Introduction: Language Standardization and Language Variation in Multilingual Contexts – Asian Perspectives

Nicola McLelland and Hui Zhao

This volume breaks new ground in studies of language standardization and language variation, both in its theoretical starting point and in the languages of its case studies.[1] Conceptually, our starting point is the conviction that processes of standardization and negotiation of variation are often profoundly and decisively affected by the multilingual context in which they occur, as we argue more fully below. All the chapters of this volume illustrate that in different ways. New too is that all these case studies concern languages of Asia: especially Chinese or other languages used in and around China (Mongolian, Tibetan); Japanese and languages of other neighbouring countries: India, South Korea, Malaysia and a Malay variety used in Thailand. Hitherto, work in sociolinguistics has tended to be dominated by European or English-language case studies: Asia is given little more than half of the page budget accorded to Europe in Ball's *Handbook of Sociolinguistics Around the World* (2010), despite the fact that Asia is, as Roche and Suzuki (2018: 1227) note, the 'world's most linguistically diverse continent'. The general tendency is no less true of standardization studies: in the otherwise valuable collection by Lane *et al*. (2017) devoted to standardization of minority languages, Europe dominates, and Asia is entirely absent. Within Europe, comparative approaches to the ideologies and practices of standardization have only begun in the past 20 years (Ayres-Bennett & Seijido, 2013; Deumert & Vandenbussche, 2003; Linn & McLelland, 2002; Percy & Davidson, 2012). Our Chinese and other Asian case studies are, then, an enrichment of the field in their own right. More than this, though, as will become clear below, they also invite us to test established models and assumptions against new data, and

https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800411562-003

to enhance them with new perspectives, in spanning two closely related but traditionally rather separate areas of sociolinguistics, each with their own preferred methodological paradigms: broadly, standardization studies and studies of language variation. Standardization studies are typically concerned with the qualitative analysis of collective and often explicit understandings of language. Work in language variation, by contrast, is more often quantitative in approach, primarily concerned with interpreting the raw data of the linguistic practices and attitudes of individuals. As we ourselves have learned, shared attention can be fruitful, especially at the points where these two approaches meet, in highlighting how individuals negotiate their own language practice in the context of standardized languages (e.g. Zhao, this volume; see also below), or where aspects of standardization are shaped by the practices of the language's speakers (e.g. Rigdrol Jikar, this volume; Samdrup & Suzuki, this volume).

Language standardization has tended to be viewed as a one-language matter, often assumed, especially within Europe, to take place in a monolingual nation state and/or with prototypically monolingual individual speakers. Recent work has begun to recognize that such a model was at most only ever a convenient fiction (contributions in Tieken-Boon van Ostade & Percy, 2017, especially Ameka, 2017; Coulmas, 2017; Klöter, 2017; Smakman & Barasa, 2017; see discussion in McLelland, 2021a: 110–112; the overlooking of multilingual speakers was noted outside linguistics too, e.g. de Swaan as early as 2001).[2] As multilingualism is increasingly acknowledged and studied, even for such monocentric states as China (e.g. Grey, 2021; Klöter & Söderblom, 2020; Liang, 2015), the chapters in this volume help bring to light the 'hidden multilingualisms' (Vogl, 2018) that play a role in language standardization – and indeed, not least for China and Chinese. Multilingualism is a red thread running through the entire history of language standardization and much language variation, both in the grammaticographical and lexicographical work through which language codification and elaboration occur (McLelland, 2021b) and in the ways in which people use, negotiate, or respond to the standard in their own linguistic repertoires.[3] First, the grammaticographical and lexicographical traditions of many languages have their origins in multilingual encounters, often motivated by missionary, colonial and/or commercial ambitions (see, e.g. Gianninoto, this volume; Hasnain, this volume). For anyone seeking to convert, conquer, govern or trade, it was first necessary to communicate, and that meant both studying and learning new languages and imposing one's own language among at least some proportion of target population, who could in turn become more or less eager to master the language of the institutions they were subject to. The practical desire of learners (or their teachers) to know what to 'aim for' as the target language (see, e.g. Wu, this volume) has motivated the desire not merely for adequate documentation of languages, but for clear and recognizable rules in the form of grammars and dictionaries. The convergence of those different but sometimes productively converging interests in language standardization is exemplified both in the 19th-century grammar of Shanghainese by the Protestant missionary Edkins which is examined by Gianninoto in this volume, and today in the work of the Summer Institute of Linguists' involvement in the project on Patani Malay in Thailand, reported on by Premsrirat (this volume). (On the faith-based Summer Institute of Linguistics, founded in 1934 and now known as SIL International, see Olson, 2009 for an insider view, and Thomas, 2008 for a view from outside.)

Once the notion of a standardized language has been encountered, its ideological force may be used to grant to minoritized languages, or to claim for them, the institutional recognition, validation and prestige associated with standardized majority languages. The decision, in the mid-20th century, of the new People's Republic of China to standardize the writing systems of its recognized minorities was a top-down attempt to do just this, though with mixed results (Zhou, 2003, 2021: 179–190). Newly produced codifying texts that are often inspired by such contacts typically remain indebted ideologically, conceptually and terminologically to other grammaticogaphical or lexicographical traditions. They are a sociolinguistic instance of 'how ideas travel'[4] and how ideas are disseminated through bilingual or multilingual cultural contacts (see Gianninoto, this volume; Heinrich, 2021 on the role of script in the spread of ideas in the 'Chinese Character Cultural Sphere'; and Makihara & Schieffelin, 2007 for case studies from Pacific societies of how cultural contact conditions the transfer of language ideologies to new contexts). Between them, the chapters in this volume add to our understanding of all of these ways in which multilingualism is implicated in language standardization.

