

Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies

Paper 61

Crossing Discourses

Language Ideology and Shifting Representations in Sweden's Field of Language Planning

by

Linus Salö[©]

(Stockholm University)

linus.salo@biling.su.se

Crossing Discourses

Language Ideology and Shifting Representations in Sweden's Field of Language Planning ■ Salö, L. forth.

1. Introduction

Over the last few decades, the widespread use of English in Sweden has come to be recognized as a linguistic problem. This complex debate may be characterized as a discursive struggle by means of which Swedish came into effect as the principal language of the state in the 2009 Language Act (SFS 2009:600). What is especially noteworthy in the debate preceding the enactment of this law was the way in which the focal point drifted from a concern with English lexical influence to the more pinpointed problem of English in Swedish academia. It is nowadays a salient feature of the habitus of Swedish language planners to assume a *laissez-faire* attitude towards loanwords and code-switching. *Elements* of English in Swedish are generally thought of as irritating, untidy or superficial – but rarely are they construed as threatening the future of the Swedish language. Nonetheless, the tangible threat in present-day discussions is that English is used extensively in contexts where Swedish previously prevailed. That is, *activities* perceived as being national are understood as gradually becoming superseded by the sole use of English linguistic goods, which in turn devalues Swedish as a linguistic resource.

The shift of focal point is closely tied to a changeover in representations within the field of language planning. Over a short period of time, the label “Swenglish” was replaced by “domain loss” for the sake of representing knowledge about linguistic change. Domain loss later came to serve as a key representation in the legislative history of the Swedish Language Act, and fundamentally changed the way in which English in Sweden was framed and talked about within public and scholarly discourses.

This chapter reviews the course of events and historical labor that may explain this shift in problematization. The question at issue is how and why such shifts occur. Such an endeavor attempts to identify convergences and divergences between the shifting perspectives directing the politics of language. I shall do this empirically by contextualizing the notion of domain loss historically. The purpose is to spotlight its producers and conditions of production – its history of ideological struggle – as well as the discourses *crossing* (Foucault 1984) the trajectories of such struggles. This approach obliges us to address the question of Swedish and English vis-à-vis other issues connected to those of language planning. Incontestably, language planning practices are historically embedded in social structures that encompass issues beyond those of language. The scope here thus goes beyond studies that limit their focus to close readings of presumably central texts, with the aim of unmasking discourses therein. Rather, this study emphasizes discourse as the system of representation (Hall 2013, 29ff.) that regulates the socio-historical conditions of text production. Discourses are “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault 1972, 49). Hence, the objective is to explain society – not texts – but through “the window of discourse” (Blommaert 2005, 66). Texts, then, are subjected to analysis as discursively manifestive of particular times and socio-political circumstances.

Additionally, I seek to present a sociological understanding that accounts for the collective historical labor of individuals and institutions by which these discourses are the products. This is to avoid yielding simplified models of action in which production of discourse is portrayed as purposely manipulated (cf. Blommaert 2005, 15). To accomplish this, we need a way of capturing context historically. Following Bigo (cf. 2013), I suggest that a Foucaultian conception of discourse combined with Bourdieu's notion of *field* provides the means to do so. Together, they compose a fruitful research trajectory for making sense of what interrelated actors are doing, and the means by which they do it. This will also shed light on the processes in which language ideologies (Schieffelin et al. 1998) can give rise to a recognized representation of a linguistic problem and – reflexively – how such representations over time may naturalize language ideology. The term ideology suits these ends, suggesting as it does representations to be “contestable, socially positioned, and laden with political interest” (Hill and Mannheim 1992, 382).

1.1 Approaching the objects

It goes without saying that the objects of knowledge are constructed (Bourdieu 1990, 52). When scrutinized as a scientific notion, domain loss has been challenged from many positions since the turn of the millennium. The notion is now to an ever-increasing extent considered unserviceable as an analytical perspective. According to critics, it represents a phenomenon for which there is neither convincing empirical evidence nor convincing support in sociolinguistic theory (Phillipson 2009, 41ff.; Preisler 2009, 11). However, domain loss belongs to a category of constructions that are only seemingly scientific, but that every so often are “uncritically smuggled into scientific language and which imports into it a whole social unconscious” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 242). Such notions are often the products of struggles in contexts other than scientific inquiry (see Stroud 2004 on the ideological constructs of *semilingualism* and *Rinkeby Swedish*). From this perspective, domain loss appears to be a product of language politics.

I will therefore take the practice of language planning in Sweden as the key sociological object of historical investigation. I concur with Castel (quoted in Madsen 2011, 268) that the general objective of such a historicist approach is “neither to rewrite nor revise history but to re-read history [...] with a sociological narrative and lens”. Here, I employ the lens and epistemological insights developed throughout the oeuvre of Bourdieu's sociology. This angle may be useful for making diachronic researches into language policy and nationalism in the unified linguistic market of the nation-state (cf. May 2011). I treat those agents practicing language planning as jointly participating in and in so doing constituting a *field* – a social arena for the struggles over symbolic and material assets, position-takings and the definition of social reality (cf. Bourdieu 1993, 1996).¹ This approach aims at fleshing out key points of transformation as well as the historical conditions under which these could emerge (cf. Dezalay and Madsen 2012). Fundamentally, the notion of *field* provides the means to grasp context, as it offers a nonmundane account for the socio-historical space from which metalinguistic discourses on English have been produced and in which domain loss has accumulated and generated its meaning. In compliance with the idea of field, the production of discourses is not assumed to be deliberately orchestrated. Instead, they are the relational outcome of the embodied values of individuals acting in the social contexts of fields (Bourdieu 1991; see

also Thompson 1991). In turn, this provides the basis for an investigation of how discursive statements relate to their producers' positions in the field. On some meta-level, this latter point is moreover germane to the enterprise of epistemic reflexivity in the research practice (e.g. Bourdieu 2004; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). In Bourdieu's reflexive sociology, studying the social world in which we as analysts are involved entails "breaking with inside experience" (Bourdieu 1988, 1 [emphasis removed]). Thus, unearthing the field's "epistemological unconscious" (Wacquant 1992, 41) is a prerequisite for achieving a reflexive understanding of one's own position and dispositions in the overlapping fields of language politics and research (Salö 2012).

2. Re-reading history

Next follows an exposition of the history of discourses on English starting from the 1960s, together with the crossing discourses of the '80s and '90s. Conceptual tools such as indexicality, language ideology, field and discourse will be introduced and explicated as they are put into practice. The material drawn upon for this exercise includes texts from the field of language planning that are often hallmarked by the field's institutions, which are also often their publishers. The core source is the periodical *Språkvård*, 'Language Care', published by the Swedish Language Council (under different names) between 1965 and 2007. Articles in *Språkvård* regularly comment on other relevant texts in the field during this period, such as legal or quasi-legal preparatory work, as well as individual work authored by agents of the field. Such writings are to some extent esoteric and jointly constitute a social space of texts, intertextually united by the fact that they produce and reproduce the values – and language ideologies – that are at stake within the field (cf. Bourdieu 1996, 205). Additionally, I shall try to bring together language ideology with Bourdieu's notions of *market* and *habitus*, as well as his writings on law, thereby contributing to some recent advances in the sociolinguistics of changing fluxes in the age of globalization (Blommaert 2010; Park and Wee 2012).

2.1 Swenglish – language ideologies from the '60s to the '80s

In Sweden, the 1960s and onwards were times of prospering internationalism and with that followed a cultural flow of what O'Dell (1997) denotes as Americanization. Because language is an aspect of culture and linguistic influences "seem to travel particularly lightly" (O'Dell 1997, 23), these currents were palpably reflected in the markets of language. This was manifested above all through increasing lexical influence from English, a tendency that had gained currency throughout the post-war era. Listings of lexical newcomers in the Swedish language show that English loanwords from the 1940s to the 1980s time and again outnumber loans from all other languages combined (Svenska språknämnden 1986).

