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The contentious relationship between Catalan and Spanish within the contemporary linguistic ecology of Barcelona, Spain, simultaneously reflects modern ideologies of linguistic resistance (Catalan nationalism) as well as linguistic regimes of the past (Spanish hegemony). In this paper, I will argue that this sociolinguistic tension between past and present in the contemporary context receives a nuanced account through a frame-theoretic analysis of Linguistic Landscapes (LL).

The data for this study were collected in Summer 2013 and consist of approximately 2,500 photographs taken of a cross-section of commercial and noncommercial public signage in Barcelona.

Following in part Coupland (2012) and Goffman (1974), I propose four frames for understanding Catalan-Spanish bilingual displays:

i. The FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN: This frame reflects an ideology of public Castilian monolingualism.

ii. The FRAME OF NORMALIZED SEMIAUTONOMOUS CATALAN: This frame reflects an ideology wherein Catalan is the appropriate language for public use in Catalonia, but which does not explicitly reject the public use of Castilian.

iii. The FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA: Within this frame, Catalan and Castilian are conceptualized as not existing in competition with one another, with each being a resource and a part of the city’s multilingualism.

iv. The FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE: This frame reflects an ideology that advocates for Catalan monolingualism within Catalan-speaking territories. Signs produced under this frame are (a) those that exclusively and explicitly advocate Catalan monolingualism and index linguistic secession and (b) those that show acts of linguistic vandalism and make visible the defacement of Castilian in its attenuated role in contemporary local politics. Such acts of linguistic transgression foreground newer forms of representations, meanings, and messages now mobilized through Catalan.

In conclusion, this paper shows that a shift in theoretical and methodological focus to Linguistic Landscaping enables us to capture the various complexes of nuances of language contact and tensions that defy an analysis in traditional sociolinguistic frameworks.
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INTRODUCTION:

The purpose of this paper is to understand the ideological representations of bilingualism in Barcelona; that is, the interaction between Catalan and Castilian\(^1\), as it appears in written form in public space. I will argue that the contested nature of this bilingualism is most visible in public displays of these two languages and as such these displays, as agentive acts, are critical empirical resources for a theory of the sociolinguistics of bilingualism.

Barcelona is a bilingual city, where both Castilian and Catalan are spoken as a mother tongue, taught in schools, and used regularly by the population. Though all Catalan speakers and 97.4% of the population of Catalonia reports to understand Catalan (reported in Pradilla, 2011), Catalan and Castilian stand in a contentious relationship with one another. One language, Castilian, is seen either as a colonial language which symbolizes the linguistic imperialism of past and, perhaps, present incarnations of the Spanish state or as a tool that ensures the linguistic and cultural unification of all of Spain. The other, Catalan, is seen either as a means of resistance against Spanish and Castilian-language hegemony or a linguistic expression of separatist ideologies that support the end of Spanish sovereignty over Catalan-speaking territories (see Roller, 2002).

\(^1\) Though the Castilian language is more commonly called Spanish in English, I have chosen to use Castilian, as it better (though not ideally) accounts for the territorial limit to the use of Castilian in Spain and allows the distinction between the language and the state to be expressed more clearly.
The tension between these differing viewpoints, as well as the uneasy coexistence of these two languages plays out daily in bilingual cities in Catalonia like Barcelona. While issues surrounding language policy and political autonomy are ever-present in the media as well as citizens’ everyday conversations, nowhere is the relationship between these two languages more clear than it is in their use in public signs. Here, visible and on display, are the various language ideologies of the signs’ creators and their expression through linguistic means. Through the way that Castilian and Catalan are used with relation (or exclusion) to one another, a relationship between these two languages is indexed and broadcast to the public. By looking at public signage, we can, then, understand how these ideologies, are negotiated in every day life, how they are reproduced and subsequently reaffirmed as valid understandings, and how they are contested and resisted by persons wishing to modify their linguistic environment and, in so doing, create a new set of acceptable or culturally understood notions of the relationship between Catalan and Castilian.

