Moreno Fernández, Francisco (2000): ¿Qué español enseñar? Madrid. Arco Libros.

Moreno Fernández, Francisco (2004): Los estudios dialectales sobre el español de España (1979-2004) Nr. 26/2/2004. LEA. 65-100.

Moreno Fernández, Francisco (2010): Las variedades de la lengua española y su enseñanza. Madrid. Arco Libros.

Moreno Fernández, Francisco (2012): Sociolingüística cognitiva. Madrid. Iberoamericana Verbuert.

Morgenthaler García, Laura (2008): Identidad y pluricentrismo lingüístico: hablantes canarios frente a la estandarización. Madrid/Frankfurt and Main. IberoamericanaVervuert.

Preston, Dennis R. (2004): Language with an attitude. In: The Handbook of Language Variation and Change. J. K. Chambers, P. Trudgill and N. Schilling-Estes. Oxford 2002. Blackwell. 40-66.

RAE/ASALE (2009): Nueva Gramática de la Lengua española. Madrid. Espasa.

Remlinger, Kathryn A./Joseph Salmons/Luanne von Schneidemesser (2009): Revised Perceptions: Changing Dialect Perceptions in Wisconsin and Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Nr. 84, 2/2009. American Speech, 176-192.

Rosch, Eleanor (1978): Principles of categorization. In: Cognition and Categorizarion. E. Rosch y B. Lloyd (eds.): Hillsdale 1978. Lawrence Erlbaum. 27-48.

Rosch, Eleanor/Carolyn B. Mervis (1975): Family resemblances: studies in the internal structure of categories. Nr. 7/1975. Cognitive Psychology, 573-605.

Trudgill, Peter (1986): Dialects in contact. Oxford. Basil Blackwell.

Villena Ponsoda, Juan Andrés (2001): Identidad y variación lingüística: Prestigio nacional y lealtad vernacular en el español hablado en Andalucía. In: Identidades lingüísticas en la España autonómica: actas de las Jornadas Hispánicas 1997 de la Sociedad Suiza de estudios Hispánicos. G. Bossong, F. Báez de Aguilar González. Frankfurt and Main 2001. Iberoamericana-Vervuert 107-150.

Kühl, Karoline (2015): South Schleswig Danish. Caught between privileges and disregard. In: Rudolf Muhr, Dawn Marley, Heinz L. Kretzenbacher und Anu Bissoonauth (Hg.): Pluricentric languages. New perspectives in theory and description. Wien: Peter Lang, S. 227-240.

South Schleswig Danish:
Caught between privileges and disregard

Karoline Kühl*

(University of Copenhagen, Denmark)
jkt404@hum.ku.dk

Abstract: South Schleswig Danish is the non-dominant variety of Danish that is spoken within the Danish national minority in Northern Germany. South Schleswig Danish differs structurally from Denmark Danish due to the Danish-German bilingualism of the minority members: It is a contact variety. In many respects, it displays prototypical features of a non-dominant variety in its earlier stages (status asymmetry, no codification), but the greatest hindrance to the further development of South Schleswig Danish into a variety in its own right seems to be its existence within the politically acknowledged and financially supported national Danish minority. The support covers the maintenance of Danish language within the minority because the Danish language is considered an essential link between the minority and its motherland. Thus, there seems to be little chance that South Schleswig Danish with its contact-induced features will replace Danish as a codified variety in its own right.

1. Introduction

South Schleswig Danish (hereafter, SSD) is the non-dominant variety of Danish spoken within the Danish national minority in Northern Germany (see section 2) in a contiguous language area just south of the Danish-German border. SSD is a result of long-standing and stable language contact between Danish and German in the South Schleswig region.[1] The variety shows linguistic *Abstand* to Denmark Danish through specific and established SSD features as well as through the persistent ad hoc bilingual language use of its speakers (see section

---

* In: Rudolf Muhr, Dawn Marley in collaboration with Anu Bissoonauth and Heinz L. Kretzenbacher (eds.) (2015): Pluricentric Languages. New Perspectives in Theory and Description. Wien et. al., Peter Lang Verlag. p. 243-256.

[1] South Schleswig is the southern part of the former duchy of Schleswig (in today's Germany) where the Danish minority lives. North Schleswig (in Denmark) is the home region of a German minority.

3). SSD is not codified, and use of SSD is at large restricted to communication within the minority.