In the early 1960s, metalinguistic discourses on English entered circulation, in which the use of English linguistic features in Swedish was looked upon with suspicion and dislike. This was manifested through the label of Swenglish, a key representation of discourses concerning the un-Swedishness of the Swedish language. In an early instance, Lundberg (1960), a columnist, wrote mockingly about the use of English words and urged teachers, journalists and others to "tighten the sloppy Swenglish which get publicity in print, and which is easily aped by uncritical readers and listeners" (Lundberg

1960, 28). Similarly, De Geer (1962) posed a question: “Will it remain to be Swedish, or will it degenerate into Swenglish or some other gibberish?” (De Geer 1962, 3).

Metalinguistic discourse is considered to be a good place for discovering manifestations of ideology (Blommaert and Verchueren 1998, 26; Woolard 1998, 9). Swenglish is on the one hand constructed around humorous aspects of Swedish mixed up with English or English spoken with a strong Swedish accent. This often used to open linguistic performance up to ridicule. In the other, more pejorative meaning, the representation draws on a set of devalued qualities with strong ties to the history of the field. Swenglish encapsulates many values of the influential Wellanderian School as propounded in the standard work *Riktig svenska* ‘Proper Swedish’ (Wellander 1939). There, the use of foreign words was depicted as low-valued symbolic capital, more specifically as metalinguistic markers of undesirable personal characteristics such as vanity, ignorance, laxity and slothfulness (p. 164–167). Woolard (1998) notes that “[w]hen a linguistic form-in-use is thus ideologized as distinctive and as implicating a distinctive kind of people, it is further often misrecognized, in Bourdieu’s term, or revalorized as transparently emblematic of social, political, intellectual or moral character” (Woolard 1998, 18–19).

This is to say that language is an indexical phenomenon. In the neo-Peircean framework as developed within linguistic anthropology (e.g. Silverstein 1996; Duranti 2012), language and ways of using language are indexical of historical and social features of meaning. Language “points to” and thus evokes stereotypes of social groups, roles or activities (Blommaert 2005, 252; Irvine 1996, 263). Indexicality consequently accounts for an important conceptual tool in the exploration of the ideological side of the politics of language, as this is manifested in the language regimes of a range of different settings (see Kroskrity 2000). Language regimes, then, comprise institutionalized language ideologies (cf. Coulmas 2005, 7). Irvine defines language ideology as “the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interest” (1996, 267). Such a definition stresses the multiple and politically constructed outlook of ideologies, whereby particular views of language serve the interest of particular social groups (Kroskrity 2006, 501).

Apart from marking deficient vocabulary and careless attitudes toward the standard, Swenglish from its launching has been held to be indexical of shallowness and artificiality of manner, largely asserted as part of a jargon that subscribes to Americanized norms (cf. Teleman 2003, 183). Consequently, Swenglish is linked to pretense: it is held to be something that superficial Swedes appropriate in order to impress “ordinary Swedes”. However, this representation has held greater currency among writers and debaters outside the field of language planning. The field of language planning is by tradition composed of individuals and institutions engaged in the standardization, promotion and cultivation of the Swedish language. These agents are jointly united by their conviction that the values at stake are important enough for the game to be worth the candle. Defined as “structured spaces of positions” (Bourdieu 1993, 72), fields are social formations of position-takings in which specialists struggle over – and thereby uphold the value of – something that is held as mutually treasured. Fields have fuzzy boundaries and co-exist in societies, alongside of and embedded into other overlapping fields. Bourdieu (e.g. 1996, 1988) makes use of this concept to characterize the various value economies of literature or science, social spaces made up by their *history of struggle* “for a mo-

nopoly of the imposition of the legitimate categories of perception and appreciation” (Bourdieu 1996, 157). The outcome of such struggles generates positions ready to be held by agents, who compete over the distribution of the field specific capital, prestige, recognition and authority with the aim of having the field to act in their favor (Hanks 2005, 73).

Swedish language planning practices have a long and assiduous history in the making of a unified linguistic market in Sweden. The emergence of the field, however, is centered in the post-war era, as this was the crucial time for making language planning an institutionalized practice in Sweden. This was developed in conjunction with the rise of the political project of *folkhemmet* – ‘the people’s home’ – in Sweden. Elsewhere, images of Sweden came to be conceptualized as the “the Swedish model”, built upon core values such as Keynesianism, social welfare, equality, and military and political neutrality (see the special issue “Images of Sweden and the Nordic Countries”, *Scandinavian Journal of History* 34, 2009). As a response to modernity, the Council for Swedish language planning² was established in 1944 (see Teleman 2003, 55ff.). Alongside the old-established cultural institution The Swedish Academy and The Swedish Centre for Technical Terminology, Sweden now had three main institutions engaged with the practice locally known as *språkvård* ‘language care’. Together with other specialized agents who participated in playing this game – newspaper columnists together with media personalities dealing with language issues, as well as individual university scholars – they would come to shape the field of language planning. By acting, in turn, “the agents are shaped by the relations they engage with” (Bigo 2013, 124). In such reflexive processes, field values and cultural ideas about language are inscribed in the social practices shaping *habitus* – ‘the embodied capital’ – of those who hold positions in the field. Habitus, as the bodily hexis of dispositions, then functions “as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions” (Bourdieu 1977a, 83 [emphasis removed]).

Historically, language planning practices in Sweden have a long tradition of controlling what was considered alien to the linguistic system. But although purism as ideology had some value in the premature rise of the field, it never became official policy in Sweden (Vikør 2010). This too was the outcome of field-internal struggles over ideals, as a set of democratic values became part of the group-habitus of the field. The ideology of language purism was instead transformed into a sort of functionalistic position from which loanwords were welcomed if they could fill a void in the lexicon and be integrated into the linguistic system (Teleman 2003). Aversion to English goods was only at times manifested, by way of example in *Språkvård* 3/1978, where users of the word *kancellera* (‘to cancel’) were said to have a “wavering feeling for the Swedish language – or in the worst case [...] consider it to be nifty to lard one's speech with foreign words which not just anybody will understand” (p. 31).

Starting in the 1980s, the field of language planning was much more concerned with charting the influence of English. Ljung (1988), Chrystal (1988) and others³ all investigated issues of lexicon. These studies contributed somewhat to toning down the perceived threat posed by loanwords, as borrowings were shown to amount to a relatively moderate number, of which most were able to blend into the lexicon. The tone of the writings of this time was mostly conducted in a matter-of-fact manner. There were, however, exceptions. Ljung (1988), for instance, proved to be influenced by a new rheto-

ric typical of the period, whereby tropes were introduced in which encroacher languages “murder” smaller languages. Ljung consequently argued that although the situation appeared to be manageable, escalated borrowing might well become “a threat to our national identity” (1988, 148).

Crossing discourses of ethno-nationalism

With changing patterns of migration and Sweden on the cusp of European integration, the years around 1990 were what Stroud would call “times of turbulent mobility”⁴. Language, then, was certainly not the only market for discourses about national identity at that time (e.g. Milani 2006, 106ff.; Oakes 2001, 2005). In fact, we see here a *crossing* of several discourses interlocking at a single point in time and consequently becoming entangled with each other. Remarking on the manner in which discourses circulate, Foucault (1984) stresses that “[d]iscourses must be treated as discontinuous practices, which cross each other, are sometimes juxtaposed with one another, but can just as well exclude or be unaware of each other” (Foucault 1984, 127). Crossings may come about if two ideological tenets are drawn from in a way that makes them liable to be juxtaposed: placed side-by-side, made available for comparison. They may then be apprehended to be essentially the same discourse.