The semiotic potential of bilingual displays is productively captured within the framework of LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPES (LL), a relatively new field that combines theoretical insights gained from disparate fields, such as linguistics, history, and urban planning, to contextualize the interaction between language and space. At its most general level, LL seeks to look at and understand how language is used in public, written displays. In this study, I investigate this relationship by looking at public signage in Barcelona. Following Kallen (2010) and Coupland (2012), I propose that a frame-theoretic (Goffman, 1974) analysis of the LL provides the most robust means by which
we can understand how language is used in public signs and how this language use can be connected to larger social, political, and historical processes which have affected and continue to affect Barcelona. I propose that the use of Catalan and Castilian on public signs in Barcelona can be accounted for by understanding it as occurring within four conceptual frames – frames being socio-cognitive organizations of thought which connect with those social, historical, and political processes that have occurred and/or are ongoing in Barcelona. These four frames are: the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, the FRAME OF NORMALIZED SEMIAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, the FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA, and the FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE.

Given the present political turmoil in Catalonia surrounding the possibility of a vote of independence, an issue that was salient and a topic of frequent discussion during my field work in Barcelona, the use of language in public signs should be understood as being enmeshed within this debate and connected to discussions and understandings of “Catalanness”, “Spanishness”, the degree to which these understandings of identity are mutually exclusive or mutually inclusive, and the connection between these identities and both the Castilian and Catalan languages. As signs are the product of a given entity’s understanding of what constitutes appropriate or effective use of language in public, signs are a reflection of an individual’s, or set of people’s, (a sign’s creator’s) relationship with and stance towards these competing ideologies.

The paper is organized as follows. In Chapter 1, I review previous literature about LL, with a focus on LL work in the context of Spain, particularly in Catalan-speaking areas. In Chapter 2, I outline the present and historical sociopolitical
background relevant to Catalonia, and Barcelona in particular. I then discuss the methodology utilized for the present study. Chapter 3 is divided into five parts. The first gives an overview of the frame-theoretic analysis of LL in Barcelona. This is followed by four sections, one for each of the proposed frames. Each of these sections includes an overview of the ethnographic and historical bases of the frame as well as examples and analysis of signs falling into each of these frames. In Chapter 4, I discuss how LL provides an opportunity to clearly see and understand the sedimentation and competition between language ideologies. Then I compare the case of Welsh and Catalan, looking at how differences in historical and present conceptualizations of bilingualism, coupled with significantly different demographic and political realities, has led to the similarities and differences found with respect to what frames are operating in each respective context. This is followed by a conclusion where I present my findings within the context of LL research and research in Catalan sociolinguistics, and offer suggestions for future research with a focus on frame analysis’ ability to provide us with robust, and highly explanatory results in LL research.
CHAPTER 1: LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE

1.1 Linguistic landscape as a methodological framework

In modern urban centers, we find ourselves surrounded by the semiosis of public displays. Every day we see billboards, advertisements, posters, graffiti, street signs, and a plethora of other media whose goal is communication with the public, and many of which express much of their meaning through linguistic signs. These public signs are elements that surround us, with which we interact, and which help us to form our understanding of our environment. They not only disseminate information, but they also reproduce and reinforce the basic structures and hierarchies of our society through not just what information is presented, but also how it is presented. Public signs are an unavoidable and integral part of urban semiosis, shaping our experience and coloring our perception of that experience. Scollon and Scollon (2003) term the study of these signs GEOSEMIOTICS, which they define as “the study of the social meaning of the material placement of signs and discourse sand of our actions in the material world” (211).

Given the importance of language in many public signs, these public signs also impact our linguistic ideologies: telling us what languages to use, which form of those languages, and where to use them. As such, these signs should be an object of sociolinguistic research not only because they constitute a register (or set of registers) of language, the patterns of which should be accounted for, but also because they are a means by which opinions about and understandings of language are enacted and broadcast to the public. Indeed, they become emblematic and iconic images that, often
unconsciously, shape our linguistic ideologies. The study of language use in signs has been termed **LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPES** (LL). **LL** is a relatively recently-developed field that, at its most fundamental level, aims to understand and account for the relationship between language and space. In essence, it seeks to analyze public language use within its geospatial context. Linguistic research has traditionally focused on language as a spoken medium, though given the ubiquity of the written word in literate societies, the relationship between language and writing has never been more salient than it is presently. Though there exists some earlier research into LL (e.g. Spolsky and Cooper, 1991), it was not until the first decade of the 2000s that a significant body of research into public language use had developed, following the publication of Landry and Bourhis’ (1997) paper on public language use in Canada. It was in this paper that the term **linguistic landscape** was coined. Their definition, which has formed the basis of much **LL** research, is the following:

“The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration.” (25)

