Originally published in: Felder, Ekkehard/Jacob, Katharina/Schwinn, Horst/Busse, Beatrix/Große, Sybille/Gvozdanović, Jadranka/Lobin, Henning/Radtke, Edgar (Eds.): Handbuch europäische Sprachkritik online (HESO). Band 4: Sprachinstitutionen und Sprachkritik. – Heidelberg: Heidelberg University Publishing, 2019. Pp. 13-14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17885/heiup.heso.2019.4

## 1.1

Ekkehard Felder/Katharina Jacob/Horst Schwinn/ Beatrix Busse/Sybille Große/Jadranka Gvozdanović/ Henning Lobin/Edgar Radtke

## Introduction

## Translation: Ronja Grebe

Readers of this fourth volume of the Handbook will be presented with a comparison of the ways in which both state-mandated and non-statemandated institutions have devoted themselves to the task of language cultivation with regard to the national languages discussed in this Handbook. The linguistic and action recommendations proposed within this framework for standardising the individual languages are characterised by both differences and commonalities - irrespective of which type of institution was making the recommendation. The comparative article in this volume, which, as in previous volumes, seeks to profile these differences and their classification in an overall linguistic and socio-political context, reveals a range of specific, comparable circumstances (e. g. language cultivation as a means of maintaining national identity) in the light of differing individual conditions (e. g. the need to differentiate within or outside of a state structure or region). One commonality in the development of the academies in Croatia and France is that they follow a state mandate, whereas the Accademia della Crusca operates independently of a state mandate. The academies in each of these countries are also characterised by distinct features - e. g. through the acceptance of each of these individual countries as states as well as through their relations with neighbouring countries. These country- and language-specific circumstances have an impact on the degree of devotion to recommendations for linguistic standardisation. Similarly, commonalities can be observed in the lack of state-authorised regulation of standardisation processes in Germany and Great Britain, but the situations are not identical and only partially comparable. All of these aspects will be presented here in a kaleidoscope of European language criticism.

This present volume, "Language institutions and language criticism", is directly linked to the first three volumes of our Handbook series and to the question, within a comparison of linguistic cultures, as to the ways in which the much-discussed and discursively constituted concept of linguistic standardisation of a national language has developed, along with the

Felder, E./Jacob, K./Schwinn, H./Busse, B./Große, S./ Gvozdanović, J./Lobin, H./Radtke, E.: Introduction. In: HESO 4/2019, p. 13–14. https://dx.doi.org/10.17885/heiup.heso.2019.1.24060 HESO 4 | 2019 - 13



ways in which it is currently changing. This perspective reveals enlightening links to the first volume of the Handbook, ("Critique of language norms"), along with both the second and third volumes ("Standardisation and language criticism" and "Linguistic purism und language criticism").

We would like to take this opportunity to thank our ten evaluators from the fields of German, English, Romance and Slavic studies for their suggestions and comments. Their expertise made it possible to publish the fourth volume of the Handbook in this form. We would also like to thank our translators Paul Chibret, Ronja Grebe, Elisa Manca, Iva Petrak and Lucia Miškulin Saletović, for their exacting and professional collaboration. A final word of thanks goes to Vanessa Münch, who took over the editorial management of this volume with extraordinary proficiency.

Heidelberg and Mannheim, December 2019