

Title	Cities, Language Academies and the State of Minority Languages : Observations from the Quechua Academy in Cuzco, Peru
Author(s)	Brenes, Ivan
Citation	言語文化研究. 2010, 36, p. 169-183
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/7676
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

Cities, Language Academies and the State of Minority Languages: Observations from the Quechua Academy in Cuzco, Peru

Ivan Brenes

都市化は、言語権力者と言語アカデミー（言語管理機関）の活発化において鍵を握る要因となっている。言語アカデミーによって承認される言語基準は通常、都市部で使用されている、あるいは使用されるべき言語に基づいている。少数言語を扱う言語アカデミーに関しては、都市部での言語を優先させる政策は、少数言語の存続にとって否定的な結果をもたらす可能性がある。なぜなら地方の話者は言語アカデミーの決定を受け入れないかもしれないからである。この都市部での言語を優先させる言語政策に関する学術的文献の多くは、ヨーロッパの少数言語を扱う言語アカデミーについて議論したものであり、同様の政策の例として、ペルーのクスコにあるケチュア語高等アカデミーを取り上げたものは皆無に等しい。少数言語を扱う一般的な言語アカデミーの一例を取り上げたこの小論文は、特に発展途上国において増え続ける都市化と絶滅の危機にある言語との複雑な関係に関する研究への一助となり得る。

Key words : language academy, minority language, Quechua

A. Introduction

Cities, with their tendencies to concentrate wealth and talent, have been fundamental for the development of linguistic elites and linguistic purism.¹⁾ A prosperous urban environment allows these elites to pursue prescriptive aims by, for example, forming language societies and the like. The most prestigious of language societies, the oft-termed language academy, first appeared in 1572 with the *Accademia della Crusca* in Florence, a body that promoted a conservative form of the Truscan dialect of Italian. More language academies would appear in European cities in the following centuries.

With the rise of the Industrial Revolution, the development of the modern nation-state, and the decades of economic prosperity after World War II, urbanization -- defined here as the demographic

1) Here, we use Thomas's (1991: 12) definition of linguistic purism as "the manifestation of a desire on the part of a speech community (or some section of it) to preserve a language from, or rid it of, putative foreign elements or other elements held to be undesirable." Language standardization is thus a puristic endeavor.

movement or transition from rural to urban settlement (see Nordberg, 1994: 1-2) -- has expanded dramatically throughout the world. Linguistic elites and their societies have increased as well. Indeed, many governments, inspired by the examples of celebrated language academies in other countries, have created or approved language authority bodies as a key element in their efforts to purify and standardize an official language.

These language bodies that promote a standard form of a national language²⁾ often favor the elite urban dialects (or those drafted by these elites) over rural dialects. Rural speakers may be disadvantaged, but the national language itself retains status and prestige. However, similar developments can prove harmful for minority languages.³⁾ Minority languages with communities of speakers and enthusiasts in cities can experience the same urban tendency to foster language purism movements. The elitist division that, again, advantages urban speech over rural speech can breed contempt and indifference among all speakers, and can sap the overall vitality of the language, especially if most speakers live in the countryside. Such discord can be especially lamentable if the urban elites have funds, language skills and a high motivation that can be valuable for the maintenance and revitalization of a minority language.

Much of the literature on minority languages and such urban-rural tensions regarding language movements and purism has concentrated on a highly urbanized Europe and a number of its minority languages. This article will briefly cover some of that background. It will then expand the perspective beyond Europe by discussing the urban underpinnings to the language ideology embraced by one of the few language academies for indigenous languages in the Americas, the High Academy of the Quechua Language in Cuzco, Peru. This article will argue that the Academy mirrors its counterparts in Europe by representing another example of a language academy whose urban origins prompt it to promote an urban dialect over rural dialects (with similarly deleterious effects). This article will also submit that the example of the minority-language academy is a useful addition to the discourse on the complexities that an increasingly urbanized future presents for endangered languages, particularly in developing countries.

B. Minority Language Academies and Urban-rural Divisions

Since cities first arose in Mesopotamia around 3500 BC, urban prosperity has often generated elites whose dialects and languages have garnered a high status. Sumerian, for example, the language of the city-state of Sumer, became an elite classical language for the conquering Akkadians in the 24th century BC because of the prestige of its cuneiform script (Ostler, 2005:

2) That is, the language of a nation, "a political, social and cultural entity," and a language which may also be the official language of government [see Eastman (2001: 657-658)].