Several of the chapters demonstrate how language standardization is crucial to real-world language planning and policy (LPP), in education, and in language activism, adding to our knowledge, not least of Chinese languages, where much of the existing literature is in non-English languages and is inaccessible to other audiences (e.g. Chinese: Bo & Lai, 2009; Li, 2010; Yao, 2006). Luo examines judgements made in Chinese language testing about standard and variation. Several other chapters illustrate how for minoritized languages, standardization – including the choice of script – is a live issue both for identity (Tibet) and for literacy and education of minorities (Thailand). Some of our contributors are themselves language activists, as members of, or allies of, the language communities they are researching (see below, our discussion of our third section, *Standardization and Minoritized Languages*), Premsrirat most explicitly so in her work helping endangered language communities to develop standardized orthographies and other materials to support their language revitalization goals. Feng also consciously adopts a 'critical stance that values promotion of social justice in research and in language policy and planning' (Feng, this volume: 84). Other contributions in this volume report on research conducted by cultural and linguistic 'insiders' (Banks, 1998), especially on topics related to minoritized languages, linguistic activism and LPP (e.g. Sargin; Rigdrol Jikar; Samdrup & Suzuki; also see below on decolonizing multilingualism). Meanwhile, our contributors who have offered an 'outsider's' perspective (e.g. Abe; Grey; Wu; Zhao) do so by emphasizing the respective language users' experience and providing details on the historical and contemporary contexts. The chapters also highlight the different roles played by different actors in language standardization, whether top-down, as in the case of Zhuang (Grey, this volume) or (partially) bottom-up (Premsrirat, this volume), and different aspects of language codification, including grammaticography (Gianninoto, this volume) and pronunciation (Wu, this volume); lexicographical elaboration (Rigdrol Jikar, this volume); the choice of script in the cases of Zhuang in China (Grey, this volume) and of Patani Malay in Thailand (Premsrirat, this volume).

It is not possible here to do justice to the current state of research in the fields of multilingualism, language standardization, and variation in Asia, or even for those relatively few in South, East and South-East Asia that are examined in this volume. Nevertheless, we note here some key points and indicative developments and suggestions for further reading. India is a well-known, indeed iconic, exemplar of the sociolinguistic complexity of multilingualism. The practical and ideological challenges involved in even describing it have been acknowledged at least since Grierson's famous *Linguistic Survey of India* (Grierson, 1903–1927; Majeed, 2018a, 2018b) and still remain (Dasgupta & Sardesai, 2010). Standardization is implicated already at the level of description of this multilingual landscape: speakers in India may use standardization as a criterion to decide whether a variety merits the label of language or not (Groff, 2017: 144). Ideological and political dimensions are perhaps most obvious in how Hindi and Urdu emerged as two separate standardized languages at the expense of the 'middle ground', Hindustani (Rahman, 2011), as well as in the largely unsuccessful attempt in the 1960s to implement a three-language policy (English, Hindi and a regional vernacular), which met with resistance to Hindi in India's South. In contemporary India, Abbi (2021) argues against 'excessive', 'monolithic' standardization of Hindi, and for acceptance of more inclusive 'near-standard' Contact Hindi varieties. Beyond India, the sociolinguistics of multilingualism in other parts of Asia is less widely known, though there is every reason to expect it to be just as rich. For example, recent work on Tibet is revealing the sociolinguistic complexity of a region where support for Tibetan, in the face of pressure from (at least) English and Chinese, comes at the cost of numerous minority languages that are neither Chinese nor Tibetan (Roche, 2019; Roche & Suzuki, 2018; see Rigdrol Jikar and Samdrup & Suzuki, this volume). The prominence of the 'multilingual ecology' in Heinrich and Ohara's (2019) handbook illustrates progress made in recognizing linguistic diversity within Japan, which, like Korea, has historically been an ideologically monolingual state (Gottlieb, 2010) – note for example the contributions of Maher (2019); Otsuji (2019); Fujita-Round (2019); Kubota (2019); Matsumoto (2019); Shoji (2019). Heinrich and Ohara's collection thus directly challenges the long-held belief of monolingualism in Japan and highlights the multilingual and metrolingual (Otsuji, 2019) reality of contemporary Japanese society (see also Heinrich & Galan, 2010).

As for China and Chinese, the *Handbook of Chinese Applied Linguistics* (Huang *et al*., 2019) includes chapters on Chinese as a heritage language (Duff & Doherty, 2019), variations in World Chineses (Lin *et al*., 2019) and sign languages in the Chinese context (Li *et al*., 2019). Yet there is comparatively little attention paid to variation within China. Just one chapter is devoted in general terms to Chinese sociolinguistics (Xu & Zhang, 2019), while Kurpaska's overview of 'Varieties of Chinese' presents the familiar tension between the Western view of these varieties as a family of Sinitic languages and the traditional Chinese insistence on the unity of Chinese linguistic identity, heavily relying on extralinguistic factors (Kurpaska, 2019). The relatively scant coverage reflects the fact that there is, globally, still surprisingly little work on the extent of variation within Mandarin Chinese and the languages of China, though the contributions in Klöter and Söderblom Saarela (2020) are a welcome addition to the field. Welcome too is the variationist journal *Asia-Pacific Language Variation* (since 2015), which frequently features studies on Chinese languages. A recent special issue on *Regional Chinese in Contact* (ed. Walker, 2019) seeks to redress the problem that the 'study of variation and change has generally focused on a small set of world languages' and has 'tended to focus on monolingual speakers' (Walker, 2019: 1). With four papers on Cantonese and one on Chinese-Australian, however, that special issue also illustrates that while there is relatively strong interest in the sociolinguistics of heritage and other varieties of Chinese outside China, especially Cantonese (e.g. Ganassin, 2020; Huang, 2021; Lin *et al*., 2019), many other Chinese varieties and languages within China remain rather understudied. It is significant, therefore, that seven of the 16 contributions in this volume deal with languages and varieties spoken within the borders of China, including, besides Mandarin itself, Shanghainese, Sibe, Zhuang, Tibetan and Mongolian (the latter three also spoken beyond China's borders).