Parallel to language discussions and starting in the 1970s, Sweden saw new waves of migration as refugees to an ever-increasing extent asked for asylum throughout Northern Europe. In time, this came to shed light on issues concerning Sweden as a multilingual state and so created a socio-political market for the study of bilingualism in Sweden (Hyltenstam and Arnberg 1988). Subsequently, debates about mother tongue education and Swedish as a second language were featured on the political agenda (ibid.). In relation to these developments and heightened by economic crises, the 1980s saw the rise of right-wing xenophobic movements in Sweden, fueled by a general discontent with immigration politics and tax policy combined (Rydgren 2006). These social currents had their breeding ground in the small anti-immigrant grassroots campaign of *Bevara Sverige svenskt* ‘Keep Sweden Swedish’, which later formed the basis for many emerging political parties of discontent. The abbreviation “BSS” was commonly spray painted on walls and public places throughout the 1980s, fueling ethno-nationalistic views about keeping different people and their cultural expressions – including language – apart. Drawing mainly on ethnic kinship vis-à-vis separation, but sometimes also on linguistic counterparts, their message was also distributed on flyers handed out in Stockholm:

The immigrants and their offspring have completely occupied Sweden. [...] The people will then become [...] a mixed race which does not speak Swedish but different languages higgledy-piggledy. (Cited in Lodenius and Larsson 1994, 23)

Nationalistic discourses about ethnical purity were linked to language discourses on English in 1987, in a daily article by Scandinavian linguist Cassirer. Cassirer reacted to a drive co-initiated by the Swedish Language Council, in which nine stickers were distributed to the readers of *Språkvård* (with issue 2-1987) with appeals against Swenglish. The sticker messages read “Swenglish may turn into heathen Greek. Use Swedish!”; “Swedish is better. Anyone will understand this”; et cetera. Under the imperative rubric “Keep Swedish mixed-up”, Cassirer questioned what he referred to as “the haughty atti-

tude that only that what is Swedish is good enough” and candidly accused the drive of playing into the hands of the extreme right:

What [the Language Council] unfortunately does not seem to realize, is that its nine hearty acclamations about the splendiddness of Swedish in fact dabble in the same troubled waters as those who do not only demand that all foreign words must leave the Swedish language, but also that all other “foreign elements” must leave Sweden. (Cassirer 1987, 5)

The field of language planning never publicly recognized the relevance of the discursive link. Instead, the editorial of *Språkvård* 3/1987 stated that it was “unreasonable for anyone to mix up attempts of resistance against cultural predominance with manifestations of contempt for immigrants and foreigners” (p. 3). Similarly, Olsson (1987), professor of literary studies, stood up in defense of the sticker initiative, invoking the argument that “Swenglish is nobody’s mother tongue but first and foremost a linguistic behavior that some Swedes have adopted to impress on other Swedes” (p. 27).

The field, however, shortly thereafter left issues of loanwords behind. Instead, the question of English in Sweden was reorientated towards a higher sociolinguistic scale (Blommaert 2010): that of linguistic relative strengths and the status of the Swedish language. This may first of all be viewed in light of scholarly relevance. The field itself had devalued the question of loanwords, as borrowing had proven to be a marginal linguistic problem (e.g. Chrystal 1988). Moreover, discourses on purity were greatly devalued as the ideas of unification and the authenticity of nationhood came to be deployed as symbolic resources in crossing xenophobic discourses. The field, arguably, needed to dissociate itself from these, not least of all because of the official ideology of anti-racism that was popular in Sweden at that time. Echoing Foucault (1991, 59), this is owing to “the law of *existence* of statements” [emphasis in the original], that renders only some statements possible to make. By and large, this illustrates the point that the outcome of discursive struggles can be affected by seemingly different discourses in circulation. A discourse may lose its value if it is deployed concurrently in an ostensibly different debate to which affinity is unwanted. And vice versa, as we shall see, the discourses of nearby struggles may be drawn from as a resource. Hence, struggles over language never exist in a vacuum but develop as part of more general sociopolitical processes (Blommaert 1999, 2).

Crossing discourses of welfare-nationalism

In the wake of industrialization, the emergence of the Swedish welfare state had become a key component of national identity (Oakes 2001). This gave rise to a new version of nationalism, which Trägårdh (2002) terms *welfare state nationalism*, characterized by the absence of romantic overtones and instead drawing on public pride over core *folkhem* values (Trägårdh 2002; see also Ekenberg 1994). This was soon manifested in the field of language planning. In 1988, the newly elected chairman of the Language Council, Teleman, held a talk at the Nordic Language Meeting, where he linked the safeguarding of Swedish to the autonomy of Sweden (Teleman 1989). Danger, argued Teleman, lured in the event of Sweden joining the EU. Membership in the Union would lead to a “Europeanization” of the political and economic climate, which in turn would have appreciable effects on the national languages. Relaxation of territorial boundaries was bound to lead to a relaxation of linguistic boundaries. This prediction would first and foremost be noticeable in large enterprises, universities and culture.

The shift in representation of English influence ought then to be contemplated as the outcome of struggles between new dispositions and old positions, in turn related to issues with connection to the struggle over the field. As Milani's (2007) analysis reveals, Teleman's perspective was adopted and promoted by Svanlund and Westman (1991), both representatives of the Language Council. Sweden had by now applied for membership in the EU after a time of political debates that Ringmar (1998) calls "a rhetorical battle" between the center-right yes-camp and the no-camp, viz. the left and the far right. As was also the case elsewhere, euroscepticism of the left archetypically displayed a version of civic nationalism organized around an anti-imperialist worldview, rather than cultural homogeneity as did their right-wing counterparts (Halikiopoulou et al. 2012). In the Swedish debate accordingly arose the somewhat inconsistent peculiarity that the EU-critical political left came to stand up for national values, thus drawing on discourses of national identity previously belonging to the repertoire of the bourgeois (Ekenberg 1994, 54; Stråth 1992, 322). Debaters from the left depicted the EU as an elitist neo-liberal project rooted in cold-hearted capitalism and colonialism (Trägårdh 2002, 154 ff.). Apart from business, money and untamed market forces, the EU manifested drug-liberalism, sexism and other moral and political values that obviously "contrasted with the democratic, solidaristic and national welfare state" (ibid., 165). As such, the EU posed a threat to Swedish *folkhem* values and was thus incompatible with the classical conception of Sweden (Ringmar 1998, 52).

Much in line with the left's framing, Swedish, argued Svanlund and Westman (1991), would hardly be on an equal footing with more commonly spoken languages in a competitive free trade linguistic market of the EU. Deep gaps between the social classes would result "if one were to pass on to deal with our official affairs in English" (p. 10–11). One possible consequence of such developments, according to the authors, was that the Swedish standard language would be reduced to a "kitchen and home language" (p. 10).

2.2 Domain loss – language ideologies of the '90s and onwards

Fields then function as sites for the production of discourse (cf. Bigo 2013). In a Bourdieusian approach, discourses are conceived to be symbolic assets in economies of linguistic exchanges (Bourdieu 1977b). Discourses, then, do not just circulate but are produced and reproduced through real practices, by real agents. In this "materialist perspective" (Blommaert and Verchueren 1998), discourses function as a "crucial symbolic resource onto which people project their interests, around which they can construct alliances, and through which they exercise power" (Blommaert 1999, 7). Production of discourse is thus linked to strategy and strategic moves which – it is necessary to underscore – are achieved "without express intention or calculation" (Bourdieu 2000, 138). This thus stands in stark opposition to theories of action à la homo economicus, in which rational actors deliberately strive to maximize profit for their own personal interest.