3) We are here referring to endogenous minority languages, or languages that are not the majority language of any nation-state (Trudgill, 2003: 43).

50-55). Over two millennia later, in ancient Roman times, the prestigious dialect of Latin (called *sermo urbanus*, or "urban speech") was the form used by the governing and educated elites of the city of Rome (Hall, 1974: 73). More centuries would pass before linguistic elites in Europe started organizing themselves institutionally around linguistic goals. The growth of cities during the Renaissance would facilitate the flowering of language societies, in part because ". . . language reformers of all persuasions have long . . . recognised the advantage accruing from association with like-minded individuals (Thomas, 1991:104)." Such associations would take many forms, including the most prestigious of all language societies, the language academies.

Eastman (1983:8) defines language academies as "language planning agencies that make decisions about the direction of language policies and the form their elaboration takes in a particular context." Fishman (2006: 311) adds that there is generally some form of political support which provides funds and authority for the production of dictionaries, grammars and other prescriptive output.⁴⁾ The first academies were all established in cities. We have mentioned the first academy, the *Accademia della Crusca* (founded in Florence in 1572), and other notable examples include the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* (1617, Weimar), the *Real Academia de la lengua* (1714, Madrid), and the *Svenska Akademien* (1786, Stockholm). For the most well-known of all academies, the *Academie francaise* (1635), Cooper (1989: 6) makes clear the primacy of the city as he writes of its founder, "That [Cardinal de] Richelieu found it expedient to influence the world of letters and indeed found it possible to do so was the result of several developments. Perhaps the most important was the establishment of Paris as an aristocratic and cultural center." The *Academie francaise*, famous for its "defense" of the purity of French language, is also notable for its role in the emerging enterprise of state building.

European national languages have not been alone in witnessing urban flowerings of language movements; activists of minority languages have demonstrated a similar drive to promote their languages: "Intelligentsia and middle-class elements, both of which are almost exclusively urban, have frequently been the prime movers of language maintenance in those societies which possess both rural and urban populations (Fishman, 1972: 126)." Unlike the minority-language speakers in the countryside, it is these elites who have the "time, resources and interest" to form language movements (Kuter, 1989: 84). Fishman (1972: 126) also makes note of the innovative nature of cities that can stir such collective endeavors:

. . . whereas small rural groups may have been more successful in establishing relatively self-contained traditional interaction patterns and social structures, urban groups, exposed

4) The boundaries separating language academies from other language authorities is not always clear. Thomas (1991: 108) notes that except for "the force of law . . . it is not easy -- except in nomenclature -- to distinguish language academies from their more humble brethren [language societies]," although Fishman (2006: 311) distinguishes "language academies" from "language boards" and "language committees."

to interaction in more fragmented and specialized networks, may reveal more conscious, organized, and novel attempts to preserve or revive or change their traditional language.

Early examples of urban language bodies that have appeared for minority languages include the *Institut d'Estudis Catalans* in Barcelona (established in 1907) and the *Euskaltzaindia* (Royal Academy of the Basque Language) in Bilbao, Spain (1918) (Trask, 1996: 61; Martí i Castell, 1993: 64-65). However, the linguistic ambitions of language academies for minority languages can be checked by a number of factors. An obvious factor can be a lack of resources and authority, which, unlike for "their counterparts among state-related ethnocultural groups," restricts the academies to a greater reliance on the work and resources of volunteers (Fishman, 1991: 338). Other impediments, as suggested above and as we will see below, relate to matters of language planning from an urban location and perspective.

The rise of language academies and linguistic purism entail the selection of linguistic standards, a process with some inescapable consequences for both national- and minority-language communities. In the case of national languages, the Industrial Revolution of the 18th century and the evolution of the nation-state generated high demands for a language standard (often for written forms but extending to spoken forms as well) to help produce an educated and literate citizenry; the prestige standard would generally be one based on the language of the urban political elite (Cooper, 1989:133; Dorian, 1998: 6-7). As increasingly industrialized societies gave rise to unprecedented prosperity and urbanization, rural dialects (and society) would generally be stigmatized, resulting in what has been termed "elitist purism" (Thomas, 1991: 78-79).