We have organized the chapters in this volume into four themes: *Histories of standardization in multilingual contexts*; *Standardization and variation in multilingual China: implications for education, testing, policy and practice*; *Standardization and minoritized languages* and *Negotiating standards and variation: case studies from Japanese*. For a part of the world where language standardization is often primarily viewed first with an eye to practical implications for *contemporary* policy and practice in its linguistically complex societies, we are pleased that our first three chapters deal with *Histories of Standardization in Multilingual Contexts*. Hasnain's study presents the nexus between language ideologies, the linguistic activities that they legitimize, and the colonization of India. Hasnain examines how an epistemology that assumed languages exist as bounded entities was imposed on the linguistic diversity of India and helped to 'legitimize the project of imperial domination'. This 'project of colonial knowledge production', although based on European principles of 'essentialism, difference and hierarchy', was, as Hasnain points out, not carried out merely by the colonizers (Hasnain, this volume: 36). Rather, the colonized themselves – or the literate among them – participated in both the linguistic classification work and the applied language work of translating and editing that was necessary to construct and sustain the bureaucracy of the colony. Hasnain's study is thus, at the macro-level, a study of 'how ideas travel' (Oergel, 2019), as Western language ideologies were ultimately adopted by those on whom they were imposed. It is worth noting, of course, that the colonial enterprise also allowed linguistic knowledge to flow in the reverse direction: Pytlowany and Van Hal (2016) have pointed out the 'pivotal' role of the Dutch East India Company in the circulation in Europe of first-hand linguistic information on Asia.

While Hasnain's chapter deals with the macro-level of knowledge creation, transfer and systematization, Gianninoto's historical study of an early Chinese grammar is an instance of that process in operation at the micro-level. Although China has an ancient philological tradition, the first grammars and dictionaries of Chinese were produced only from the 17th century onwards, with European learners in mind (see, e.g. Chappell & Peyraube, 2014; Klöter, 2010). They thus continue in China a long European grammatographical tradition, dating back at least as far as Latin learners of Greek (Law, 2003: 58), in which the needs of L2 learners provide the impetus for the first grammars of a language (McLelland, 2017: 94). The focus of Gianninoto's study, J. Edkins' *Grammar of Colloquial Chinese: as Exhibited in the Shanghai Dialect* ([1853] 1868), one of several works by Europeans to focus on a spoken Chinese vernacular, is a reminder of the long history of multilingualism within China. It is striking for the attention paid to how certain sounds differ both from Mandarin and from the English phoneme inventory of Edkins' audience. In grammatical analysis, Edkins – like many predecessors dating back to the 18th century – productively combined both Western and Chinese knowledge frameworks, though he was unusual in drawing on the important treatize of Bì Huázhēn, a work rarely quoted in other contemporary Western sources.[5] Edkins combined familiar Western grammatical categories and divisions (such as the familiar tripartite structure of a European grammar into 'sounds', 'parts of speech' and 'syntax') with insights from Chinese philology such as the fundamental division between 'full' and 'empty' words.

Gianninoto's study of Edkins's grammar contributes to a well-established body of scholarship of the history of describing Chinese varieties for European learners, often also in a missionary context (Klöter, 2010; Snow, 2020), but the history of presenting the Chinese language for the benefit of L2 learners within China itself remains almost entirely uncharted territory. This is a significant blind spot, as the monolingual ideology of present-day China (albeit in tension with lip-service, at least, to minority language rights)[6] encourages not only the erasure of the multilingualism today, but also an invisibilizing (Langer & Havinga, 2015) of multilingualism and of minoritized languages in China's past. Wu's chapter is therefore a significant contribution to uncovering that hidden history, with an analysis of a rhyme dictionary written for Mongolian-speaking learners of Chinese, the 1917 *Mongolian-Han Original Sounds of the Five Regions* (Menghan Hebi Wufang Yuanyīn, 蒙漢合璧五方元音). Rhyme dictionaries – a tradition dating back to the medieval period – served as a guide to pronunciation; Branner (2006: 14) considers them 'practical, prescriptive tools', though individual compilers' motivations were more or less prescriptive or scholarly. As Wu shows, the main challenge for the author, Khaisan, in adapting a much older rhyme dictionary to his Mongolian-speaking readership, was to indicate the pronunciation of Chinese by transliterating into the Mongolian alphabet, working around the fact that certain phonological distinctions in Chinese were not made in Mongolian. Wu finds evidence of possible influence from Manchurian transcriptions of Chinese (the author was a fluent speaker of Manchu) and further evidence of the multilingual influences on how languages are codified. Published at a time when the basis for a standard Chinese was still debated, Khaisan's work also reflected the trend away from the Nanjing-based (southern Mandarin) norm to a more eclectic pronunciation, chiefly based on northern Mandarin with vernacular Beijing Mandarin features as well as features from southern Mandarin.

Our second section contains four case studies from China and Chinese: *Standardization and Variation in Multilingual China: Implications for Education, Testing, Policy and Practice*. Feng, whose expertise lies especially in trilingual education in China (i.e. education in Mandarin, English and a local variety), tackles head-on the ideological tension between multilingualism and assimilation. Feng advocates a resolution of that tension by recognizing the pluricentric nature not just of Chinese, but just as much of English and local varieties in China, thus providing a way to put all these on an equal footing within a framework of trilingual education. Both Feng and, later in this section, Wang tackle how to conceptualize the relationship of other varieties of Chinese with Mandarin. Feng draws on the hierarchical model of Li (2017) which presents a continuum (and a hierarchy) from a *Dahuayu* or 'greater Chinese' (defined as 'the common language of all ethnic Chinese on the globe'), to the national variety: Putonghua in China, Guoyu in Taiwan and 'other