Mehan (1996, 253) talks of *entextualization* as processes through which "complex, contextually nuanced discussions get summed up in [...] a single word". In Teleman (1992), these new discourses on English were entextualized in this sense, as they were given the lexical label *loss of functional domain*. Teleman listed four domains on the verge of internationalization: i) research and higher education, ii) politics and administration,

iii) trade and industry, and iv) culture and entertainment. Over the years that followed, this phenomenon was given the shorter form domain loss, as coined in Denmark a few years before (Lund 1989). The early 1990s, furthermore, saw the publication of *Linguistic Imperialism* (Phillipson 1992). Directed as it was towards greater issues of language and power, the book proved to be influential to the Swedish debate and the new line of language politics given prominence in that debate (Milani 2007, 178). More and more discourses centered around the exclusive use of English for a number of more or less specialized practices. Domain loss thereby entered the discussion on English as the field's representation and, as such, a more legitimate way of talking about threats against Swedish – with the focal point directed against powerful institutions of social apparatus instead of ordinary language use. To these discourses, the representation of domain loss soon came to serve as a symbolic resource among agents of the field. Laureys (1994), as well as Hyltenstam (1996) and others, invoked the argument that the integration of Sweden into Europe would weaken the state autonomy, which in turn would weaken the Swedish language.

The point is this: “What the agents say and how they say it, to an extent, reveal their position both within and outside the field in terms of [...] political affiliations” (Dezalay and Madsen 2012, 448). The impression that the language issue had become subordinate was clearly illustrated by Westman, director of the Swedish Language Council 1985–2000:

With the increasing Europeanization, the national self-determination is quite likely obliged to be decreased. That is as we know the basic idea. More and more important decisions which concern us will be made outside of the country after negotiations that are not likely to be held in Swedish. (Westman 1996, 185)

This juxtaposition gives a prime example of the way in which accumulated forces of changing a field can “draw support from external changes moving in the same direction” (Bourdieu 1996, 127). In light of this, one may conclude – in line with the analyses by Hult (2005), Oakes (2005), Milani (2007) and others – that it was not a coincidence that the discussion about domain loss emerged at the same time as the discussion of the EU was intensified. They occurred in a time of “economic, political and identity crisis” (Milani 2007, 177). As I have argued elsewhere (Salö 2012), they are also ideologically interconnected. The juxtaposition indexes the link between the political left and the safeguarding of the national language, founded in “the nationalism of modernity which has become the left's Swedish self-image” (Lindberg 2005, 4). As the new threat to Swedish was constructed around the national autonomy of Sweden, agents of the field mobilized against the EU – using language “as the site at which to promote, protect, and legitimate those interests” (Kroskirty 2006, 501). Membership of the EU, following this logic, created a new market to exercise defense of the Swedish language, mobilized through the rhetoric of welfarism and sovereignty. This is not to say that post-war safeguarding of the national language is a leftist project altogether, but rather that the social value of Swedish reflects a socio-political ideal (cf. Blommaert 1999, 2). Moreover, such elaborations of ideology are *reconfigurations* and hence not free of legacy from their predecessors, just as the notion of *folkhemmet* still contains “vital allusions to an ethnic entity, the *folk*” (J. Andersson 2009, 240 [emphasis in the original]). From this vantage point, the nationalist revival that Oakes (2005) observes may be seen as the out-

come of romantic conceptions of the national language becoming revalorized when filtered through the lens of democratism and into the logics of the contemporary field. However, this may perhaps only be grasped by apprehending language planning as a battlefield for language disputes, where agents conduct a struggle over what problems the field should address or how conceptualizations are to be perceived. This then attests to Bourdieu's point that "[t]he struggles within the field are struggles to be or remain contemporary" (Bourdieu 2004, 64).

The struggles over indexicalities

Summing up the last few years of debate, Teleman and Westman (1997) were able to establish that Swedish was continuously losing domains to English. To maintain and promote Swedish, a language policy aim was presented stating that Swedish should be a "complete and society bearing language" (see Milani 2007 for a critical review). The phrasing is important, as it appeared several years after the coining of domain loss, and was later to reappear in several important language policy documents. At length, it sets the objectives towards which domain loss pose a threat. It is through this rationalization that domain loss has its *raison d'être* as a representation of a linguistic problem.

In 1997, the government requested the Language Council to draw up an action plan for the promotion of the Swedish language. Milani (2006) claims that the government decision to entrust the Language Council with such a task was informed by the field's metalinguistic discourses on English. The result was presented the year after in the Draft Action Programme (Svenska språknämnden 1998). Here, the proposed measures for safeguarding Swedish included that the position of the Swedish language should be established by law. The reason for this was that

"The most far-reaching influence [...] consists in Anglo-American taking over areas of usage in which Swedish previously predominated" (Svenska språknämnden 1998, 9)

Whereas Swenglish was indexical of Americanized consumerism and mass culture, "Anglo-American" more distinctively attests that these indexicalities of English are cultural-political. Rendering Anglo-American to be a synonym of English should then be seen as an attempt to project a certain set of indexicalities onto a language, that is – bottom line – to identify English as a cultural product of the United States and, as such, emblematic of anti-*folkhem* values. Use of English then equals caving in to the hegemonic and normative behavior of a superior power. This is not unique to Sweden but follows a global tendency in which English is "associated with core values of capitalist ideas of success: entrepreneurship, mobility, luxury" (Blommaert 2005, 212). If one concurs with Park and Wee (2012, 125) that the indexical value of English is imbued through metalinguistic discourses about English, it makes sense that safeguarding Swedish practices make use of such discourses in their position-taking. This could serve as a counterweight to the positive social values of English, emblematic as it is in Sweden of professionalism, cosmopolitanism and modernity. In this way, the indexicalities are played out against each other, in turn suggesting fields to be sites for the production of indexicalities. Hence, as Silverstein (1996, 299) maintains, "there *is* a market" [emphasis in the original]. In Sweden, goods therein to a great extent acquire their indexical value through the Swedish national self-image. It is through perceived differences between the Swedish model and the American "model" that values are "projected onto the difference"

(Silverstein 1996, 297) between Swedish and English. With English framed as a symbol for cultural superiority, antipathy to English could be perceived as punching above your weight. This, moreover, coincides with theories on the politics of language purism (Weinstein 1989), claiming that purist ideologies tend to target features that manifest domination, and thus only target languages “construed as threats on a social or political basis” (Woolard 1998, 21–22).

Elaborating monoglot ideology

The Action Programme (Svenska språknämnden 1998) gave rise to critique in *Språkvård* (Boyd and Huss 1999). This targeted mainly what was perceived to be a one-sided focus on the Swedish language, thus sidestepping minority languages. This was unfortunate, argued Boyd and Huss (1999, 7), particularly because the Action Programme was written during the same period as when Sweden was preparing accede to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages of 1992 (see SOU 1997:192). The Charter was ratified in 2000, with the result that five languages were recognized as minority languages of Sweden: Finnish, Sami, Meänkieli, Romani Chib and Yiddish.

In response to the critique, Josephson, Scandinavian linguist and recently appointed director of the Swedish Language Council, counter-argued in *Språkvård* for the inescapable relevance for the Language Council to deal with Swedish too:

“If the government official report on minority languages – and rightly so – can devote close to five hundred pages to the minority languages without really discussing the Swedish language, then the Swedish language council must be permitted to devote fifteen pages to the Swedish language!” (Josephson 2000, 35)

This quote reflects a breeding dissatisfaction among agents of the field with the fact that the position of Swedish had been largely neglected in wider societal discourses on other languages in the multilingual landscape of Sweden. In particular, these centered around linguistic rights to other mother tongues, recognition of minority languages and language educational issues in connection to speakers of languages other than Swedish. This discontent was manifested in the oft-noted particularity that the status of Swedish was enforced by law in Finland – but not in Sweden (e.g. Allén 2005; also K. Andersson 2005). By the same token, Falk (2001, 7) raised the point that “[t]he way things are now, Sweden has five officially recognized minority languages but no official majority language.”