In this chapter, I will argue that SSD has little chance of further development into a pluricentric language in its own right for several reasons. Although the historical much larger geographical extension of the minority's motherland, Denmark, resulted in the presence of Danish in a number of places outside Denmark (South Schleswig, the Faroe Islands, Greenland, and historically Iceland and Norway), Danish is not recognised as a pluricentric language and thus acknowledges no non-dominant varieties. Furthermore, the complicated relationship between the overt and covert prestige, with which speakers of non-dominant varieties of pluricentric languages must cope, impedes SSD's movement toward acknowledgement (see section 4).

The covert prestige of SSD is supported by a general disregard for (regional) language variation and a very high degree of linguistic centralisation in Denmark (see section 5). However, SSD's development is halted not only by non-recognition and disregard but also by the privileges that are granted Danish (not SSD) as the minority language: Danish (not SSD) is officially acknowledged, protected, and supported as a minority language in Northern Germany. Further development of SSD toward a codified and officially recognised variety in its own right would throw doubt on the political and financial support of the minority and also the privileges granted to Danish as a minority language.

Officially acknowledged language change from Danish to SSD would weaken the minority's ties to Denmark. The official recognition and maintenance of Danish as a minority language thus seems to be the most effective hindrance to any further development of SSD into a acknowledged (non-dominant) variety and, in consequence, of Danish into a pluricentric language.

2. The Danish minority in Northern Germany

Today's border between Denmark and Germany was determined by popular plebiscites in 1920, a few years after Germany's defeat in World War I. The new border created minority groups on both sides of the border and generated contiguous language areas across the Danish-German borderline. The Danish state has bestowed an annual grant to the Danish minority group ever since. The money was used to establish Danish schools and associations with the aim of promoting Danish language and culture (cf. Pedersen 2000: 15). In 1955, ten years after the end of World War II, the bilateral Bonn-Copenhagen Declarations were signed as a result of years of mutual rapprochement and confidence-building processes. This led to a largely peaceful coexistence and cooperation of minority and majority in the federal state of Schleswig-Holstein: The Bonn Declaration lays down binding bilateral financial support to the Danish minority institutions[2] as well as possibilities of political representation: The minority's political party, *Südschleswiger Wählerverein* (SSW, South Schleswigian Voters' Association), is exempt from the 5% vote threshold for parliamentary representation and thus has a fair opportunity for political participation (J. Kühl 1998).[3] Furthermore, the declaration states the right of the approximately 50,000 minority members to freely profess their affiliation to the minority and to use the Danish language.

The German state has no right to either examine or dispute an individual's commitment to the minority or to make use of 'objective' criteria such as ethnicity or language competence in order to assess the minority's size. The legal status of the minority is supported by the recognition of Danish as a minority language in Germany in the 'European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages' (effective since 1999) as well as in the 'Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities' (ratified by Germany in 1998). The maintenance of the Danish language is made possible through and within the minority's institutional framework: Kindergartens, schools, cultural associations, senior care, sports clubs, youth associations, libraries, a daily newspaper, a charity organisation, and congregations. The 56 kindergartens, 44 primary schools, and two secondary schools provide minority children with a complete Danish school education in Germany, and graduation from the secondary schools allows for university studies in both Denmark and Germany. The minority's four well-funded libraries are popular, and the libraries' book buses traverse the region to enable people in remote areas to borrow Danish reading/listening materials.

The daily newspaper *Flensborg Avis* provides regional as well as national and international news in both Danish and German (as well as some Frisian, another minority language of the region). The association for cultural issues, *Sydslesvigsk Forening* (SSF, South Schleswigian Association), offers and supports a wide variety of activities, including the invitation of Danish cultural figures (authors, musicians, comedians etc.) to South Schleswig (see J. Kühl 2005 on the institutions of the minority).

The well-established institutional structure makes a minority Danish life in Northern Germany possible and provides great possibilities for maintaining Danish. It is no exaggeration to say that the Danish minority has a privileged position compared to other minorities around the world, both within the German majority society and with regard to the connection to its motherland; a connection that is politically accepted, defined, and stable. However, the minority's political, financial, cultural, and linguistic rights and privileges depend entirely on the maintenance of the status quo, i.e. the maintenance of its status as a national Danish minority with Danish as the official language.

---

[2] In 2013, financial support from Denmark amounted to 447 million Danish crowns (around 60,000 million Euro), see Sydslesvigudvalget on www.uvm.dk

[3] The party is currently part of the government of the federal state of Schleswig-Holstein.