Chinese concentrated areas in Europe and North America' (Feng, this volume: 90). Under these sit local varieties of Putonghua, then topolects, dialects and the most local dialects. Li's *Dahuayu* model is reminiscent of models that have a long pedigree in European linguistics and which capture the notion of a continuum from standard to dialect, via a varying number of (more or less distinct) intermediary steps (see Löffler, 2005 for an overview and problematization with reference to German). There are, however, two notable differences in this model. First, the pluricentric model (developed within German sociolinguistics by Clyne, 1984; see also Clyne, 1992) assumes that each nation has its *own* standard variety. Such a model is fundamentally at odds with a hierarchical model in which a *single* shared standard is an 'umbrella' language (or *Dachsprache*, lit. roofing language, overarching language). Yet Li's approach in effect combines the two. Dollinger (2019: 40) has suggested that to posit such a model for English would be considered unacceptably 'colonial'. For while such a model acknowledges areal variation, it is monocentric in assuming a single standard that is in effect set for all by one dominant nation. Second, Li's model allows for topolects (*fangyan*) that are not genetically related to the overarching standard to sit below it. That too seems 'colonial' or imperialist to someone trained in a different tradition.[7] It is worth noting too the parallels between Li's model of Chinese and a rather different but no less hierarchizing model, Kachru's three-circle model of English, which is, like Chinese, a 'central' language in the 'global language system' (Kachru, 1986; De Swaan, 2001). Kachru's model has been critiqued and reconceptualized by Park and Wee (2009) to reveal the ideological assumptions that underpin the 'prevailing structure of the global linguistic market' (Park & Wee, 2009: 403) and the value in it of named varieties such as 'Indian English' or, indeed, in the Chinese language context, Malaysian Chinese. While there is no space here to pursue these differing approaches further, such reflections illustrate the value of comparing and contrasting European models and conceptualizations with those of other major language paradigms that may operate within different ideological frameworks.

Even if Li's *Dahuayu* model provides, as Kachru's model has done for English, conceptual space to talk about variation within written and spoken Chinese, there are ideological difficulties in imposing the notion of *Dahuayu*, which explicitly privileges China's standard, on communities outside China such as Chinese Malaysians, whose own separate history goes back several hundred years. Wang instead builds on previous work that has argued for the recognition of a standard Malaysian Mandarin *alongside* Putonghua (Khoo, 2017); Wang tackles the task of identifying what can be incorporated into a Malaysian standard of Chinese, arguing that 'All in all, as long as a grammatical structure is accepted in written language extensively, it should be regarded as a standard form and accepted in school textbooks' (Wang, this volume: 155).

Luo's chapter is a pioneering case study of the real-life consequences of a strong standard language ideology and strictly codified standard in language testing. China arguably has a testing regime for its standard language that is unparalleled elsewhere in the world. Not only is there a language test for foreign learners, the *Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi* (HSK) or the test of Chinese proficiency for foreign learners, which can be used as a gatekeeping test for access to study and work opportunities in China (comparable to the International English Language Testing System [IELTS] and other such language testing regimes); there is also the *Minzu Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi* (MHK) or the test of Chinese proficiency for minorities in China, some of whom also learn Chinese as a second language, and for whom the test has a similar crucial gatekeeping role. There is, since 1994, furthermore, a spoken Mandarin proficiency test for native speakers (*Putonghua Shuiping Ceshi* [PSC]) to promote standard pronunciation, which serves as a further gatekeeper to certain professions (teaching, broadcasting, etc.). These tests are important tools in LPP, as Luo emphasizes. Within this highly regimented testing regime, the notion of a *Dahuayu*, which recognizes and legitimizes variation within Chinese, is a challenge, as Luo notes, and a potential disruptor. Against this background, Luo investigates both the extent of non-standard language in HSK and MHK written tests, and the responses of the test markers, as actors within that LPP regime, to such non-standard variants. Luo finds, first, that there is a gap between state pronouncements and practitioners' decisions. Second, there is a gap between practitioners' beliefs and their own practice. Third, Luo draws attention to the (not unexpected) gap between current legislation and the more variation-tolerant work of recent academic interventions in the field.

Finally in this section, Zhao continues the real-world examination of the standard language in action, with her study of how 'non-standard' features of Beijing Mandarin are used, perceived and assigned social meaning. Used as the basis of Putonghua, Beijing Mandarin therefore shares many similarities with the standard variety while having local features prescriptively deemed 'non-standard' in Putonghua. Zhao investigates the use of three 'non-standard' features to understand how social meanings such as 'localness' and 'casualness' are established in perception and how prescriptive language standards (or the lack thereof) affect the social attributes associated with speakers in social interactions. Zhao finds that the presence of 'non-standard' Beijing features are, as we might expect from variationist studies in other language contexts, associated with localness and casualness. More unexpectedly, however, local 'non-standard' usage is not perceived as different from standard usage in terms of status, solidarity, or occupation suitability – aspects where sociolinguistic judgements can often bring real-life consequences (e.g. linguistic discrimination); the only exception is an overt violation of standard language grammar (classifier omission). Zhao suggests that Beijing Mandarin enjoys similar prestige to the standard variety, as well as being used to signal local affiliation.

In our third section, *Standardization and Minoritized Languages in Multilingual Contexts*, six Asian cases studies contribute to a growing body of work on standardizing minority languages, complementing Lane *et al.* (2017), from which Asian case studies are absent. The six chapters explore and, in some cases, advocate for how the tools of language standardization, and associated language ideologies, may have an impact on minoritized languages. Often explicitly attempting to confer legitimacy and status on them by making them resemble more powerful, majority languages in a multilingual context, standardization efforts can be risky, for example, coming at the expense of the diversity inherent within the minoritized varieties (Costa *et al.*, 2017: 1). Grey opens the section with her study of Zhuang, a 'cautionary tale of the limits of standardization to future-proof a minoritized language' (Grey, this volume: 164). Zhuang is the language of a people in Southern China, the largest among the 55 official minorities recognized by China. It was one of many newly-recognized languages standardized in the 1950s. However, Grey argues that Zhuang standardization created 'an icon rather than a lingua franca', for Zhuang is not valued in the linguistic market. In that market, if language competence in any language in addition to Mandarin is valued, priority is given to English, with its gatekeeping role in education and in employment opportunities. Furthermore, because Zhuang is now written in the Roman alphabetic script used both for standard Mandarin (Putonghua pinyin) and for English (as the traditional writing system was rejected in the 1950s), even its iconic use in the public linguistic landscape (for example, in street signage) can be easily mistaken for pinyin or English. Even the minimal, emblematic function of Zhuang is, then, ironically weakened by a decision ostensibly intended to bolster its linguistic capital.