Linn and Oakes (2007, 87) point out that Scandinavian countries were pioneers in politicizing the threat from English. Among these, Sweden was first out. In 2002, the committee report *Mål i mun* (SOU 2002:27) was published – the result of the last few years of language political debate. The term domain loss was mentioned repeatedly in *Mål i mun*, and the report devoted several pages to conduct a thorough line of reasoning about potential long-term effects of this phenomenon. Likewise, the dispositional outline of the report was largely a reflection of the discussion up until this point, where domains were dealt with separately in different chapters. In broad outline, *Mål i mun* later came to be exported as the model for similar reports in other Nordic countries, e.g. *Sprog på spil* in Denmark 2003 and *Norsk i hundre* in Norway 2005 (see Josephson 2012, 23–24).

Mål i mun proposed that Swedish should be established as the principal language of Sweden by law (p. 35). With its functionalistic ideal now also covering status issues, the report stands out as a symbol for the completed shift towards the new linguistic order in

Sweden with Swedish as the principal language. Moreover, room was given for the use of English in globalized environments – if there is *parallel* room for Swedish too (Hult 2005, 76). As many scholars admit, however, *Mål i mun* also attempted to put emphasis on Sweden as a multilingual state (e.g. Boyd and Huss 2003; Hult 2004; Milani 2007). By and large, this is illustrative of the point made by Hyltenstam (1996): that Swedish is a local majority language and at the same time a global minority language. This sheds light upon a crucial feature of language ideology in Sweden, grounded in the task of keeping the linguistic market unified in the era of globalization but without pressuring languages subordinated to Swedish in the nation-state hierarchy (cf. Hult 2004; Hyltenstam 2002).

In this respect, it may be argued that discussions on domain loss and the position of Swedish were able to effectively cling on to discourses linked to the status of the minority languages (Salö 2012). However, as Milani and Johnson (2008) have analyzed in some detail, the follow-up bill *Bästa språket* (Prop. 2005/06:2) did not include the proposal of establishing the status of Swedish by law. Without referring to this debate, the responsible minister Pagrotsky (2005) argued that legislation was not needed to enshrine the status of Swedish. The reluctance of having the status of Swedish fixed by law was linked to an anxiety about disfavouring the position of the immigrant and minority languages and, as a consequence, potentially discriminating against their speakers (Prop. 2005/06:2, 14ff.). Such concerns had already been raised field-internally (Boyd and Huss 2003). By and large, these arguments were, however, outcasts within the field at large. Somewhat dejectedly, Josephson (2005, 13) noted that “[a] law about Swedish as the principal language would have been directed against English. It was therefore consistent for the government to reject the proposition.”

One way or the other, it appears as if a struggle about language in the context of a nation-state is in the cards for touching upon the national. Linn and Oakes (2007) apprehend the underplaying of Swedish as a symbol for national identity as the outcome of nationalism being a historically burdened conceptualization in Sweden. This “taboo about ethnicity and nationalism” (Milani and Johnson 2008, 9) may explain the field’s fear of yet again becoming entangled with discourses of ethno-nationalism. But related to this, it was reckoned to be offensive to couple the safeguarding of Swedish to nationalism. Thus, such juxtapositions invoked frustration within the field. For instance, Allén, previous Permanent Secretary of the Swedish Academy, argued that one “must be able to [...] point to the fact that Swedish is the most important language of Sweden without being called a nationalist” (Allén 2005, 6).

This tension around nationalism may then be explained by reference to the Janus-faced comprehension of this notion in Sweden. Nationalism may be comprehended as coupled to mainstream ideals of civic unity and political sovereignty – but simultaneously, as loaded with the taste of cultural homogeneity and racism. These are layers of somewhat intersected indexical meanings. As a result, even those who strive at upholding nationalistic values more often than not decline the epithet nationalists. For these reasons, it seems unfruitful to attempt to pin down discourses on English in Sweden by means of pre-given concepts of nationalism. Although Bourdieu offers no comprehensive theory on nations and nationalism, he has written extensively on the social genesis of groups and collectives. Tools elaborated in this framework may subsequently be de-

ployed to compass nations and nationalism as objects of struggle (see Gorski 2013). This compels analysts to refrain from reducing field agents to nationalists. But at the same time, it cannot be neglected that notions of dominant languages fundamentally derive from processes of state formation and institutionalized political domination (Bourdieu 1991, 150). In the phrasing of May “these processes were and are deeply imbricated with the politics of modern nationalism” (May 2011, 151). In consequence, to language planning practices, the nation-state is an indispensable category for the promotion of national languages, and thus, the *doxa* of the field has nationalistic footings. Globalizing processes, then, lead up to transformation of capital – changes in its valorization, composition and distribution – which disarrays status quo and triggers “nation-ization” struggles (Gorski 2013, 261). Discussing nationalist responses to European integration, Andersson (2009) asserts that “[i]n Sweden, it has clearly given rise to a kind of welfare nationalism, in which European integration and the Others that it brings with it is seen as a threat to the architecture and values of the Model, its collective agreements, wage bargaining system and labour law” (J. Andersson 2009, 241). To this one may add the language regime, and reactions to the way in which these change in globalizing environments (Coulmas 2005). To the field of language planning, globalization threatens the values at stake.

Most scholarly accounts on language and nationalism deal with an early conception of nationalism, that of the emergence of the nation-state and the language ideological nexus of one nation – one people – one language (see Kroskirty 2000). Domain loss, however, circumvents this maxim. Its social underpinnings, then, do not disclose a textbook case of *monoglot ideology* (Silverstein 1996), as it is commonly manifested in English only campaigns. Domain loss is based on different assumptions on the role of Swedish in society, where the rendering of this ideology largely draws on the social order of lingua franca: for Swedish to have the position locally that English enjoys globally. Yet this rendering too shows a strong belief in one neutral, standardized language emblematic of the unified nation-state – possession of which is portrayed as the crucial key to equality (Silverstein 1996, 286, 291). Moreover, the natural linkage between language and place – Swedish and Sweden – is undisputedly the “neutral point used to measure and evaluate events and phenomena that are congruent or deviant” (Blommaert 1999, 19). This is apparent irrespective of whether focus is on purity or social value. But as the backbone permeating many language disputes in Sweden, monoglot ideology is subject to constant negotiation, elaboration and change.

Regimenting ideology through law

As we have seen, domain loss was effectively used as a resource to gain a hearing for discourses on English both in and outside the field. That is, this discourse of problematization was first entextualized and anchored within the field, and then disseminated into other fields of power. This is obviously relevant to issues concerning the regimentation of language ideologies through language legislation. To Bourdieu (1987, 848), the essential instrument of such normalization processes is the law.

In the government report *Värna språken* (SOU 2008:26) later enforced by the Swedish Language Act, the government’s chief investigator Nilsson stated that “[a]ccording to scholars, there is [...] nothing that indicates that the incorporation of loan words nec-

essarily leads to language death. Language death rather occurs through domain losses” (p. 45). Subsequently, the Language Act states that Swedish is to be usable in all areas of society (SFS 2009:600, section 5). This way of representing knowledge, then, had far greater impact than the mere contribution of a concept, as the entire debate had come to revolve around the domain worldview. As a case, it shows that a notion may travel interdiscursively from a field to law through a “chain of legitimation” (Bourdieu 1987, 824) given the state’s authority: from quasi-official examinations to sanctioned action plans and further on to government official reports, government bills and into the realms of law. Similarly, Blackledge (2005) refers these discursive phenomena in respect to the manner in which arguments “travel along ‘chains of discourse’ until they gain the legitimacy of the state” (2005, VII). In so far as the state is the legitimate issuer of seals, Bourdieu (2000) considers law to be the objectification of the dominant vision recognized as legitimate. This is to say that a discourse given legal authority guaranteed by the state is the quintessential form of recognized symbolic power (Bourdieu 2000, 186). The case of domain loss adds insight to this, as it highlights the historical conditions under which this force was made possible (cf. Dezalay and Madsen 2012, 438). This may be seen as an illustrative example of what systems of representations *do* in the construction of “reality”. As Hall (2013) reasons, knowledge about any particular subject is informed by historic and culturally specific ways of representing it. Although changing ideologies may lead to a change of representations, the case of domain loss in Sweden reveals this to be a reflexive process that rather highlights the reverse: that a elaborated language ideology may win recognition by offering a new representation on the market. Domain loss, as an illustrative case for the study of the trajectory of an idea, sheds light upon one of the most salient features of systems of representations, namely their capacity to germinate and form the objects they originally set out to narrow down (cf. Foucault 1972). This may be seen as a backwash feature of entextualization, whereby domain loss served as an ideological forerunner and the operator of “the regime of truth that the field imposes” (Bourdieu 2000, 96).