These elitist tendencies of promoting urban standards can also be observed among minority-language communities. However, such inclinations can compound uncertainties for the future of these languages (whereas for national languages, similar issues arising from urban-rural inequalities could amount to little more than "growing pains" and would not threaten the overall status of the language). For one thing, as Edwards (1985: 71) effectively describes, there can exist considerable socio-economic differences between urban "authorities" of minority languages and rural speakers:

It is often the case . . . that individuals (and groups) concerned with language maintenance and revival are middle-class, city-dwelling intellectuals. Such persons are generally atypical of the heartland native speakers, have in fact assimilated successfully into the majority mainstream (or are majority-group members), have often romantically rediscovered their 'roots', and often evoke little interest from native speakers in the heartland.

Besides these social differences between city and country, there are the more consequential and

practical issues of language planning. While urban efforts to standardize a minority language can be immensely beneficial (for purposes of education and status planning, for example), they can also, by intensifying puristic concerns, lead to rifts and disparities that can threaten the long-term vibrancy of the language (Dorian, 1994: 479-480; Grenoble and Whaley, 2006: 155).

As notable examples, Fishman (1991: 342-343) mentions two language planning issues, both relevant to rural speakers, that can weaken the status of a minority language. First, a resultant standard of planning efforts (often urban-based) can fail to attract speakers -- rural as well as urban -- because it is "stilted and artificial." Second, the standard can favor those groups whose speech more closely resembles it, and disadvantage speakers of other -- often regional -- dialects. These challenges for standardization movements can be seen in numerous minority languages around the globe, from the Amazigh (Berber) languages in Northern Africa to Tibetan and Qiang in China (Brenzinger, 2007:126-128; Poa and LaPolla, 2007: 349). Nevertheless, the bulk of the analysis that has touched on the urban-rural aspect of these problems has concentrated on the minority languages of Europe.

The experience of Irish Gaelic illustrates well some of the complications that can arise from a minority language having its language movements in urban areas and the bulk of its native speakers in rural hinterlands. With increased language restrictions and socio-political domination from England, Irish had started to decline from the 16th century. Interest in the language was revived in the 19th century, and a major language body, the Gaelic League, was established in 1893. The League was successful in promoting the symbolic value of Irish, in part through language classes, but the language movement remained largely focused on urban usage:

In the heyday of the Irish revival movement...most of the leaders were Dublin-born upper-middle-class intellectuals, for whom Irish was an acquired competence rather than a maternal one, and for whom the idealized *Gaeltacht* (Irish-speaking area) was conveniently removed on the other side of the country. A place to praise and to visit, to be sure, but not a place to live in. (Edward, 1994: 108)

After the independence of Ireland in 1922, Irish was declared the first official language, and the standardization of the Irish language fell to the Translation Section of the Irish Civil Service in Dublin. While Fishman's second issue of a dominant dialect is not a major concern (Irish has three main dialects with no one prestige dialect, urban or rural), the first problem, where speakers reject a standard they feel is inauthentic, is. Members of the Section did forge a standard (a guide was first published in 1958) that to some extent tried to accommodate the different rural dialects, but the results have been mixed. While the written standard has been useful for symbolic purposes and

for the education in school of second language learners, Ó Baoill (1988: 118) states that, "The most serious problem with it [the written standard] is that it does not agree in any systematic way with the spoken dialects . . ." Consequently, the rural residents of the *Gaeltacht* feel caught between two varieties of Irish, the local and the standard, both of which, for different reasons, fail to command speaker loyalty:

It requires effort to acquire a command of the standard, a variety that is seen as somewhat synthetic and of limited practical use in their daily lives. Estranged from their home variety through the dynamics of language shift and because it is not reinforced at school, the standard is equally rejected by some as a legitimate and useful target variety because of its distance from local authentic speech, adding to the spiral of linguistic marginalization. (Ó Hifearnáin, 2008: 123)

Due to such factors and others as well, such as increased economic development that has intensified contact between Irish and English speakers, the regional dialects of the *Gaeltacht* have continued to decline (Ó Riagáin, 2001).

