiva; rezultat teh raziskav so slovarji, zbirke in priručniki slovenskega jezika. Inštitut za slovenski jezik že več kot šestdeset let zbira in ohranja slovensko leksiko in sprotno beleži razvoj slovenščine. Trajna in kontinuirana je zlasti skrb za dograjevanje oz. stalni razvoj teh zbirk in za njihovo digitalizacijo, saj so omenjene večmilijonske zbirke že same po sebi odraz razvojnega stanja slovenščine, hkrati pa so izhodišče za vse temeljne in aplikativne jeziko(slov)ne projekte. Kar pa je še treba poudariti: rezultati raziskav so uporabni tudi v različnih strokah. Mimo slovarskih projektov splošnega, strokovnega in narečnega besedja v slovenščini je treba poudariti tudi vsakdanje sprotno uporabno zlasti jezikovno svetovanje zelo različnim uporabnikom. Za razvoj strokovnega izrazja oz. leksike skrbi Sekcija za terminološke slovarje, ki se ukvarja z raziskavo terminološkega izrazja ter pripravo in izdelavo razlagalnih slovarjev posameznih strok – pri vsakem slovarju poleg leksikologov sodeluje tudi skupina vrhunskih zunanjih strokovnjakov, ki so univerzitetni predavatelji, uveljavljeni znanstveniki ali strokovnjaki na določenem področju.

The Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language, SRC SASA, is organised according to sections each dealing with a particular field and aspect of the Slovenian language. It is a national centre for systematically tracking and explaining texts written in Slovenian, which ultimately results in the compilation of Slovenian language dictionaries, collections and manuals. The Institute has been collecting and preserving Slovenian lexis for more than 60 years, all the while keeping track of the language and its development. Particular focus is given to a continual development and digitalisation of collections, since collections with several million entries in their own right reflect the evolution of Slovenian and at the same time represent a starting point for all foundational and applicative language/linguistic projects – we should also mention that the results of this kind of research are valid also in other fields. Apart from conducting dictionary projects involving general, professional and dialectal lexica, the Institute also provides linguistic advice to a great variety of users for their everyday use of the Slovenian language. The development of professional terminology lies in the domain of the Section for Terminological Dictionaries, which is involved in researching terminological terms and preparing and compiling explanatory dictionaries of various fields – the work on each dictionary sees the cooperation of a team of top external experts (apart from lexicologists) consisting of university lecturers, established scientists or experts in a given field.

O vlogi Inštituta

Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU (od leta 1982 je Inštitut v sklopu Znanstvenoraziskovalnega centra pri SAZU) s sekcijsko ureditvijo glede na različna področja in vidike obravnave slovenščine je državno središče za sistematično spremljanje in razlago slovenskega jezikovnega gradiva; rezultat teh raziskav so slovarji, zbirke in priročniki slovenskega jezika. Od ustanovitve leta 1945 naprej zbira jezikovno gradivo in ga uporablja za izdelavo temeljnih del slovenskega jezikoslovja (slovar knjižnega jezika, pravopisni in pravorečni slovar, opisno in zgodovinsko slovnico, historično-onomastični slovar, historično-topografski slovar, lingvistični atlas, zbornik narečnih besedil, fonogramski arhiv dialektov).

Trdno izhodiščno bazo za nadaljnji leksikalni in normativno-stilni razvoj slovenščine z raziskovalno dejavnostjo nudijo Etimološko-onomastična sekcija s sistematičnimi raziskavami izvora in etimologije celotnega slovenskega izraznega fonda, Sekcija za zgodovino slovenskega jezika z raziskovanjem nastanka in normativnega ustaljevanja slovenskega knjižnega jezika in Dialektološka sekcija z raziskavami slovenskih narečij na vsem slovenskem etničnem prostoru, z izdelavo jezikovnih atlasov in kart, medtem ko se sinhrona obravnava današnje slovenščine združuje in povezuje v Leksikološki sekciji, ki se ukvarja z vprašanji sodobnega slovenskega jezika in njegove leksike, in v Sekciji za terminološke slovarje, ki v tematskem smislu obsega interdisciplinarno raziskovanje slovenske terminologije, leta 2001 se je slednjima pridružil še Laboratorij za slovenskega jezika, kjer nastaja oz. se sprotno dograjuje prostodostopni besedilni korpus Nova beseda, dostopen je tudi spletni seznam besed slovenskega jezika s povezavami na različne vire, ki je nastajal z namenom na enem, vsem dostopnem mestu zbrati večino slovenskih besed z osnovnimi podatki, npr. o besedni vrsti, in s povezavami na spletna mesta, kjer je o teh besedah mogoče izvedeti več. Trenutno v okviru obravnave sodobne slovenske leksike nastajata *Slovar novejšega besedja*, kot leksikološko-leksikografska podlaga za nov razlagalni slovar slovenskega jezika, sodobni pravopisni priročnik v knjižni, elektronski in spletni različici in nekaj terminoloških slovarjev.

Temeljne raziskave slovenskega jezika v sedanosti in zgodovinskem razvoju, ki jih opravlja Inštitut, in obsežne gradivske zbirke, edinstvene v Sloveniji, so pomembne za status in razvoj slovenščine in za razvoj zlasti domačega jezikoslovja. Trajna in kontinuirana je zlasti skrb za dograjevanje oz. stalni razvoj teh zbirk in za njihovo digitalizacijo, saj so omenjane večmilijonske zbirke že same po sebi odraz razvojnega stanja slovenščine, hkrati pa so izhodišče za vse temeljne in aplikativne jeziko(slo)vne projekte. Treba pa je še poudariti, da so rezultati raziskav uporabni tudi v različnih strokah.