In the spirit of Phipps' manifesto for *Decolonising Multilingualism* (2019), it is worth noting that the next three chapters examining minoritized contexts are authored by scholars from within the linguistic communities themselves. Ying Sargin presents the case of Sibe, a language with nearly 30,000 active speakers settled in Xinjiang and which is, on purely linguistic grounds, generally recognized as a variety of Manchu. Ying Sargin examines the ways in which many speakers of Sibe strive to establish its separateness and its status as a language in its own right. It is evident that Sibe is a further demonstration, from within the Chinese multilingual context that is less familiar to Western scholarship, of the common observation that how languages are delineated is as much determined by political and other ideological (national and group) loyalties as by linguistic criteria. The next two chapters deal with Tibetan. Rigdrol Jikar examines the work to establish, promote and maintain the standard of Tibetan 'in the context of the domination of Han Chinese culture and language', including considerable activity to develop and promote replacement terms for Chinese loanwords. Striking here is the role of linguistic purism as an element of corpus planning and its potential either to strengthen or endanger language revitalization efforts, depending in part on acceptance. Again, the presence of English in the linguistic space is notable, seemingly bolstering Tibetan by association in two Chinese-Tibetan-English dictionaries of new vocabulary. Samdrup and Suzuki also deal with Tibetan, focussing in part on humilific expressions, an aspect of sociolinguistics that has received little attention in language standardization and variation to date. They suggest that the trend – driven by both bottom-up and top-down initiatives – towards a norm based on a more literary variety of Amdo Tibetan is marginalizing the use of certain kinds of humilifics, because they have the potential to be misinterpreted as derogatory by those who do not use them.

Saltzmann draws on recent work on language ideologies, language revitalization and language policies in South Korea to examine the case of Jejueo, a minoritized language indigenous to Jeju Island in South Korea. While only about 10% mutually intelligible with Korean, Jejueo has typically been viewed as a dialect. A recent reframing of Jejueo by UNESCO as an 'endangered language' (Moseley, 2010) provides impetus and legitimization for language revitalization efforts and language activism, but such efforts still take place against an ideology of linguistic homogeneity in South Korea. Yet again, too, English is a complicating factor, competing with the minoritized language for space both in school curricula and in individuals' decisions about their linguistic repertoires (cf. also Hanks, 2017).

The final chapter in this third section deals with a self-reported success story, as Premsrirat presents the case for community-based bottom-up standardization to revitalize Patani Malay, a language spoken in southern Thailand, especially to improve literacy education in schools. Premsrirat emphasizes the need not merely for language documentation to support revitalization, but for a standardized written language as a mark of prestige for the community of speakers to accept it. Just as the traditional writing system of Zhuang was replaced with a Romanized alphabet, in line with the use of pinyin for Mandarin Chinese, so in the case of Patani Malay, educators and community leaders chose a Thai script that closely matched contemporary pronunciation over a traditional (Arabic-based) script for use in early grade literacy classes. Premsrirat is optimistic, but it remains to be seen whether, in contrast to the cautionary tale of Zhuang discussed by Grey in the first chapter of this section, the revitalization of Patani Malay through standardization of the Thai-based script will succeed in the long term.

Our final section is *Negotiating Standards and Variation: Case Studies From Japanese*. While the dissemination and acceptance of standard Mandarin (Putonghua) is still underway in China, where it is still promoted by an annual Speak Putonghua week (Luqiu, 2018: 669), Japanese is an instructive case study of what happens once standardization has 'succeeded' at the expense of locally-rooted varieties. By some accounts at least, Japanese standardization is very advanced, and there is a high degree of homogeneity (Heinrich, 2012). How variation within uniformity is negotiated by speakers of Japanese to convey desired social meanings and to construct social identities is the subject of the three studies in this section. Heinrich describes what he calls 'dialect cosplay' (*hōgen kosupure*; see Tanaka, 2011) in Japan. Heinrich suggests that the adoption of standard language by speakers was initially akin to 'passing' (Renfrow, 2004); speakers seek to 'pass' as standard language speakers, by 'linguistic self-monitoring and self-censure and correction in order to produce standard language' (Heinrich, this volume: 286). However, Heinrich suggests, with the standard widely accepted and used, most young speakers no longer need to work to 'pass' as standard language users. Freed of that linguistic insecurity, they seek new ways to construct their social personæ in different contexts. While in other countries, migrant languages are often the source of linguistic creativity, in Japan – which has only small migrant population – linguistic transgressions draw not on migrant languages but instead use tokens from regional dialects to index roles ('costumes') and values of 'warmness', 'cuteness', 'coolness', etc. Heinrich's case study is an example of third-wave sociolinguistics (Eckert, 2012) in action: understanding language variation now has less to do with identifying particular *varieties* associated with specific speaker groups and *domains*, than with the *repertoires* of individual speakers adopted in particular *contexts*.

Abe's work on queer speakers in Japan similarly makes clear some of the limits of earlier approaches to sociolinguistics, including the assumptions behind using binary categories such as gender based on studies on cis-gender speakers (Calder, 2020; Hall *et al*., 2021). Abe argues that 'standard-ness' is a construct that, crucially, marginalizes non-hetero individuals. This is particularly the case for a language such as Japanese. Speaker gender is encoded in grammatical and lexical forms of the language, but flexibly and performatively so – that is, speakers may make choices (consciously or otherwise) in specific contexts (Hiramoto, 2021). Abe explores how the equation of standardness with heteronormativity may be negotiated flexibly by Japanese transgender speakers in their use or avoidance of particular features, in different ways in different contexts. Abe shows that these speakers and their linguistic representation of their 'womanhood' do not merely mirror the idealized 'standard' women's speech but rather challenge and rework heteronormative linguistic practice to index their own transgender identity (Cashman, 2018; Gray, 2018; Konnelly, 2021).