2.3 Language ideology, market, and habitus

New conceptions on the national language in the unified market of the nation-state should thus be added to the antagonistic tension of the field. The key dynamics of a linguistic market approach maintain that no language has any value outside the market, and linguistic competence is to be comprehended as linguistic capital (Bourdieu 1993). In the logic of such Bourdieusian thought, the market of Swedish barely exceeds the territorial space of Sweden, while Sweden is part of the global marketplace of English (cf. Bourdieu 1991, 57). Following Bourdieu (1977b), the language dominating the market inevitably becomes the norm against which the prices of other languages are defined – and with them the value of the competence in them, authority over them and so forth.

This insight helps explain a kind of process of elimination in the beginning of the new millennium, whereby the number of domains alleged to be threatened was narrowed down until English as a language of education was the last outpost of the field’s language ideological struggle. In the years surrounding the publication of *Mål i mun*, some work was published surveying the language situation in the most frequently alleged domains. Falk (2001) as well as Höglin (2002) – as did *Mål i mun* – singled out re-

search and higher education to be the domain most prone of suffering from domain loss. Language in such milieus had already been the subject of investigation in a study by Gunnarsson and Öhman (1997), in which usage of English was shown to be both widespread and ever increasing. This understanding was strengthened further in the anthology *Engelskan i Sverige* (Svenska språknämnden 2004), yet another attempt to deal with these domains. The highly globalized area of popular culture proved here to be difficult to address critically without directing criticism against cultural manifestations of youths and groups with different possessions of cultural capital. Likewise, in the chapter on the role of Swedish in the EU, Melander (2004) somewhat unexpectedly commented that domain loss (particularly *loss*) was a problematic characterization of a language situation which “came up first in that Sweden entered the EU” (p. 177).

Attention was instead turned more wholeheartedly towards the universities, a subject dealt with in Gunnarsson’s chapter and thereafter by Jansson (2008), Salö (2010), Söderlundh (2010) and others, many of which continued to frame this issue by means of the domain loss notion. Through the reproduction of such a representation, interest-laden sets of ideas about language could be transmitted through historical practices as truths of the field. This way, the professional habitus of those who embark upon playing the game of the field may be effectively adjusted in advance of the demands of the field, as pretendents of the field inherit the awareness that domain loss describes a real phenomenon and that it should be fought against. Following Hanks (2005), I suggest that language ideology aligns nicely with Bourdieu’s concept of habitus on this point, as it explains orderliness by reference to the social embedding of agents (Hanks 2005, 69). This accounts somewhat for how one becomes an ideology broker (Blommaert and Verchueren 1998). In general terms, it explicates why experts, laymen and scholars so often appear to be disposed to understand the semiotic complexity of a certain linguistic phenomena in a special way. Language, in this respect, becomes indexical in relation to habitus as a product of history (cf. Bourdieu 1990, 54).

The globalized transnational fields of science and higher education, too, show vestiges of struggles, which now had the ground prepared for internationalization, New Public Management techniques and publish or perish regimes that are commonly held to favor English (Kauppi and Erkkilä 2011). The “university domain” stood out as indeed iconic of the dystopia of the field: a tax-funded market crucial to Sweden as a knowledge society in which languages other than Swedish were valuable linguistic capital. Swedish was even reported to be absent in many disciplines (Gunnarsson and Öhman 1997). What was really new, however, was a tendency for English to become established as a language of instruction (Salö 2010). One might say that university teaching accounts for the language regime par excellence for the nation-state to uphold – which, in fact, has become much more important than the practice of publishing research. In the linguistic market of Bourdieu, “the educational system is a crucial object of struggle because it has a monopoly over [...] the reproduction of the market on which the value of linguistic competence depends, in other words its capacity to function as linguistic capital” (1977b, 652).

Positions and position-takings

In this light, Bourdieu poses the claim that “[t]hose who seek to defend a threatened capital, be it Latin or any other component of traditional humanistic culture, are forced to conduct a total struggle [...] because they cannot save the competence without saving the market” (Bourdieu 1977b, 651). This points to an important correspondence between the agents and the stakes: positions and position-takings (cf. Dezalay and Madsen 2012, 448). To say that domain loss served as a symbolic resource is to contemplate it as a product of the relation between habitus and field (cf. Thompson 1991, 14). This is to acknowledge *per se* that the field’s agents are those who have orchestrated its construction, including players who from their positions in academic fields have vouched for the legitimacy of the representation. Against the backdrop of such statements, one may establish that these discourses on English were not in the first place produced by “objective” reviewers or “neutral” experts of language endangerment – because it is a fallacy to assume the existence of such objectivity. They were rather produced by those agents who jointly collaborate into upholding the value of the symbolic goods that constitute the field. Saving Swedish, according to this logic, implies saving Sweden as a market in which Swedish – and metalinguistic knowledge of Swedish – is valued symbolic capital. Through habitus, this was “collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor” (Bourdieu 1977a, 72). That is to say that this was not done deliberately in the calculated sense, but in accordance with “the logic of practice” (Bourdieu 1990, 80ff.) in which representations are structured through the habitus of their producers (Bourdieu 1977a, 72).

3. Conclusion

The re-reading presented in this chapter proposes domain loss to be a socially embedded representation, loaded with a particular, historically contingent way of representing knowledge about the interrelationship between language and the social world. Since the early ‘90s, it has served as part of a strategy to establish discourses about threats to the nation-state language regime. As such, it manifests an elaboration of monoglot ideology, which encapsulates language ideologies partially originating from different conceptualizations of nationalism. Throughout the social history of the domain loss notion, these have impacted the trajectories of the field’s struggles through crossing discourses that defined “the limits and forms of the sayable” (Foucault 1991, 59).

The main argument embarked on in this chapter is that the genesis of this notion cannot be accounted for by focusing on the debate on Swedish vs. English only. Most notably, discourses on the position of minority languages, and the linguistic rights of their speakers, have directed the politics of language also with regards to the position of Swedish contra English in the era of globalization. The change in representation in the debate on English in Sweden ought then to be contemplated *vis-à-vis* other issues with connection to struggle over the field, as a field effect from adjacent struggles.

The notion of field is suggested to be a powerful tool for fleshing out the mechanisms of this transformation, as through agents’ habitus it elucidates “the interrelationship between individual action and group mores” (May 2010, 164). As Blommaert (2005, 43) has identified: “If we want to explain the way in which people make sense socially, in real environments, we need to understand the contexts in which such sense-making practices develop.” Thus, the notion of field explicates the linkage of discourses to positions.