Vsakdanje jezikovno in jezikoslovno osveščanje

Mimo slovarskih projektov splošnega, strokovnega in narečnega besedja v slovenščini je treba poudariti tudi vsakdanje sprotno uporabno zlasti jezikovno svetovanje zelo različnim uporabnikom. Tudi vprašanja oz. poizvedovanja so zelo različna – od normativnih zadreg glede pisave ločil, velike začetnice, narazen-skupaj pa do bolj ali manj utemeljenih predlogov slovenskih ustreznice za novo predmetnost oz. pojav z »uvoženim« oz. prevzetim poimenovanjem. Spodbudno za izrazno bogatenje slovenščine in zlasti za vzdrževanje in bogatenje strokovne slovenščine je to, da naše vsakdanje razpravljanje o jezikovni rabi in možnih rešitvah (telefonsko, pretežno pa že po elektronski pošti) še zdaleč ni omejeno na t. i. akademsko sfero, temveč je odzivnost razširjena na praktično vso populacijo – od prevajalcev, literarnih ustvarjalcev, posa-

meznih jezikovnih navdušencev, obrtnikov do različnih predstavništev firm, državnih in vladnih uradov, strokovnih služb, pa do inštitutov in drugih strokovnih ustanov. Kot rečeno, spodbudna je že jezikovna ustvarjalnost spraševalcev; določena stopnja jezikovne osveščenosti pa se kaže tudi pri normativnih vprašanjih (dopustna stopnja podomačevanja prevzete leksike, pisava velike začetnice, pisava skupaj-narazen, pisava ločil ipd.) in pri poizvedovanjih o ustrežnejši stilni in zvrstni uporabi določenega izraza oz. besede, npr. *dekanka/dekanja/dekanica*. Dobivamo in zbiramo pa tudi pobude, pripombe, mnenja, opozorila, dopolnitve, npr. Kako utemeljevati zvezo *pljučna pečenka*? Bi poleg *umetniški vodja* šlo tudi *umetniška vodja*? Kako je z ustrežnostjo rabe *prihodnji* nasproti *naslednji*? Bi bila možna uporaba slovenskih ustreznice glagola *vnovljati* ali glagolnika *vnovljanje* namesto dosedanje *predelave* za niz postopkov (regeneracija, ponovna uporaba, recikliranje)? S kolegi na fakulteti za matematiko in fiziko menimo, da je za *hovercraft* primerna slovenska beseda *lebdilnik*, saj lebdí na zračni blazini, prav tako ima lep prizvok. Dobro bi bilo navesti tudi slovenske ustreznice za mesece. Kriket zveza Slovenije si želi poenotiti slovensko izrazje za *kriket*. Namesto sedanjega umetno narejenega gesla *metličan* naj se uporabi realna zveza *metliška črnina*, in še novica, da se nanovo uveljavlja še poimenovanje *metliček*.

Pomenljiva je tudi vzratna, največkrat posredna informacija o razširjenosti uporabe normativnih priročnikov in pa razlagalnega slovarja knjižne slovenščine in terminoloških slovarjev.

Skrb za razvoj strokovne leksike

Sekcija za terminološke slovarje se ukvarja z raziskavo terminološkega izraza ter pravo in izdelavo razlagalnih slovarjev posameznih strok. Pri vsakem slovarju sodelujejo leksikologi Sekcije za terminološke slovarje in skupina vrhunskih zunanjih strokovnjakov, ki so univerzitetni predavatelji, uveljavljeni znanstveniki ali strokovnjaki na določenem področju, naenkrat jih pri različnih terminoloških slovarjih sodeluje okoli sto.

Poleg že narejenih in izdanih terminoloških slovarjev so trenutno v delu *Slovar kemijske procesne tehnike*, *Botanični terminološki slovar*, *Pravnozgodovinski terminološki slovar*, *Umetnostnozgodovinski terminološki slovar*, *Smučarski terminološki slovar*, *Veterinarski terminološki slovar*, *Slovar evropskega prava*, *Pravni terminološki slovar*, *Farmacevtski terminološki slovar*, *Slovar elektronike, elektrotehnike in informatike* (slov.-it. in it.-slov.); neke vrste rdeča nit tehniškega izraza je nastajajoči *Slovenski tehniški slovar*, v okviru katerega je nastal tudi *Priročnik za tehnike*, ki so ga pripravili sodelavci komisije za tehniški slovar. Ob tolikšni že dosednji produkciji terminoloških slovarjev je dokaj realen načrt za prihodnost tudi sodobni *Splošni terminološki slovar*.

Zaradi obsežne interdisciplinarnosti so v slovarske projekte vse pogosteje vključene tudi različne gospodarske družbe in državne ustanove s svojimi strokovnjaki.

Slovenščina v prepletu raziskovalnega in pedagoškega dela

Vse več sodelavcev Inštituta redno sodeluje v izobraževalnih programih vseh treh slovenskih univerz, vedno več pa je takih, ki redno predavajo na tujih univerzah. Na tak način se sprotna spoznanja o slovenski leksiki, tako splošni kot strokovni, neposredno širijo v visokošolske ustanove. V okviru sistema mladih raziskovalcev se vsakoletno redno izobražuje nekaj novih podiplomcev.

Inštitut za slovenski jezik že več kot šestdeset let zbira in ohranja slovensko leksiko in sprotno beleži razvoj slovenščine.