We now consider Fishman's second issue as we discuss the zealous identification of one historically esteemed city with one dialect by the High Academy of the Quechua Language in Cuzco, Peru.

C. The Linguistic Regionalism of the Quechua Academy

The Quechua language, the ruling language of the Incan empire, is actually a group of dialects that exhibit diverse levels of intelligibility comparable to those of the Romance languages (Grinevald, 1998: 129). The vast majority of Quechua speakers reside in the Andean nations of Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia, with smaller populations of speakers in Argentina and Colombia. The speakers number 7 to 10 million, the most of any indigenous language in the Americas; 3 to 4 million live in Peru (population 28 million) (Adelaar, 2009: 891; INEA, 2008: 9). The dialects are divided into two groups. One group, Quechua I, is found in central Peru, while the second group, Quechua II, includes the dialects of southern Peru and the other four countries; the Cuzco dialect is in the second group. Despite the large numbers of speakers, the language is considered endangered by many scholars (King and Hornberger, 2004: 1-2). Indeed, the percentage of Spanish monolinguals in Peru rose from 50 percent in 1940 to 72 percent in 1982 (Hornberger and King 2001: 167-168). Quechua speakers have experienced oppression and exclusion since colonial times, and many have little choice but to speak Spanish, the language of commerce, education, government services, and a better life. Non-indigenous speakers of Quechua are extremely rare.

In terms of language authority bodies for the language, the *Academia Mayor de la Lengua Quechua* (the High Academy of the Quechua Language, hereafter, the Quechua Academy) is the oldest and arguably the most prestigious Quechua language academy in South America. It is located in the city of Cuzco [population 349,000 (INEI, 2008: 30)], the ancient capital of the Incan empire and today the capital of the department of Cuzco in southeastern Peru [first-language speakers of Quechua make up 52% of the department's population over the age of five (INEA, 2008: 119)]. The Academy's general goals are to promote the Quechua language and literacy.⁵⁾ Fitting Fishman's description of an academy for minority languages, the Quechua Academy is a voluntary, non-profit organization that operates with little government funding, although with official government recognition (Hornberger and King, 2001: 178; Marr, 2002: 200). In fact, despite the status enjoyed by the members because of their considerable fluency in Quechua, the role of the Academy is largely symbolic because senior members have held controversial views that have largely marginalized the body in the national language planning efforts of Peruvian linguists and the Ministry of Education.

This marginalization is largely due to the core tenet of the Quechua Academy: The Cuzco dialect is the purest and most authentic form of Quechua because it was the source of the Quechua language and because it was the language of the Inca elite. The last two points are not supported by research in archaeology and historical linguistics. The origins of Quechua are placed in the central region of Peru (Hornberger and King, 1998: 396-397), and for many linguists, the standard Cuzco dialect of the Quechua Academy is in reality a sociolect, a "purist 'invention'" (Howard, 2004: 114) that can sound foreign to mainstream Quechua speakers (Niño-Murcia, 1997: 149). Nevertheless, the Academy retains its beliefs in these myths because, as Niño-Murcia (1997: 139) explains, "By stressing that the language of the nobility both originated and is preserved in Cuzco, the city and its elite acquire a unique aura which places Cuzco in a higher position in respect to Lima, and connects its speakers to their Inca past."

Thus, reverence for the city of Cuzco underlies much of the Quechua Academy's reasoning for being: "The identification of the language with the city is absolute, as is the identification of the city with the Incas (Marr, 2002: 202)." This glorification for Cuzco and all things from Cuzco has a long history in Peru. After the conquest of Peru in 1527-1532, the language had status to the Spanish rulers as a lingua franca of various indigenous communities, but many of the Academy's views actually stem from the 17th century (Coronel-Molina, 2008: 322). During this period, landowning classes in the Cuzco region, made up of bilingual mestizos (people of mixed European and indigenous ancestry), attempted to solidify their elite status by promoting the Cuzco dialect as

⁵⁾ For example, the Academy offers Quechua instruction, publishes books and journals in Quechua, sponsors annual competitions of literary works (drama, poetry, short stories, novels), and broadcasts programs in Quechua on local radio networks (Hornberger and King, 2001: 177-178).