The object of research using LL as a methodological tool is any “sign” visible within a pre-defined geographical area. A “sign” in this sense is rather loosely defined to include “any piece of written text within a spatially definable frame” (Backhaus, 2006:55). The “text” of LL research, then, includes any example of written language within that defined area, from a large, neon-lit sign to a small sticker that advertises a
locksmith. Each of these serves to tell us something about the social, political, and historical conditions and processes that underlie how persons living in that area use and understand language. Other studies have extended the definition of sign to include text from newspapers (e.g. Atkinson & Kelly-Holmes, 2011) and t-shirts (e.g. Coupland, 2011). Given the presence of and public nature of these texts, they too can form a part of a LL, albeit a part that is less permanent, though not nearly as ephemeral as it might be considered at first glance.

According to Coupland (2012), LL should not just be seen as patterns of language use, but rather, “a contested field of performative display” (4). This highlights the public, performative nature of linguistic displays wherein signs “do things” and contest understandings presupposed by other signs in a way that is intended for mass consumption. LLs are the synthesis of many different individual signs, each produced by different individual persons, under the pressures of different constellations of ideologies.

Emphasizing the multiplex nature of LLs, Ben-Rafael et al. (2010) argue that “LLs are moulded by different circumstances – historical, social, political, ideological, geographic and demographic – and at the same time illustrate processes that are inherent to their own dynamic, which, in turn participate in the melding of the wider social and cultural reality” (xiii). A LL’s multifariousness is, then, a product not only of competing discourses surrounding related social or political processes, nor only of the myriad individuals creating, posting, and modifying them, but also the LL itself: other signs, the relative frequency of their language choice, the salience of their message, and the different meanings that signs attain as a result of their contexts. This suggests that while
LLs may, over time, retain certain features particular to them that are related to relatively long-lasting social structures. LLs are in a constant state of flux, continually changing and adapting to their present contexts. This modification comes about both at the physical level, whereby signs themselves are removed, refashioned, or modified by individual agents, and also at an ideological level whereby the uptake of a sign and its relationship to its LL may be slightly modified by any change to that context, be it more local (i.e. those signs that are in its immediate vicinity) or more global (i.e. sign usage in a city or larger region). Thus, the effect of, for example, the defacement of a sign has implications for not only the meaning of that sign, but also for how those signs immediately surrounding it are perceived.

In order to account for such diverse variables that impact language use within its geospatial context, research into LL uses theoretical insight gained from research in disparate fields including: linguistics, anthropology, sociology, urban planning, discourse analysis, and history. By approaching public language use from an interdisciplinary perspective, one can best account for the myriad social, political, and historical processes that conspire to give meaning to a given sign. It is through the semiosis of these different elements of a sign that its meaning is created. Important to analysis is not only the language used, but a sign’s color, its relative prominence, its location, and its coordination with those visible signs around it. These must all be understood and accounted for to meaningfully understand the full weight and effect of each sign.

Given the ubiquity of written language in modern, industrialized countries, the importance of language in the semiosis of public signs is significant. In Spain, the focus
of the present study, 97.7% of the population over 15 is literate (Central Intelligence Agency, 2010). With such a high percentage of the population that understands and can use a written form of language, it is important that we be able to account for what we see in terms of this language use. Indeed, use and consumption of the written language in public space is a significant feature of daily language use in modern, literate societies where the population has access to universal schooling.

1.2 Linguistic landscape in multilingual settings

LL has come to be a useful methodological framework by which we can understand language use in multilingual settings and this focus has, in some ways, come to define the field. As a result of processes such as globalization and immigration, urban LLs are “polyphonous and multilingual” and this multilingualism is something that now forms an important part of them (Kallen and Ni Dhonnacha, 2010). Questions surrounding the distribution of various languages, the different patterns of use among these languages relative to each other, as well as the connection between these languages and relevant local and global language ideologies can be answered, at least in part, through detailed analysis of how those languages are used in public relative to each other. One of the major contributions LL has made to linguistics has been its ability to tease apart some of the more salient features of language use in multilingual settings. A number of volumes have been dedicated to LL and multilingualism (e.g. Gorter, 2006; Gorter et al., 2012a, Hélot et al., 2012), as well as some sections of other volumes (e.g. Shohamy, et al., 2010). LL has been used as a methodology which allows one (i) to
assess a minority language’s level of vitality (e.g. Landry and Bourhis, 1997; Barni & Bagna, 2010; Shohamy and Abu Ghazaleh-Mahajneh, 2012), (ii) to tease apart the multilingual realities of modern global cities where not only are indigenous and immigrant languages represented, but also how global languages are represented (e.g. Backhaus, 2007; Bogatto & Hélot, 2010), (iii) to discuss the political value of certain languages (e.g. Spolsky & Cooper, 1991), (iv) to assess colonial legacies and their linguistic reflexes (e.g. Taylor-Leech, 2012), (v) to investigate competing conceptions of the nature of bilingualism in an area (e.g. Coupland, 2011), and (vi) to understand the tension between immigrant enclaves and corporate business interests competing for space (e.g. Lou, 2010).