In this light, metalinguistic discourses on English were produced by agents who had themselves invested their capital in the market they defended, a market that, outside the realm of the state, was perceived as becoming devalued. In these struggles, agents were feeding a growing nostalgia for the ideological foundations of the civic welfare state (cf. J. Andersson 2009). Swedish, in the narratives of such struggles, becomes indexical of the post-war notions of Sweden and the social model of Swedish modernity. Domain loss has its breeding ground in resistance against the disestablishment of the project of the total and all-embracing language regime(s) of Sweden, in which the nation-state is crucial as a frame for keeping such a vision intact. The notion may then be understood as a way of handling globalization processes in which the role of the state is set in flux, opening up linguistic markets beyond the control of the nation-state, where Swedish naturally is of low value (cf. Blommaert 2010). In this sense, it is a successful representation, irrespective of its status as a scientific notion.

Acknowledgements

Thanks go to members and supporters of the Swedish Association for Linguistic Anthropology (Swalan) as well as to two anonymous reviewers. All translations of quotes here are made by the author unless otherwise stated.

Notes

1 This chapter by no means constitutes a field analysis of the language planning practices in Sweden. Such a task requires a vitally different approach (see Bourdieu 1996). Here, the notion of field is rather deployed as a theoretical posture as part of a comprehensive sociological model, which, of course, in agreement with Madsen (2011, 269), “naturally presupposes that a field eventually emerged”. The rationale for adopting this approach is due to the general laws of fields: “we can use what we learn about the functioning of each particular field to question and interpret other fields” (Bourdieu 1993, 72).

2 *Nämnden för svensk språkvård*, later *Svenska språknämnden* ‘The Swedish Language Council’.

3 Cf. the 1985 conference *English in Swedish*, focusing mainly on words in different “spheres” (see *Språkvård* 1-1986).

4 Keynote at *Language and Super-diversity: Explorations and interrogations*, Jyväskylä June 2013.

References

- Allén, Sture. 2005. “Är god svenska diskriminerande?” Svenska Dagbladet, 6 Dec., 6.
- Andersson, Karolin. 2005. “Svenska blir inte lagskyddat.” Svenska Dagbladet, 6 Dec., 3.
- Andersson, Jenny. 2009. “Nordic Nostalgia and Nordic Light. The Swedish Model as Utopia 1930–2007.” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 34(3): 229–245.
- Bigo, Didier. 2013. “Security. Analysing Transnational Professionals of (In)security in Europe.” In *Bourdieu in International Relations. Rethinking Key Concepts in IR*, ed. Rebecca Adler-Nissen, 114–130. London/New York: Routledge.
- Blackledge, Adrian. 2005. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Blommaert, Jan. 1999. “The Debate is Open.” In *Language Ideological Debates*, ed. Jan Blommaert, 1–38. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge.
- Blommaert, Jan and Jef Verschueren. 1998. *Debating Diversity. Analysing the Discourse of Tolerance*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977a. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977b. “The Economics of Linguistic Exchanges.” *Social Science Information* 16(6), 645–668.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1987. “The Force of Law: Toward a Sociology of the Juridical Field.” *The Hasting Law Journal* 38:814–853.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1988. *Homo Academicus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Malden: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *Sociology In Question*. London: SAGE.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. *The Rules of Art*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2004. *Science of Science and Reflexivity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to a Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Boyd, Sally and Leena Huss. 1999. "Det behövs en helhetssyn på språken i Sverige!" *Språkvård* 3:5–9.
- Boyd, Sally and Leena Huss. 2003. "Mål i mun och språklig mångfald." *Språkvård* 1:28–34.
- Cassirer, Peter. 1987. "Bevara svenskan blandad." *Dagens Nyheter*, 8 Aug., 5.
- Coulmas, Florian. 2005. "Changing Language Regimes in Globalizing Environments." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175/176, 3–15.
- Chrystal, Judith. 1988. *Engelskan i svensk dagspress*. Stockholm: Esselte Studium.
- De Geer, Vilhem. 1962. *Svenska språkets engelska sjuka*. Stockholm: Andrén & Holm.
- Dezalay, Yves and Mikael Rask Madsen. 2012. "The Force of Law and Lawyers: Pierre Bourdieu and the Reflexive Sociology of Law." *The Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 8, 433–452.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 2012. "Anthropology and Linguistics." In *The Sage Handbook of Social Anthropology*, eds. Richard Fardon, Olivia Harris, Trevor Marchand, Mark Nuttall, Cris Shore, Veronica Strang, and Richard Wilson, 12–23. Los Angeles/London: Sage.
- Ekenberg, Stefan. 1994. "Nationalism in the Swedish Welfare State." *Migration* 23–24:43–61.
- Falk, Maria. 2001. *Domänförluster i svenskan*. Köpenhamn: Nordiska ministerrådet.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. "The Order of Discourse." In *Language and Politics*, ed. Michael J. Shapiro, 109–138. Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Politics and the study of discourse." In *The Foucault Effect. Studied in Governmentality*, eds. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller, 53–72. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gorski, Philip. 2013. "Nation-ization Struggles. A Bourdieusian Theory of Nationalism." In *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis*, ed. Philip Gorski, 242–265. Durham/London: Duke University Press.
- Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise and Katarina Öhman. 1997. "Det internationaliserade universitetet. En studie av bruket av engelska och andra främmande språk vid Uppsala universitet." *TeFa* 16: 1–88.
- Halikiopoulou, Daphne, Kyriaki Nanou and Sofia Vasilopoulou. 2012. "The paradox of Nationalism: The Common Denominator of Radical Right and Radical Left Euroscepticism." *European Journal of Political Research* 51(4): 504–539.
- Hall, Stuart. 2013. "The Work of Representation." In *Representation*, eds. Stuart Hall, Jessica Evans and Sean Nixon, 1–56. London: SAGE.
- Hanks, William. 2005. "Pierre Bourdieu and the Practices of Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 67–83.
- Hill, Jane and Bruce Mannheim. 1992. "Language and World View." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21:381–406.
- Hult, Francis. 2004. "Planning for Multilingualism and Minority Language Rights in Sweden." *Language Policy* 3: 181–201.
- Hult, Francis. 2005. "A Case of Prestige and Status Planning: Swedish and English in Sweden." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 6(1): 73–79.