The minority is nonetheless not a homogeneous and static Danish national group within a German majority: The internal member structure of the minority has been described in terms of several circles (J. Kühl 1994; 1998: 37-42) constituted through various weightings of Danish ethnicity, culture, and language. The inner circles, the 'core' of the minority, consists of people who identify themselves with the minority; have done so for much or all of their lives; and possess 'objective' minority markers such as Danish ethnicity, knowledge of Danish culture and traditions, and/or Danish language. The further out one goes, the looser this connection and the presence of the associated objective criteria become. The outermost circles' connection to the minority is unstable and situational, created, for instance, by children attending a minority sports club for a period of time. The outer circles are thus open towards the majority. Here, the objective criteria of a connection to the Danish minority are (mostly) limited. J. Kühl (1994: 50-67) labels the inner circle's relationship to the minority as 'membership', the middle circle's relationship as 'affiliation', and the outermost circle's relationship as mere 'affinity'. The quantitative relationship between the groups is uncertain as no institution has the right to examine the individual's commitment to the minority. Still, it becomes clear that the minority as a whole is not a closed Danish system, but a heterogeneous and dynamic group characterised by versatile individual choices and biculturalism and bilingualism.

3. South Schleswig Danish

The members of the minority are all Danish-German bilinguals. Although the bilingualism varies from balanced Danish-German bilingualism to a variety of L1/L2 distributions and competences, this creates a stable speech community that is bilingual within the same language combination. The receptive and productive Danish-German bilingualism of most members implies that there are few obstacles to freely mixing and switching between the languages and, as a result, overt bilingual Danish-German language use is a default mode of speaking within the minority. It seems that hardly anybody uses pure Denmark Danish within the minority (though to my knowledge, this has never been investigated), not least because of the necessary South Schleswig words (i.e. established loans from German, see further down).

Regardless of their national affiliation/affinity and their participation in the Danish minority, Danish is not (and historically has never been) the home language or L1 for most of the members of the minority (Pedersen 2000; K. Kühl 2008; Fredsted 2009). In the traditionally multilingual region of Schleswig (today's Northern Germany and South Denmark), there has historically been no straightforward connection between national affiliation/affinity and language use and the (changing) political borders (cf. K. Kühl 2008: 39, 61; Fredsted 2009). Danish is an early L2, learned from kindergarten, for many (perhaps most) minority members. However, what is acquired and accordingly spoken by many members of the minority is not Denmark Danish but SSD. SSD differs from Denmark Danish both in ad hoc bilingual language use and in specific SSD features. The specific SSD features are the result of a long-standing and stable language contact between Danish and German in the South Schleswig region.[4] Due to the influence of German (through ad hoc language mixing as well as in established SSD features), SSD and Denmark Danish are not necessarily mutually intelligible.

Empirical research that distinguishes between established SSD features and ad hoc bilingual language use is scarce to non-existent, despite SSD being quite a popular topic for linguistic research. In particular, research on adult SSD speakers that goes beyond recollection and analysis of idiosyncratic bilingual language use (e.g. Christophersen 1979; partly Pedersen 2000) is lacking. Quantitatively robust and balanced research into the language use in South Schleswig is limited to the investigation of bilingual language use by younger and older minority adolescents (cf. K. Kühl 2008; Fredsted 2007; Carstensen and K. Kühl 2007; Pedersen 2000). Still, the general focus in this research has been more on the bilingual situation than on SSD as a variety. Thus, more empirically based research distinguishing between ad hoc Danish-German bilingual language use and established SSD features in the speech of adults in non-institutional contexts is desirable. The following brief description of established specific SSD features combines results from different publications (especially my own PhD thesis, K.

---

[4] The regional dialects Low German as well as the Danish dialect South Jutish (indigenous speakers of which were still found south of today's border at the beginning of the 20th century) do not contribute to SSD. Today, South Jutish is extinct as an indigenous language in Northern Germany, and a general language shift from Low German to High German has taken place. Still, features of Low German are default parts of spoken Northern High German, creating a regionally marked spoken variety.

Kühl 2008) and personal observations (real life and social media). However, due to the desiderata mentioned above, the list of specific SSD features is probably not exhausting.