the traditional speech of the Incas. More defining moves came with the *Indigenismo* movement of the 20th century, a Latin American movement that mobilized for the most part *mestizo* elites to push for greater social and political roles for indigenous peoples (as well as for more use of indigenous languages). *Indigenismo* helped empower the Cuzco elite (now mostly urban) to lend more formal and institutional forms to its regionalist views. When the Quechua Academy was founded in 1953, it was as part of the *Inti Raymi* Center, an organization that promoted Inca culture and oversaw the performance in Cuzco of *Inti Raymi*, an ancient Inca ceremony that honors the Incan sun god. Language was a major concern of the Center as it targeted actors with the "purest" Cuzco Quechua for the ritual (Nino-Murcia, 1997: 147).

For our discussion on rural-urban divides and language purism, there are interesting parallels between the Quechua Academy and the minority-language academies in Europe. For example, the members of the Quechua Academy are upper- and middle-class residents of Cuzco, and this class background is largely comparable to those of the European language academies for minority languages.⁶⁾ The members also echo their European counterparts by displaying urban linguistic trappings that further distance them from the native rural speakers [reinforcing Edwards's (1985) observations on the socio-economic gaps]. Indeed, the Quechua Academy itself is modeled after the Spanish *Real Academia de la lengua* in Madrid. Observers have also criticized the members for holding meetings in Spanish instead of Quechua, and for promoting an alphabet that conforms more closely to Spanish rather than to Quechuan phonological norms (Marr, 2002: 209-210). More critically for the purposes of language maintenance and language revitalization, however, is Fishman's second issue of an urban elite promoting a prestige dialect at the expense of the regional dialects. As the Cuzco sociolect is the standard for the Academy members because of the city's special historical status, the dialects of the rural Quechua are vigorously disdained as "uncultured" and "impure" (Niño-Murcia, 1997: 134), or at least of little worth:

Despite their declared concern for the indigenous population and their talk about collaborative research in rural communities, Academy members rarely leave the Cuzco region and do not display much respect for ordinary Quechua speakers. According to their arguments, the indigenous population cannot be viewed as experts in the language because they are not educated enough and do not speak a pure Quechua . . . (Coronel-Molina, 2008: 333)

The result is further marginalization of the rural speakers as well as indifference and ill feelings towards the Quechua Academy on the part of those speakers (Coronel-Molina, 2008: 330; Niño-Murcia, 1997: 134; Howard, 2004: 104). Finally, as we have suggested, the positions of the

6) Coronel-Molina (2008: 324) points out that the Quechua Academy members include teachers, lawyers, engineers, nurses, journalists and economists, all with little formal education in linguistics.

Quechua Academy are so exceptional that they generate non-negotiable ideological divisions with the wider language movements for the maintenance and revitalization of Quechua:

Perhaps the most striking point to emerge from a consideration of the tradition which gave rise to the Academia is that, quite obviously, it could be hostile to any project which proceeded from the assumption that the language of rural monolinguals was in itself good, whole or representative. (Marr, 2002: 215)

Language scholars and activists who disagree with the Academy are branded as self-seeking opponents of what is best for the Quechua language. Of course, these targets of the Academy's criticisms respond with their own denouncements of the Academy's ineptitudes and obstinacy.

This is all unfortunate because a number of scholars, including firm critics of the Quechua Academy, have recognized that the Academy has prestige, resources and language skills that could be potentially beneficial for Quechua maintenance and revitalization efforts (Hornberger and King, 1998: 407; Marr, 2002: 215-216; Coronel-Molina, 2008: 337). Overall, though, the Quechua Academy represents another example of linguistic elites in a city distancing themselves culturally and linguistically from rural speakers. In this case, the Quechua Academy's rejection of rural dialects renders the monolingual speakers of Quechua invisible in the Academy's language planning endeavors and hampers the revitalization of the very language the Academy is seeking to promote.