- Hyltenstam, Kenneth. 1996. "Svenskan, ett minoritetsspråk i Europa – och världen?" *Svenskans beskrivning* 21, 9–33.
- Hyltenstam, Kenneth. 2002. "Sociolinguistic Dynamism and Minority Languages – Global Trends reflected on the Swedish Scene." In *Cultural Diversity in the Baltic Sea Region*, eds. Imbi Sooman and Erwin Uhrmann, 36–44. University of Vienna.
- Hyltenstam, Kenneth and Lenore Arnberg. 1988. "Bilingualism and Education of Immigrant Children and Adults in Sweden." In *International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, ed. Christina Bratt Paulston, 475–513. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Höglin, Renée. 2002. *Engelska språket som hot och tillgång i Norden*. Köpenhamn: Nordiska ministerrådet.
- Irvine, Judith. 1996. "When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy". In *The Matrix of Language*, eds. Donald Brenneis and Ronald Macaulay, 258–283. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Jansson, Erland, ed. 2008. *Vetenskapssvenska – med svensk kvalitet?* Stockholm: Språkrådet, Högskoleverket and Södertörns högskola.
- Josephson, Olle. 2000. "Samhällsbärande språk." *Språkvård* 2:33–35.
- Josephson, Olle. 2005. "Bra mål i språkpolitiken." Svenska Dagbladet. 10 Dec., 13.
- Josephson, Olle. 2012. "La communauté linguistique nordique. Éléments de comparaison des politiques linguistiques dans les pays nordiques." *Nordiques* 24: 17–36.
- Kauppi, Nilo and Tero Erkkilä. 2011. "The Struggle over Global Higher Education: Actors, Institutions, and Practices." *International Political Sociology* 5:314–326.
- Kroskrity, Paul, ed. 2000. *Regimes of Language*. Santa Fe: SAR Press.
- Kroskrity, Paul. 2006. "Language Ideologies." In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. Alessandro Duranti, 496–517. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Laureys, Godelieve. 1994. "Det svenska språket i ett europeiskt perspektiv." *Svenskans beskrivning* 20: 24–37.
- Lindberg, Bo. 2005. "Det nya Sverige och språket vi ärvde." *Svenska Dagbladet*. 21 March 2005, 4.
- Linn, Andrew and Leigh Oakes. 2007. "Language Policies for a Global Era: The Changing Face of Language Politics in Scandinavia." In *Standard, Variation and Language Change in the Germanic Languages*, eds. Christian Fandrych and Reinier Salverda, 59–90. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Lodienius, Anna-Lena and Stieg Larsson. 1994. *Extremhögern*. Stockholm: Tiden.
- Ljung, Magnus. 1988. *Skinheads, hackers & lama ankor. Engelskan i 80-talets Sverige*. Stockholm: Trevi.
- Lund, Jørn. 1989. *Okay? Amerikansk påvirkning af dansk sprog*. Köpenhamn: Dansklærerforeningen.
- Lundberg, Allan. 1960. "Om bruket av fula ord." *Industria* 10: 24–28.
- Madsen, Mikael Rask. 2011. "Reflexivity and the Construction of the International Object: The Case of Human Rights." *International Political Sociology* 5, 259–275.
- May, Stephen. 2011. "Language Policy." In *Bourdieu, Language and Linguistics*, ed. Michael Grenfell, 147–170. London: Continuum.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1996. "The Construction of an LD Student: A Case Study in the Politics of Representation." In *Natural Histories of Discourse*, eds. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, 253–276. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Melander, Björn. 2004. "Vinna eller försvinna? Om engelskans användning i EU-sammanhang." In Svenska språknämnden 2004.
- Milani, Tommaso. 2006. "Language Planning and National Identity in Sweden: A Performativity Approach." In *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices*, eds. Clare Mar-Molino and Patrick Stevenson, 104–117. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Milani, Tommaso. 2007. "Voices of Endangerment: A Language Ideological Debate on the Swedish Language." In *Discourses of Endangerment. Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*, eds. Alexandre Duchêne and Monica Heller, 169–196. London: Continuum.

- Milani, Tommaso and Sally Johnson. 2008. "Language politics and legitimation crisis in Sweden." *Language Problems & Language Planning* 32(1):1–22.
- Oakes, Leigh. 2001. *Language and National Identity. Comparing France and Sweden*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Oakes, Leigh. 2005. "From Internationalisation to Globalisation. Language and the Nationalist Revival in Sweden." *Language Problems & Language Planning* 29(2), 151–176.
- O'Dell, Tom. 1997. *Culture Unbound. Americanization and Everyday Life in Sweden*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Olsson, Bernt 1987. "Alla språk duger." *Språkvård* 3:26–28.
- Pagrotsky, Leif. 2005. "Svenskan är så stark att den inte behöver försvaras." Svenska Dagbladet, 20 Dec., 6–7.
- Park, Joseph Sung-Yul and Lionel Wee. 2012. *Markets of English. Linguistic Capital and Language Policy in a Globalizing World*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, Robert. 2009. "English in Higher Education: Panacea or Pandemic?" *Angles on the English-Speaking World* 9, 29–58.
- Preisler, Bent 2009. "Complementary Languages. The National Language and English as Working Languages in European Universities." *Angles on the English-Speaking World* 9, 10–28.
- Prop. 2005/06:2. *Bästa språket – en samlad svensk språkpolitik*. Stockholm: Kulturdepartementet.
- Ringmar, Erik. 1998. "Re-imagining Sweden: The Rhetorical Battle Over EU Membership." *Scandinavian Journal of History* 23:45–63.
- Rydgren, Jens. 2006. *From Tax Populism to Ethnic Nationalism. Radical Right-Wing Populism in Sweden*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Salö, Linus. 2010. *Svenska eller engelska? En kartläggning av språksituationen inom högre utbildning och forskning*. Stockholm: Språkrådet.
- Salö, Linus. 2012. "Domänförlust som språkideologisk representation. Språkvårdens diskurser om engelska i Sverige." *Nordand* 7(2):21–59.
- Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard and Paul Kroskrity, eds. 1998. *Language Ideologies. Practice and Theory*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SFS 2009:600. 2009. *Språklag*. Svensk författningssamling. Stockholm: Kulturdepartementet.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1996. "Monoglot 'Standard' in America: Standardization and Metaphors of Linguistic Hegemony." In *The Matrix of Language*, eds. Donald Brenneis and Ronald Macaulay, 284–306. Boulder: Westview Press.
- SOU 1997:192. 1997. *Steg mot en minoritetspolitik - Europarådets konvention för skydd av nationella minoriteter*. Stockholm: Landsbyggsdepartementet.
- SOU 2002:27. 2002. *Mål i mun. Förslag till handlingsprogram för svenska språket*. Stockholm: Kulturdepartementet.
- SOU 2008:26. *Värna språken – förslag till språklag*. Stockholm: Kulturdepartementet.
- Stroud, Christopher. 2004. "Rinkeby Swedish and Semilingualism in Language Ideological Debates: A Bourdieuan Perspective." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8(2): 196–214.
- Stråth, Bo. 1992. *Folkhemmet mot Europa. Ett historiskt perspektiv på 90-talet*. Stockholm: Tidens förlag.
- Svanlund, Jan and Margareta Westman. 1991. "Svenska språkets ställning vid europeisk integration." *Språkvård* 4:9–11.
- Svenska språknämnden 1986. *Nyord i svenskan från 40-tal till 80-tal*. Stockholm: Esselte Studium.
- Svenska språknämnden 1998. *Förslag till handlingsprogram för att främja svenska språket*. URL: www.sprakradet.se/2284 (Feb. 22 2013).
- Svenska språknämnden 2004. *Engelskan i Sverige. Språkval i utbildning, arbete och kulturliv*. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Söderlundh, Hedda. 2010. *Internationella universitetet – lokala språkval. Om bruket av talad svenska i engelskspråkiga kursmiljöer*. Uppsala universitet.

- Teleman, Ulf. 1989. "Det nordiska språksamarbetet. Idéer och framtidsuppgifter." *Språk i Norden* 1989, 14–32.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1992. "Det svenska riksspråkets utsikter i ett integrerat Europa." *Språkvård* 4:7–16.
- Teleman, Ulf. 2003. *Tradis och funkis. Svensk språkvård och språkpolitik efter 1800*. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Teleman, Ulf and Margareta Westman. 1997. "Behöver vi en nationell språkpolitik?" *Språkvård* 2:5–16.
- Thompson, John. 1991. "Editor's Introduction." In Bourdieu 1991.
- Trägårdh, Lars. 2002. "Sweden and the EU. Welfare State Nationalism and the Spectre of 'Europe'." In *European Integration and National Identity. The Challenge of the Nordic States*, eds. Lene Hansen and Ole Wæver, 130–181. London: New York: Routledge.
- Vikør, Lars. 2010. "Language Purism in the Nordic Countries." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 204, 9–30.
- Weinstein, Brian. 1989. "Francophonie: Purism at the International Level." In *The Politics of Language Purism*, eds. Björn Jernudd and Michael Shapiro, 53–79. Berlin New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wellander, Erik. 1939. *Riktig svenska. En handledning i svenska språkets vård*. Stockholm: Norstedts & Söner.
- Westman, Margareta. 1996. "Har svenska språket en framtid?" In *Svenskan i tusen år. Glimtar ur svenska språkets utveckling*, eds. Lena Moberg and Margareta Westman, 182–194. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 1992. "Toward a Social Praxeology: The Structure and Logic of Bourdieu's Sociology." In Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc Wacquant. 1992.
- Woolard, Kathryn. 1998. "Introduction. Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry." In Schieffelin et. al. 1998.