The established features that distinguish SSD from Denmark Danish involve all structural levels, viz. syntactical, morphosyntactical, lexical, and phonological features. A salient syntactic feature is the placement of obligatory complements in relation to the verb(s) in main declarative clauses: SSD often follows the German 'sentence bracket' where the finite verb and the infinite verb (or a verb particle) form a bracket comprising first the optional complements and then the obligatory complements, i.e. $[SV_{fin}Compl.V_{inf}/V_{part}]$. This differs from Danish, in which the complements or objects follow the infinite verb (or a verb particle), i.e. $[SV_{fin}V_{inf}/V_{part}$ Compl.] (Pedersen 2000: 218-219). Furthermore, SSD differs from Denmark Danish with regard to the internal order of adverbials of time and place: Unlike Denmark Danish, SSD places the time adverbials before the place adverbials (cf. K. Kühl 2008: 200; Pedersen 2000: 218; Braunmüller 1995).

Apart from differences in word order, SSD is distinguished from Denmark Danish by its clear tendency toward analytic possessives with the prepositions *af* ('of') or *fra* ('from') instead of the synthetic –s-possessives that prevail in Denmark Danish (e.g. SSD *hovedet fra kvinden* vs. DD *kvindens hoved* 'the woman's head) (K. Kühl 2008: 166). SSD is further characterised by a tendency toward the use of a preposed definite article instead of the enclitic definite article of Denmark Danish (*huset* 'the house' where *–et* is the article morpheme). The preposed definite article in Denmark Danish is demonstrative, i.e. *det hus* would mean 'that house' in Denmark Danish while simply denoting 'the house' in SSD.

SSD also differs from Denmark Danish in tense use: SSD present tense describes states or actions begun in the past but still continuing whereas Denmark Danish uses perfect tense in these contexts. SSD perfect tense is the default tense for actions completed in the past or habitual past where Denmark Danish would use past tense (K. Kühl 2008: 177-178; Pedersen 2000: 218).

In addition, SSD-specific features include many semantic, lexical and/or idiomatic features. The minority members are, of course, confronted with German institutions, organisations, and issues every day. This has resulted in necessary adaptations/loan translations of the German names of the German institutions (e.g. *landdag* for the German *Landtag* 'parliament of the federal state') as well as the established use of some German terms for specific German institutions (e.g. *TÜV* 'Technischer Überwachungsverein', the German equivalent to the British *MOT*).

Moreover, SSD contains established loan translations of German words (so-called *sydslesvigismer/Südschleswigismen*, 'South Schleswigisms'), such as *aftenkasse* 'box office, to buy tickets on the day' (German *Abendkasse*) (cf. Pedersen 2000: 219-220). Although long lists of these South Schleswig words and phrases exist (e.g. Christophersen 1979), it is often unclear whether these are established throughout the speaker group or represent idiosyncratic bilingual language use.

SSD differs phonologically from Denmark Danish, especially in the realisation of the allophones of/a/(cf. Pedersen 2000: 208-212, vol. 1). Also, the Danish glottal stop is seldom realised in SSD, and weak syllables are stressed more than they would be in Denmark Danish (Denmark Danish phonotactics are simplified due to assimilation, the syncopation and apocopation of [ə], and partial consonant loss).

A salient phonological feature of SSD is the realisation of the Danish sentence final discourse particle *ikke* ('isn't it, innit'), which is realised as [ekə] in SSD but as [eg] in Denmark Danish. The use of the originally German sentence final discourse particle *nä* 'isn't it, innit' in other Danish contexts is certainly an established feature of SSD, too. Research into and comments on the pragmatics of SSD are scarce, yet Braunmüller (1996: 42-43) argues for a pragmatic norm that is shared by SSD and German and thus provides speakers with a shared social framework to ease language production.

All of the specific SSD features mentioned in this brief description have their origins in the contact between Danish and German. This implies that German language learners of Danish can (and will) produce the same phenomena in the process of acquiring Standard Danish. This is probably why SSD is typically deemed as representing learner faults both by Denmark Danes as well as by many speakers of SSD. However, I argue that SSD is more than the language learner phenomena of 50,000 people. Although the acquisition of SSD has never, to my knowledge, been systematically investigated, it seems that it is SSD (not Denmark Danish) that is acquired as an early L2 by children growing up within the minority. As both children with German as their L1 and the smaller group of children with Denmark Danish as their L1 seem to know both the specific SSD features and the bilingual way of speaking, these features should not be regarded as mere mistakes by German learners of Danish. Many of the local-born and locally educated nursery school teachers and schoolteachers speak SSD themselves, the children's parents do so when they communicate with other members of the minority within the institutions, and the older pupils use it, too. SSD, both the bilingual way of speaking and the established SSD features, thus seems to be passed on within the minority.