D. The Language Academy and the Complexities of Urbanization and Language Shift

To briefly expand our discussion of minority-language academies and urban-rural divides, this article will submit that the benefits and failings of language academies can instruct us on the complex relationship between urbanization and the state of endangered languages.⁷⁾ On a broader level, the study of language variation in the city is "at the heart of work in sociolinguistics" for some linguists (Wardhaugh, 1998: 47), but in much of the growing literature on endangered languages, the growth of cities has largely been seen as a key cause of language endangerment (Fishman, 1991: 58; Crystal, 2000: 77-78; Moseley, 2007: ix; Grenoble, 2009: 326). Cities are magnets for peoples of different backgrounds, and the increase in density intensifies social, economic, political and technological pressures that promote the use of a language of wider communication over a minority language. Urban migration also breaks up rural communities and families, distancing migrant speakers of minority languages from the communal and cultural context where they can use their language. As Harrison (2007: 14) succinctly argues, "Urbanization is growing worldwide, and it will be the death of language diversity."

7) By our definition, all minority languages are endangered or potentially endangered as first languages; see Simpson (2001: 579).

Such alarm has grown because, according to United Nations estimates, the year 2008 marked the first time ever that a majority of the world's population is living in urban areas (DESA/UN, 2007: 2). And as language scholars and activists contemplate a world that could see over half of its 6000 or so languages become extinct in this century (Krauss, 1992: 7), much of their attention is focused on the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. These countries harbor a majority of the world's endangered languages and they will also see much of future urbanization; 67% of the population in these countries could be living in urban areas by the year 2050, up from 44% in 2007 (DESA/UN, 2007: 4).⁸⁾

Still, while many scholars seem to accept the inevitability of these long-term trends, others (Tandefelt, 1994: 247-248; King, 2001; Blench, 2007: 152) have cautioned against oversimplifying the nature of urbanization and language shift. King (2001: 14-15), for example, cautions against post hoc explanations which analyze the effects of urbanization on language shift after urban migrations have taken place. Indeed, for Hornberger and Coronel-Molina (2004: 13), the whole science of predicting language shift may be "elusive if not impossible." Other scholars have argued that complex and dynamic urban environments in both the developed and developing worlds can help sustain and even encourage language diversity (Mackey, 2003: 77; Nordberg, 1994: 2; Christ, 2007: 128). Christ in particular reminds us that cities are "the most linguistically diverse sites in the world" (2007: 203) and that "the complex set of relationships between the languages of a city" have a myriad of implications for "responses to linguistic diversity including assimilation, separatism, ghettoisation, multiculturalism, interculturalism and cosmopolitanism (2007: 210)."⁹⁾

These discussions direct us back to that factor of overwhelming importance, perhaps the "single strongest force influencing the fate of endangered languages" (Grenoble and Whaley, 1998: 52): economics, or for our purposes, the economic prosperity that cities can generate. Scholars do agree that people who feel more economically and socially secure are more likely to turn their attention to language matters (Crystal, 2000: 132-133; Bradley, 2007: 88) because "prosperity can boost social self-confidence while also providing the resources for institutional language-maintenance efforts that might otherwise seem prohibitively expensive (Dorian, 1998: 13)." Welsh and Catalan are the often cited examples of maintenance and revitalization cases that have progressed because of greater economic security, but King (2001: 104-105) has found similar trends of a more localized nature among speakers of Quichua (as the Quechua language is called in Ecuador).

8) Peru has seen the share of its urban population rise from 47.4% in 1961 to 75.9% in 2007, and rural Quechua speakers have been a major part of the migration to cities (Hornberger and Coronel-Molina, 2004: 24-26; INEI, 2008: 119). The city of Cuzco itself has experienced significant urbanization (the population grew 36.5% in 1993-2007, a growth fuelled in part by the tourist industry), although its population is a far cry from that of Lima (8.4 million) (INEA, 2008: 30).

9) The potential benefits of urbanization can also extend beyond the city: Blench (2007: 152), for example, notes how the urban use of African minority languages in radio broadcasts can increase the prestige of minority languages in the countryside.