In the final chapter in our collection, Hiramoto examines diversity within the Japanese migrant population in Hawai'i, specifically between two waves of migration, and reactions to that diversity. Just as multilingual settings result in language hierarchies, so here we find hierarchization within the dialects of Japanese in Hawai'i. As an earlier wave of migrants stigmatized Tôhoku dialect features of the 'latecomers', those speakers sought, sometimes consciously, to avoid the stigmatized phonological features, but with only partial success. Nevertheless, the result is, Hiramoto, finds, a significant degree of dialect change and mixing of features among Tôhoku dialect speakers, which ultimately halted with the onset of the war. This change may be evidence of progress towards a Japanese koine in Hawai'i. It is, incidentally, a further instance of diversity within migrant populations that are often assumed by the majority population to be linguistically homogeneous (see Harrison, 2019; McLelland, 2021a for discussion).

The chapters in this collection use a diverse range of theoretical frameworks, methods and data to examine the multilingual sociolinguistics of variation and standardization in Asia. They offer examples of both majority and minoritized language standardizations, of apparent standardization successes and failures, as well as of cases where the ultimate outcome still remains to be seen, and where the implications for individual identity, and for institutional policy and practice are still being worked through. Importantly, they also show how variation persists in tension with even the most standardized language settings, and how that variation is negotiated and re-negotiated, both by individuals in their linguistic repertoires, and by the self-appointed authorities that codify, legitimize, or stigmatize language varieties. We trust that readers will appreciate, as we have in preparing this volume, both the contribution of these new Asian case studies to the field, and the range of perspectives and the ways in which they expand our understanding of the sociolinguistics of standardization, variation and their points of intersection, in Asia and beyond.

Notes

(1) This volume is the result of a conference at the University of Nottingham Ningbo in December 2017, 'Language Standardization and Linguistic Variation in Asia', as part of a project funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council [grant number AH/N004671/1], *Multilingualism: Empowering Individuals, Transforming Societies*. We gratefully acknowledge additional funding from the University of Nottingham Ningbo.

(2) This presumption of monolingual nation states was not restricted to Europe, but also carried weight in Asia: 'attempts to build a monolingual nation was the overriding policy in the Southeast Asian region even though the inhabitants in all the countries spoke a variety of languages' (Guan & Suryadinata, 2007: 1). De Swaan (2001: 176) already noted that sociolinguists had had a tendency to 'overlook […] that all these languages are connected to one another, linked by multilingual persons who hold the various groups together'.

(3) Not all grammar- and dictionary-making is by definition part of language standardization; those genres can have their own discourse tradition that is not identical with that of a standard language ideology, though typically at some point the two cross paths and, often, merge. See McLelland (2021b: 272–274) for discussion.

(4) We adopt the notion of 'how ideas travel' from Oergel's (2019) study of the spread of the notion of *Zeitgeist*.

(5) On the interactions between Western and Chinese linguistic traditions, see now also McDonald (2021).
(6) Luqiu (2018: 671) points out that while 'many proposals and suggestions for protecting dialects are submitted each year during the National People's Congress in China; however, as of 2016 and 2017, no bill has been submitted by legislators'. The position remains unchanged today. Note that the term 'dialects' – here rendering the Chinese term *fangyan* – also covers varieties that are not mutually intelligible with Mandarin. See also Feng's account of the tension between recognition of the languages of ethnic minorities and the promotion of a standard Chinese (Feng, this volume).
(7) The complex co-existence of *fangyan* and standard Mandarin has a long history, in China and Chinese nationalism; see Tam (2020).

References

Abbi, A. (2021) Social cohesion and emerging standards of Hindi in a multilingual context. In W. Ayres-Bennett and J. Bellamy (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization* (pp. 115–138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ameka, F.K. (2017) The uselessness of the useful: Language standardisation and variation in multilingual contexts. In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade and C. Percy (eds) *Prescription and Tradition in Language: Establishing Standards across Time and Space* (pp. 71–87). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Ayres-Bennett, W. and Seijido, M. (eds) (2013) *Bon usage et variation sociolinguistique. Perspectives diachroniques et traditions nationales*. Lyon: ENS Editions.

Ball, M.J. (2010) *The Routledge Handbook of Sociolinguistics Around the World*. London: Routledge.

Banks, J. (1998) The lives and values of researchers: Implications for educating citizens in a multicultural society. *Educational Researcher* 27 (7), 4–17.

Bo, S. and Lai, H. (2009) *Dangdai zhongguo yuyan guihua yanjiu* [*Language Planning Research in Contemporary China*]. Beijing, China: China Social Science Press.

Branner, D.P. (ed.) (2006) *The Chinese Rime Tables Linguistic Philosophy and Historical-Comparative Phonology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Calder, J. (2020) Language, gender and sexuality in 2019: interrogating normativities in the field. *Gender and Language* 14 (4), 429–454.

Cashman, H.R. (2018) Narrating the intersection: Body, time, space and transition in one queer life. *Gender and Language* 12 (4), 416–436. https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.34633

Chappell, H. and Peyraube, A. (2014) The history of Chinese grammars in Chinese and western scholarly traditions. *Language & History* 57 (2), 107–136.

Clyne, M. (1984) *Language and Society in the German-Speaking Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M. (1992) *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Costa, J., de Korne, H. and Lane, P. (2017) Standardising minority languages. Reinventing peripheral languages in the 21st century. In P. Lane, J. Costa and H. De Korne (eds) *Standardising Minority Languages. Competing Ideologies of Authority and Authenticity in the Global Periphery* (pp. 1–23). London: Taylor & Francis.