SSD is a conceptually oral language (cf. Koch and Oesterreicher 2007) and is not codified in any way. It is used in situations of communicative proximity within the minority (e.g. personal communication, Facebook, chat, etc.). This is partly because it fulfils the function of the minority's in-group language (see the following section) but also simply because SSD and Denmark Danish are not necessarily mutually intelligible, due to the contact-induced changes of SSD. Thus, SSD can only to a certain extent be employed for communication with Denmark Danes. Denmark Danish is used for tasks of communicative distance – at least to such a degree as the minority members are capable of distinguishing between the two varieties. Typically for a non-dominant variety, there is uncertainty among SSD speakers as to what is 'proper' Danish and what is SSD (cf. Muhr 2012: 39-40).

4. Attitudes towards South Schleswig Danish within the Danish minority

Within the minority, SSD seems to be acknowledged, not necessarily as a variety in its own right, but certainly as a manner of speaking that is typical of the minority. This is reflected metalinguistically, e.g. in Wikipedia articles on SSD as well as columns and comments on language use within the minority in *Flensborg Avis*, the daily Danish newspaper of the region. Furthermore, there are Facebook groups where SSD is at once the topic and communication medium: The main interest of the groups is the collection and display of SSD speech practices within the minority, and posts are written in orthographic transcription of SSD. The evidence here is both metalinguistic and linguistic. The same language use, though realised in standard orthography, is both used and commented on in graduation booklets from the secondary schools (*Blå Bog*, 'Blue Book'), where the students write about each other and shared experiences during their time at school. Even minority institutions partly acknowledge the variety: For example, *Sydslesvigsk Forening* ('South Schleswig Association'), the main minority association for cultural issues, has published a CD with examples of SSD, somewhat overemphasised but nevertheless realistic.[5] SSD is clearly an acknowledged part of the minority members' linguistic repertoire. This is another argument in favour of considering SSD as a variety in its own right rather than as the assembled learner faults of a speaker group.

The use of SSD, Denmark Danish, and German within the minority may be described as follows, according to the model of concentric circles (J. Kühl 1998) mentioned above: Within the innermost circles ('membership' according to J.

Kühl 1998), Denmark Danish (or something close to it) prevails, while German seems to be used mostly for interaction with the majority. With regard to SSD, there seems to be a division between innovative speakers who employ SSD, and those who may be termed "complaint traditionalists" (according to Schneider 2009: 56) who adhere to the external norm (Denmark Danish) and mourn the loss of standard language competence.

The innovative speakers partly use (chunks of) SSD in order to make fun of it. One should not, however, underestimate the extent to which the innovative speakers seem to use SSD as a mark of group solidarity by referencing shared knowledge and group affiliation. Among the minority members in the middle circles ('affiliation' according to J. Kühl 1998), German-SSD bilingualism seems to be predominant, implying that competence in Denmark Danish is relatively lower than in the inner circles. The middle circles may be able to deselect some SSD features in favour of Denmark Danish features but cannot do so comprehensively across their language use. Finally, in the outer circles ('affinity' according to J. Kühl 1998), there seems to be little left of Denmark Danish: German prevails, and the only variety of Danish that is spoken is SSD.

Typically for a non-dominant variety, the attitude towards SSD within its speaker group varies according to the asymmetry in status of Denmark Danish and SSD (cf. Clyne 1992). The minority seems to be divided with regard to the acceptance or non-acceptance of the development of the minority language towards a variety in its own right, a development that would include codification and imply the relinquishing of adherence to exonormative Denmark Danish/Standard Danish standards. This would represent a challenge to the situation as it is today, in terms of the financial and political privileges of Danish as a minority language. The 'complaint traditionalists' (Schneider 2009: 56) among the model speakers of the group (the inner circle) lament the decay of Denmark Danish in the minority. Here, SSD is often categorised as a product of incomplete L2 acquisition that could be improved if only SSD speakers made the effort to learn Denmark Danish properly.