In the end, then, the same wealth that draws minority-language speakers from the countryside can offer those languages another beginning, albeit tenuous at times. It is this urban paradox of apparently fostering both monolingualism and multilingualism that this article suggests are reflected in the language planning labors of the Quechua Academy and its counterparts in Europe. On the constructive side, the language academies of minority languages are manifestations of more secure and urbanized communities where linguistic elites have taken a greater interest in the future of their language. Through their activities and status, these elites can confer more symbolic capital on a minority language while also possessing resources and expertise that can be vital for language maintenance and revitalization. For example, an indigenous academy in the developing Americas with relatively more positive results in its planning efforts is the more recent *Academia de Lenguas Mayas* (Academy of Mayan Languages) in Guatemala. Approved in 1991 and funded by the government,¹⁰ the academy does seem to have had some success in promoting Mayan languages in the countryside, despite shortcomings in administrative and linguistic expertise. This success is due in part to its decentralized and less elitist approach to language planning: Much of the academy's work is conducted through locally administered linguistic communities which have, in some places, resulted in greater Mayan pride and increased use of the languages (England, 2003: 740).

As we have seen, however, the purist and urban nature of a language academy can distance it from what could be a language's most valuable resource: the speakers, usually rural and sometimes monolingual, who continue to use the language in their daily lives. If, as in the Quechua Academy, the ideologies and language standards of an academy produce disinterest, disapproval or lower self-regard among regional speakers, the possibilities for successful language maintenance and revitalization can be diminished. The "playing out" of such urban-rural intricacies -- in Peru, Guatemala and throughout the developing world -- will have major consequences for the linguistic diversity of the planet.

E. Conclusion

National language movements, the high status of urban dialects, and the development of cities have had a long interconnected history. Minority languages as well have seen their language movements culminate in the formation of urban language academies whose puristic leanings are reflected in language standards approved by urban elites. Discussions on the consequences that these urban language planning efforts have had for rural minority-language speakers have often been conducted in a European context, but the experience of the Quechua Academy in Cuzco confirms some broad challenges that arise from regional non-acceptance of an academy's directives or from the stigmatization of rural speech. As a result, while a language academy in the city can

10) Indeed, the Mayan Academy's status as a government entity is underscored by its location in the former residence of the Ministry of Defense in Guatemala City.

be a valuable tool for minority language movements, its language planning efforts can alienate the rural-speaker base of a minority language. These observations complement the broader discourse on the complexities of the relationship between the growth of cities and the maintenance or loss of minority languages. As the confluence of the two global phenomena of urbanization and language endangerment will be concentrated in the developing world, the perils and promises that cities bear for these languages will likely command greater import for the scholars and activists concerned.

REFERENCES

- Adelaar, W.F.H. (2009). Quechua. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World*, K. Brown & S. Ogilvie (eds.), 891-892. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Blench, R. (2007). Endangered languages in West Africa. In *Language Diversity Endangered*, M. Brenzinger (ed.), 140-162. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bradley, D. (2007). Language Policy and Language Rights. In *The Vanishing Languages of the Pacific Rim*, O. Miyaoaka, O. Sakiyama, & M.E. Krauss (eds.), 77-90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brenzinger, M. (2007). Language Endangerment in Northern Africa. In *Language Diversity Endangered*, M. Brenzinger (ed.), 123-139. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Christo, D.M.G. (2007). *Language and the City*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cooper, R.L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coronel-Molina, S.M. (2008). Language Ideologies of the High Academy of the Quechua Language in Cuzco, Peru. In *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* Vol. 3, No. 3, 319-340.
- Crystal, D. (2000). *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DESA/UN (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations). (February 2008). *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2007 Revision*. New York. Online at http://www.rb.ru/upload/admins/files/2007WUP_Highlights_web.pdf. Accessed August 2009.
- Dorian, N.C. (1998). Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects*, L.A. Grenoble & L.J. Whaley (eds.), 3-21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eastman, C.M. (1983). *Language Planning: An Introduction*. San Francisco: Chandler and Sharp Publishers.
- Eastman, C.M. (2001). National Language/Official Language. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics*, R. Mesthrie (ed.), 657-662. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Edwards, J. (1985). *Language, Society and Identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin Books.
- England, N.C. (2003). Mayan Language Revival and Revitalization Politics: Linguists and Linguistic Ideologies. In *American Anthropologist* 105(4), 733-743.
- Fishman, J.A. (1972). *The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society*. Rowley, Ma.: Newbury House Publishers.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J.A. (2006). Language Policy and Language Shift. In *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, T. Ricento (ed.), 311-328. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (1998). Toward a typology of language endangerment. In *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects*, L.A. Grenoble & L.J. Whaley (eds.), 22-54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (2006). *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grenoble, L.A. (2009). Endangered languages. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World*, K. Brown & S. Ogilvie (eds.), 317-327. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Grinevald, C. (1998). Language endangerment in South America: a programmatic approach. In *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects*, L.A. Grenoble & L.J. Whaley (eds.), 124-159. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, R.A. (1974). *External History of the Romance Languages*. New York: American Elsevier Ltd.
- Harrison, K.D. (2007). *When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hornberger, N.H. & King, K.A. (1998). Authenticity and Unification in Quechua Language Planning. In *Language, Culture and Curriculum* Vol. 11, No. 3, 390-410.
- Hornberger, N.H. & King, K.A. (2001). Reversing Quechua Language Shift in South America. In *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* J. A. Fishman (ed.), 166-194. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N.H. & King, K.A. (2004). Introduction. Why a special issue about Quechua? In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 167, 1-8.
- Howard, R. (2004). Quechua in Tantamayo (Peru): toward a 'social archaeology' of language. In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 167, 95-118.
- INEI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática). (August 2008). *Perfil Sociodemográfico del Perú 2007*. Lima, Perú. Online at <http://www1.inei.gov.pe/Anexos/libro.pdf>. Accessed August 2009.