Coulmas, F. (2017) Prescriptivism and writing systems. In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade and C. Percy (eds) *Prescription and Tradition in Language: Establishing Standards across Time and Space* (pp. 39–56). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dasgupta, P. and Sardesai, M. (2010) Sociolinguistics in South Asia. In P. Dasgupta and M. Sardesai (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Sociolinguistics Around the World* (pp. 81–88). London: Routledge.

De Swaan, A. (2001) *Words of the World: The Global Language System*. Cambridge: Polity Press and Blackwell.

Deumert, A. and Vandenbussche, W. (eds) (2003) *Germanic Standardizations. Past to Present*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Dollinger, S. (2019) *The Pluricentricity Debate: On Austrian German and Other Germanic Standard Varieties*. London: Routledge.

Duff, P. and Doherty, L. (2019) Learning 'Chinese' as heritage language: Challenges, issues, and ways forward. In C.-R. Huang, Z. Jing-Schmidt and B. Meisterernst (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Chinese Applied Linguistics* (pp. 149–164). London: Routledge.

Eckert, P. (2012) Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41, 87–100.

Fujita-Round, S. (2019) Bilingualism and bilingual education in Japan. In P. Heinrich and Y. Ohara (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics* (pp. 170–183). London: Routledge.

Ganassin, S. (2020) *Language, Culture and Identity in Two Chinese Community Schools: More than One Way of Being Chinese?* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gottlieb, N. (2010) Sociolinguistics in Japan. In M.J. Ball (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Sociolinguistics Around the World* (pp. 89–97). London: Routledge.

Gray, J. (2018) 'Entre el alivio y el palo': A Spanish trans man's narrative of transitioning in middle age. *Gender and Language* 12 (4), 437–458. https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.34608

Grey, A. (2021) *Language Rights in a Changing China: A National Overview and Zhuang Case Study*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Grierson, G.A. (1903–1927 (2nd edn, 1966)) *A Linguistic Survey of India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Groff, C. (2017) Language and language-in-education planning in multilingual India: A minoritized language perspective. *Language Policy* 16 (2), 135–164.

Guan, L.H. and Suryadinata, L. (eds) (2007) *Language, Nation and Development in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Hall, K., Borba, R. and Hiramoto, M. (2021) Language and gender. In J.M. Stanlaw (ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 892–912). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Hanks, D.H. (2017) Policy barriers to ainu language revitalization in Japan: When globalization means English. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 32, 91–110. See https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol32/iss1/5 (accessed July 2021).

Harrison, K. (2019) Ukrainian in the United Kingdom: Language use, attitudes, ideologies and identities in the Ukrainian community. PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Heinrich, P. (2012) *The Making of Monolingual Japan: Language Ideology and Japanese Modernity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Heinrich, P. (2021) Language modernization in the Chinese character cultural sphere. China, Japan, Korea and Vietnam. In W. Ayres-Bennett and J. Bellamy (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization* (pp. 576–596). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heinrich, P. and Galan, C. (eds) (2010) *Language Life in Japan: Transformations and Prospects*. London: Routledge.

Heinrich, P. and Ohara, Y. (2019) *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge.

Hiramoto, M. (2021) Reflections on the Journal of Language and the view from Japan. *Journal of Language and Sexuality* 10 (1), 37–47.

Hiramoto, M., Su, H.-Y. and Wong, A. (2021) Chineseness on the margins. Special issue of *Language & Communication* 76.

Huang, C.-R., Jing-Schmidt, Z. and Meisterernst, B. (eds) (2019) *The Routledge Handbook of Chinese Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Huang, J. (2021) A shifting standard: A stratified ideological ecology in a Birmingham Chinese complementary school. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 42 (2), 165–177.

Kachru, B. (1986) *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Khoo, K.U. (2017) Malaysian Mandarin variation with regard to Mandarin globalization trend: Issues on language standardization. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 244, 65–86.

Klöter, H. (2010) *The Language of the Sangleys: A Chinese Vernacular in Missionary Sources of the Seventeenth Century*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Klöter, H. (2017) 'What is correct Chinese?' Revisited. In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade and C. Percy (eds) *Prescription and Tradition in Language: Establishing Standards across Time and Space* (pp. 57–70). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Klöter, H. and Söderblom Saarela, M. (2020) *Language Diversity in the Sinophone World. Historical Trajectories, Language Planning, and Multilingual Practices*. London: Routledge.

Konnelly, L. (2021) Nuance and normativity in trans linguistic research. *Journal of Language and Sexuality* 10 (1), 71–82.

Kubota, R. (2019) English in Japan. In P. Heinrich and Y. Ohara (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics* (pp. 110–126). London: Routledge.

Kurpaska, M. (2019) Varieties of Chinese: Dialects or Sinitic languages? In C.-R. Huang, Z. Jing-Schmidt and B. Meisterernst (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Chinese Applied Linguistics* (pp. 182–195). London: Routledge.

Lane, P., Costa, J. and De Korne, H. (2017) *Standardising Minority Languages. Competing Ideologies of Authority and Authenticity in the Global Periphery*. London: Taylor & Francis. Open access at https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781138125124 (accessed July 2021).

Langer, N. and Havinga, A. (eds) (2015) *Invisible Languages in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Law, V. (2003) *The History of Linguistics in Europe from Plato to 1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, Y. (2010) *中国语言规划论* [*Theories on Language Planning in China*]. Beijing: Commercial Press.

Li, Y. (2017) 大华语：全球华人的共同语 [The Greater Chinese: Lingua franca of the global Chinese]. *Applied Linguistics* 1, 2–13.

Li, J., He, J. and Tang, G. (2019) Investigating sign languages in the Chinese context. In C.-R. Huang, Z. Jing-Schmidt and B. Meisterernst (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Chinese Applied Linguistics* (pp. 748–772). London: Routledge.