This deficit-oriented view on SDD is mirrored in that the speakers of SSD themselves often are subject to "linguistic schizophrenia" (Muhr 2012: 39): SSD is heavily practised but officially disparageed, while Denmark Danish is rarely practised but officially appreciated. This matches the covert prestige of SSD:

> "In covert prestige, forms belonging to vernacular dialects are positively valued, emphasizing group solidarity and local identity. This kind of prestige is covert, because it is usually manifested subconsciously between members of a group, unlike the case of overt prestige, where the forms to be valued are publicly recommended by powerful social institutions." (Crystal 2003: 115)

---

[5] CD 'Med Lille Klaus på besøg hos de danske mindretal', SSF's press committee (1998).

Besides being a means of communication within the minority, use of SSD – at least if the choice of SSD is contrastive to the choice of Denmark Danish and German – can be an expression of group affiliation as well as an expression of regional bilingualism and biculturalism (cf. Braunmüller 1996). Despite the status differences between Denmark Danish and SSD, SSD speakers do not necessarily aim to adhere completely to the exonormative standards of Denmark Danish/Standard Danish, as this would mean giving up shared knowledge and a shared way of speaking.

5. Attitudes toward linguistic variation in Denmark

Denmark is a linguistically homogeneous state to an exceptionally high degree around an absolute norm centre, the capital Copenhagen (cf. Gregersen 2011). The dialects (such as 'sønderjysk' in Southern Jutland) at the peripheries of the country that have managed to survive Denmark's general de-dialectalisation process since around 1900 were until recently largely ignored by contemporary Danish dialectology and sociolinguistics.[6]

In line with the lack of interest in regional linguistic variation within Denmark, academic interest in Danish outside of Denmark (e.g. on the Faroe Islands, Greenland, Iceland, etc.) has until recently been quite scanty as well (but see K. Kühl in print and K. Kühl forthc.).

Today, Denmark is linguistically highly centralised: The capital Copenhagen has a high-prestige trendsetter function, not only with regard to speech practice. Copenhagen attracts political, cultural, and linguistic power: the parliament with its associated administration, most press institutions (radio, TV, newspapers), most cultural institutions, and the biggest university in Denmark. Varieties of Danish besides the Copenhagen lect are thus rare in the media. Studies show that linguistic innovations that occur in Copenhagen (viz. the Modern Copenhagen lect) spread rapidly across the country (cf. Jensen and Maegaard 2012). This influence is so strong that if a feature recedes in Copenhagen, it will subsequently recede in rest of the country (Maegaard et al. 2013)

Copenhagen's linguistic dominance seems to simultaneously produce revolt and pronounced "linguistic schizophrenia" (Muhr 2012: 39) throughout Denmark. This has been convincingly shown by matched-guise tests: When overtly asked about language attitudes through a label ranking task, one's own local way of speaking is clearly valued most highly, while the Modern Copenhagen lect is devaluated. However, when asked to assign labels to speech samples without areal assignment, the Modern Copenhagen lect is pronouncedly favoured, and the other varieties are disparaged (Kristiansen 2009). Thus, it seems safe to conclude that regional linguistic variation in Denmark (traditional dialects, regiolects) is not associated with overt prestige, and their speakers must cope with status asymmetry through ambiguous language use and language attitudes.

---

[6] There is, of course, ongoing work on dialect dictionaries (Ømålsordbogen and Den Jyske Ordbog). However, these dictionaries and other dialect descriptions are rather documentation of historical and classical dialect features and thus have little in common with interest for today's dialectal language use.

6. Conclusion

In many respects, SSD seems to be a prototypical example of a non-dominant variety in stages 3-4 according to Muhr's classification of the developmental stages of non-dominant varieties (Muhr 2012: 35). SSD is limited in its development by the disregard of the dominant nation (Denmark) and the low overt prestige of regional variation in Denmark, as well as minority-internal by the defiance of SSD by the community's model speakers and by the "linguistic schizophrenia" (Muhr 2012: 39) of the SSD speakers. Strangely enough, the greatest obstacle to SSD's further development seems to be its existence within a recognised and politically and financially supported national minority: The financial and political support of the minority, and thus the support of the Danish language, relies on maintenance of the connection to the motherland, Denmark.

By actively dissolving this connection in terms of a further development (including codification) of SSD, the Danish minority would challenge the legality of its status and, accordingly, of the political and financial support. Such an act would fundamentally change the language community's self-perception, from a national minority that defines itself through affiliation to the dominant nation, to an autonomous group with its own language variety outside the motherland's borders. SSD thus seems to be caught between disregard and privileges as the title of this chapter indicates.