- King, K.A. (2001). *Language Revitalization Processes and Prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Krauss, M. (1992). The world's languages in crisis. In *Language* Vol. 68, No 1, 4-10.
- Kuter, L. (1989). Breton vs. French: Language and the opposition of political, social, and cultural values. In *Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death*, N.C. Dorian (ed.), 75-89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackey, W.F. (2003). Forecasting the fate of languages. In *Languages in a Globalising World*, J. Maurais & M.A. Morris. (eds.), 64-81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marr, T. (2002). Language ideology, ownership and maintenance: the discourse of the Academia Mayor de la Lengua Quechua. In *Opportunities and Challenges of Bilingualism*, L. Wei, J.M. Dewaele & A. Housen (eds.), 199-219. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Marti i Castell, J. (1993). The First International Catalan Language Congress, Barcelona, 13-18 October, 1906. In *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning: The "First Congress" Phenomenon*, J.A. Fishman (ed.), 47-68. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Moseley, C. (2007). General introduction. In *Encyclopedia of the World's Endangered Languages*, C. Moseley (ed.), vii-xvi. London/New York: Routledge.
- Niño-Murcia, M. (1997). Linguistic Purism in Cuzco, Peru: A Historical Perspective. In *Language Problems and Language Planning* Vol. 21, No. 2, 134-161.
- Nordberg, B. (1994). Introduction. In *The Sociolinguistics of Urbanization: The Case of the Nordic Countries*, B. Nordberg (ed.), 1-15. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ó Baoill, D. P. (1988). Language planning in Ireland: the standardization of Irish. In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 70, 109-126.
- Ó Hifearnáin, T. (2008). Endangering Language Vitality through Institutional Development: Ideology, Authority, and Official Standard Irish in the Gaeltacht. In *Sustaining Linguistic Diversity: Endangered and Minority Languages and Language Varieties*, K.A. King, et.al. (eds.), 113-128. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ó Riagáin, P. (2001). Irish Language Production and Reproduction 1981-1996. In *Can Threatened Languages be Saved?* J.A. Fishman (ed.), 195-214. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ostler, N. (2005). *Empires of the Word: A Language History of the World*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Poa, D. & LaPolla, R.J. (2007). Minority Languages of China. In *The Vanishing Languages of the Pacific Rim*, O. Miyaoka, O. Sakiyama, & M.E. Krauss (eds.), 337-354. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, J.M.Y. (2001). Minority Languages. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics*, R.

- Mesthrie (ed.), 579-580. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Tandefelt, M. (1994). Urbanization and Language Shift. In *The Sociolinguistics of Urbanization: The Case of the Nordic Countries*, B. Nordberg (ed.), 246-273. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic Purism*. London: Longman Group.
- Trask, R. L. (1996). *History of Basque*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Trudgill, P. (2003). *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1998). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.