Liang, S. (2015) *Language Attitudes and Identities in Multilingual China. A Linguistic Ethnography. A Critical Introduction of Chinese Language Policy and Language Education to an International Audience*. London: Springer.

Lin, J., Shi, D., Jiang, M. and Huang, C.-R. (2019) Variations in world Chineses. In C.-R. Huang, Z. Jing-Schmidt and B. Meisterernst (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Chinese Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1–18). London: Routledge.

Linn, A.R. and McLelland, N. (eds) (2002) *Standardization. Studies from the Germanic Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Löffler, H. (2005) Wieviel variation verträgt die deutsche Standardsprache? Begriffsklärung: Standard und Gegenbegriffe. In L.M. Eichinger and W. Kallmeyer (eds) *Standardvariation. Wie viel Variation verträgt die deutsche Sprache?* (pp. 7–27). Berlin: de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110193985

Luqiu, L.R. (2018) Counter-hegemony: Grassroots use of the Internet to save dialects in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 39 (8), 663–374.

Maher, J.C. (2019) Metroethnicity: From standardized identities to language aesthetics. In P. Heinrich and Y. Ohara (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics* (pp. 129–142). London: Routledge.

Majeed, J. (2018a) *Colonialism and Knowledge in Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India*. New Delhi: Routledge.

Majeed, J. (2018b) *Nation and Region in Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India*. New Delhi: Routledge India.

Makihara, M. and Schieffelin, B.B. (2007) *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matsumoto, K. (2019) Language variation and change. In P. Heinrich and Y. Ohara (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics* (pp. 199–217). London: Routledge.

McDonald, E. (2021) *Grammar West to East. The Investigation of Linguistic Meaning in European and Chinese Traditions*. Singapore: Springer.

McLelland, N. (2017) *Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages: A History of Language Education, Assessment and Policy in Britain*. London: Routledge.

McLelland, N. (2021a) Language standards, standardization and standard ideologies in multilingual contexts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 42.2, 109–124.

McLelland, N. (2021b) Grammars, dictionaries and other metalinguistic texts in the context of language standardization. In W. Ayres-Bennett and J. Bellamy (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization* (pp. 263–293) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moseley, C. (2010) *UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* (3rd edn). Paris: UNESCO Publishing. See www.unesco.org/languagesatlas/index.php.

Oergel, M. (2019) *Zeitgeist - How Ideas Travel. Politics, Culture and the Public in the Age of Revolution*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Olson, K.S. (2009) SIL International: An emic view. *Language* 85, 646–652.

Otsuji, E. (2019) Metrolingualism in transitional Japan. In P. Heinrich and Y. Ohara (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics* (pp. 143–157). London: Routledge.

Park, J.S.Y. and Wee, L. (2009) The three circles redux: A market–theoretic perspective on world Englishes. *Applied Linguistics* 30 (3), 389–406.

Percy, C.E. and Davidson, M.C. (eds) (2012) *The Languages of Nation: Attitudes and Norm*s. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Phipps, A. (2019) *Decolonising Multilingualism: Struggles to Decreate*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pytlowany, A. and Van Hal, T. (2016) Merchants, scholars and languages: the circulation of linguistic knowledge in the context of the Dutch United East India Company (VOC). *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 38 (1), 19–37.

Rahman, T. (2011) *From Hindi to Urdu: Social and Political History*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Renfrow, D.G. (2004) A cartography of passing in everyday life. *Symbolic Interaction* 27 (4), 485–506.

Roche, G. (2019) Articulating language oppression: Colonialism, coloniality and the erasure of Tibet's minority languages. *Patterns of Prejudice* 53 (5), 487–514.

Roche, G. and Suzuki, H. (2018) Tibet's minority languages: Diversity and endangerment. *Modern Asian Studies* 52 (4), 1227–1278.

Shoji, H. (2019) Japan as a multilingual society. In P. Heinrich and Y. Ohara (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics* (pp. 184–195). London: Routledge.

Smakman, D. and Barasa, S.N. (2017) Defining 'standard': Towards a cross-cultural definition of the language norm. In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade and C. Percy (eds) *Prescription and Tradition in Language: Establishing Standards across Time and Space* (pp. 23–38). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Snow, D. (2020) Romanizing southern Mǐn: Missionaries and the promotion of written Chinese vernaculars. In H. Klöter and M. Söderblom Saarela (eds) *Language Diversity in the Sinophone World. Historical Trajectories, Language Planning, and Multilingual Practices* (pp. 60–79). London: Routledge.

Tam, G.A. (2020) *Dialect and Nationalism in China, 1860–1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tanaka, Y. (2011) *方言コスプレの時代* [*The Age of Dialect Cosplay*]. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten.

Thomas, M. (2008) Gender and the language of scholarship of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in the context of mid twentieth-century American linguistics. In G. Hassler and G. Volkmann (eds) *History of Linguistics 2008: Selected Papers from the Eleventh International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHoLS XI), 28 August – 2 September 2008, Potsdam* (pp. 389–397). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. and Percy, C. (eds) (2017) *Prescription and Tradition in Language: Establishing Standards across Time and Space*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Vogl, U. (2018) Standard language ideology and multilingualism: Results from a survey among European students. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics* 6 (2), 185–208.

Walker, J.A. (ed.) (2019) *Regional Chinese in Contact* (Special issue of) *Asian-Pacific Language Variation* 5 (1).

Xu, D. and Zhang, J. (2019) Chinese sociolinguistics. In C.-R. Huang, Z. Jing-Schmidt and B. Meisterernst (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Chinese Applied Linguistics* (pp. 691–708). London: Routledge.

Yao, Y. (2006) *中国语言规划研究*. [*Language Planning Research in China*]. Beijing: Commercial Press.

Zhou, M. (2003) *Multilingualism in China: The Politics of Writing Reforms for Minority Languages, 1949-2002*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Zhou, M. (2021) Standardization of minority languages. Nation-state building and globalization. In W. Ayres-Bennett and J. Bellamy (eds) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization* (pp. 170–197). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.