The case of SSD seems to be able to add some refinement to Muhr's recent and comprehensive typology of linguistic dominance and non-dominance in pluricentric languages. This typology accounts for non-dominant varieties that are non-dominant within an asymmetrical relationship of power between a dominant nation and a non-dominant group (that may be a nation, or not) in at least two different nations (Muhr 2012: 26, 35).

As shown in this paper, SSD is clearly a (non-dominant) variety of Danish with regard to language attitudes: Its speakers recognise it but it is not officially acknowledged, neither by the minority's motherland nor the host country, nor consistently within the minority itself.

It is not codified. It is relevant for social identity, e.g., the expression of group affiliation, but is shows low overt prestige and its speakers are subjected to 'linguistic schizophrenia' (Muhr 2012: 39).

This means that with regard to language attitudes and language behaviour, SSD fits all criteria proposed by Muhr (2012: 39-41). SSD is characterised by contact-induced changes, which in turn lead to the linguistic *Abstand* from the dominant variety that is another of Muhr's criteria for a (non-dominant) variety in its own right (Muhr 2012: 35).

However, as SSD's linguistic characteristics are due to a specific language contact situation (namely the South Schleswigian German-Danish situation), it does not exist in two or more nations. This suggests that Muhr's first two criteria for pluricentric languages, "1: *Occurrence*: A certain language occurs in at least 2 nations" and "2: Linguistic distance (*Abstand*): The variety must have enough linguistic (and/or pragmatic) characteristics that distinguish it from others and by that can serve as a symbol for expressing identity" (Muhr 2012: 29-30, italics in the original), need refinement, especially when they are interrelated.

If two varieties beneath the same roofing language display linguistic distance from another and occur in at least two nations, then it is not "the same language" (cf. first criterion) that occurs in two nations, but rather two varieties of the same language (or rather an abstract system of shared typological features of these varieties, e.g., the lowest common denominator of all World Englishes). An elaboration of Muhr's criteria in this sense would make it possible to account for varieties that have undergone further development with regard to their structural and/or pragmatic features, either due to system-internal development or to contact-induced changes, within a situation of pluricentricity.

References

Braunmüller, Kurt (1995): Südschleswigdänisch – eine Mischsprache? In: Beiträge zur skandinavistischen Linguistik. Ed. by E.H. Jahr. Oslo. Novus, 144-153.

Braunmüller, Kurt (1996): Sydslesvigdansk - et regionalsprog? In: Talesprogsvariation og sprogkontakt. Til Inger Ejskjær på halvfjerdsårsdagen den 20. maj 1996. Ed. by B.J. Nielsen and I.L. Pedersen. Copenhagen. Reitzel, 33-44.

Carstensen, Astrid/Kühl, Karoline (2007): Divergierender bilingualer Sprachgebrauch bei Jugendlichen. 1. Unterschiedliche Ausnutzung bilingualer Ressourcen: "Så sidder jeg der og quäler mig af..." versus "Ich gi' das nicht". Zeitschrift für Kultur- und Bildungswissenschaften: Flensburger Universitätszeitschrift 18, 124-137.

Christophersen, Hans (1979): Sydslesvigdansk. Mål og Mæle 6.2, 8-16.

Clyne, Michael (1992): Pluricentric languages. Introduction. In: Pluricentric languages. Differing norms in different nations. Ed. by M. Clyne. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter, 1-10.

Crystal, David (2003): A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. 5. ed. Oxford. Blackwell.

Fredsted, Elin (2007): Divergierender bilingualer Sprachgebrauch bei Jugendlichen 2. Pragmatisch relevanter Kodewechsel oder "gemischte" Kontaktvarietät? Zeitschrift für Kultur- und Bildungswissenschaften: Flensburger Universitätszeitschrift 18, 138-153.

Fredsted, Elin (2009): Sprachen und Kulturen in Kontakt - deutsche und dänische Minderheiten in Sønderjylland/Schleswig. In: Neben Deutsch. Die autoch-thonen Minderheiten- und Regionalsprachen Deutschlands. Ed. by C. Stolz. Bochum. Brockmeyer, 1-23.

Gregersen, Frans (2011): Language and ideology in Denmark. In: Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe. Ed. by N. Coupland and T. Kristiansen. Oslo. Novus, 47-56.

Jensen, Torben Juel/Maegaard, Marie (2012): Past participles in Jutland Danish: A real time study of regionalization and standardization. Nordic Journal of Linguistics 35.2, 169-195.

Koch, Peter/Oesterreicher, Wulf (2007): Schriftlichkeit und kommunikative Distanz. Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik 35, 346-375.

Kristiansen, Tore (2009): The macro-level social meanings of late-modern Danish accents. Acta Linguistica Hafniensia 41, 167-192.

Kühl, Jørgen (1994): Dansk identitet i Sydslesvig. In: National identitet. Fem foredrag om dansk og tysk identitetsfølelse i grænselandet. Aabenraa. Institut for grænseregionsforskning, 50-67.

Kühl, Jørgen (1998): The 'Schleswig Experience'. The national minorities in the Danish-German border area. Aabenraa. Institut for grænseregionsforskning.

Kühl, Jørgen (2005): Die Organisationen der dänischen Minderheit. In: Ein europäisches Modell? Nationale Minderheiten im deutsch-dänischen Grenzland 1945-2005. Ed. by J. Kühl and R. Bohn. Bielefeld. Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 341-377.

Kühl, Karoline (2008): Bilingualer Sprachgebrauch von Jugendlichen im deutsch-dänischen Grenzgebiet. Hamburg. Kovač.

Kühl, Karoline (in print): Danske aflæggere i Nordeuropa: Færødansk, sydslesvigdansk og bokmål. Danske Talesprog 14.

Kühl, Karoline (forthc.): Faroe Danish. An unknown variety. In: Language Variation - European perspectives V. Ed. by E.N. Torgersen and B. Mæhlum. Amsterdam. Benjamins.

Maegaard, Marie/Jensen, Torben Juel/Kristiansen, Tore/Jørgensen, Jens Norman (2013): Diffusion of language change: Accommodation to a moving target. Journal of Sociolinguistics 17.1, 3-36.

Muhr, Rudolf (2012): Linguistic dominance and non-dominance in pluricentric languages: A typology. In: Non-Dominant Varieties of Pluricentric Languages. Getting the Picture: In Memory of Michael Clyne. Ed. by R. Muhr, C. Norrby, H.L. Kretzenbacher and C. Amorós Negre. Vienna. Peter Lang, 23-48.

Pedersen, Karen Margrethe (2000): Dansk sprog i Sydslesvig. Det danske sprogs status inden for det danske mindretal i Sydslesvig. 2 volumes. Aabenraa. Institut for grænseregionsforskning.

Schneider, Edgar W. (2009 [2007]): Postcolonial English. Varieties around the world. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Attitudes of speakers of non-dominant varieties of Hungarian towards their own variety and the dominant one

Máté Huber and Timea Molnár[*]

(University of Szeged, Hungary)
hubermate@gmail.com, timke.molnar@gmail.com

Abstract: In this paper we investigate the attitudes that speakers of NDVs of Hungarian exhibit towards their own variety and the DV of their mother tongue, i.e. Hungary Hungarian. Attitudes of Hungarians from Slovakia, Ukraine, Romania, and Serbia are analyzed based on two large-scale studies, one of which provides an answer to two questions: (1) how beautiful speakers find the given varieties, and (2) how useful they think it is to speak them. The other study sheds light on speakers' attitudes to these varieties as shown by their evaluation of speech samples with respect to (1) solidarity traits and (2) status traits. Based on these, we determine speakers' loyalty to their own NDVs and to the DV, as well as the status of these varieties as perceived by the speakers. Since these attitudes play an essential role in forming the status of the given (non-dominant) variety, their analysis enables us to draw conclusions about this issue as well.

1. Introduction

The main reason for studying language attitudes is that the way people think about speakers of different languages or linguistic varieties also carries an expression of social and linguistic evaluations (Fasold, 1984). Studying language attitudes can provide insight into the current situation of a language or language variety as well as establish possible outlooks for them since language attitudes can have an influence on the success or failure of status planning, especially in the case of non-dominant varieties of a language. The present paper focuses on attitudes towards different varieties of Hungarian as a pluricentric language.

Muhr (2012) presents five criteria by which pluricentric languages are defined. According to this definition a pluricentric language has to occur in at least

---

[*] In: Rudolf Muhr, Dawn Marley in collaboration with Anu Bissoonauth and Heinz L. Kretzenbacher (eds.) (2015): Pluricentric Languages. New Perspectives in Theory and Description. Wien et. al., Peter Lang Verlag. p. 257-270.