1.3 Linguistic landscapes in Spain

Being one of the more multilingual European countries in terms of indigenous languages, many regions in Spain offer an ideal environment for the study of LL. 41% of Spain’s population lives in a region where there is more than one official language (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2007). There has been significant research in the LL of two minority regions in Spain: the Basque County and the Catalan-speaking regions, both of which are areas where there are relatively high levels of bilingualism and where the legal status of the regional minority language, Basque and Catalan respectively, vis-à-vis Castilian can be a politicized and polarizing issue.

With respect to research into the LL of the Basque country, there have been a number of studies. Cenoz and Gorter (2006) compares the LL of Donostia (San
Sebastián) with that of Ljouwert (Leeuwarden), a Frisian-speaking city in the Netherlands, where Dutch is the state language. Results indicated that in Donostia, bilingual signs, as well as signs in the regional language were relatively more common than in Ljouwert. In both settings, the dominant language (Castilian and Dutch, respectively) was used in a plurality of the signs and tended to occupy the more prominent position. They account for the differences between these cities with differences in language policy with respect to the minority language, where Basque saw greater official support than did Frisian. Aiestaran et al. (2010), again looking at Donostia, examined perceptions with regards to language use in signs. They found that, Basque-L1 speakers were evenly split between a preference for signs in two languages or in more than two languages, while Castilian-L1 speakers had a preference for signs in more than two languages, but give little explanation for this difference. What is interesting is the degree to which residents, both Basque-L1 and Casitlian-L1 showed support for public displays of multilingualism. Gorter et al. (2012b) provides an overview of the connection between the process of linguistic normalization in the Basque country and the use of Basque on official signs.

With respect to studies of LL in Catalan-speaking regions, research into language use on public signs has not been insignificant. The Catalan government has long been interested in statistics with regards to the extent to which the Catalan language is used and how this connects with language policy and much of the research done (e.g. Solé and Romaní, 1997; Cazo and Romani, 2004) has focused on providing quantitative results.²

These have tended to show that over time, the extent to which Catalan has been used has increased since the adoption of legal measures supporting the revitalization of the Catalan language. Two studies looking at public signs in Barcelona have been done explicitly under an LL framework: Grosso (2008) and Comajoan and Long (2012). Grosso looked at language use in four streets in the Raval neighborhood (part of the Ciutat Vella district, see §2.3 for a map of Barcelona), looking at the different languages used in the context of neighborhoods with different ethnic make-ups. Comajoan and Long (2012) looked at three streets in demographically and geographically distinct areas of the city: Nou Barris, Sarrià-San Gervasi, and Ciutat Vella. They found a correlation between the percentage of residents in these neighborhoods who were born in Catalonia and the extent to which Catalan-only signs were found in that neighborhood. Lado (2011) looked at the use of Valencian3 vis-à-vis Castilian in Gandia and Valencia, two cities in the Valencian Community. Her findings indicating that though there was government support for the use of Valencian in public signage, particularly so in Gandia, private signs only rarely used Valencian in either city. Lado suggests that the reason for the infrequent use of Valencian in the face of government-supported use of this language was due to Valencian not being considered a symbol of identity for the residents of these cities, connecting it to past language policy that disfavored the public use of Valencian.

Issues with previous studies in the LLs of Spain is that they have largely been almost entirely quantitative, with little focus on qualitative analysis of the data and almost

---

3 Valencian is a regional variety of Catalan, which, while mutually intelligible with Catalan, is often referred to as Valencian and is treated by some as a separate language. I have used Valencian here, following the preferences of the author of the paper cited.
none on detailed analysis of individual examples of signs. While quantitative data in LL is useful and important in that it gives us an accurate picture of the degree to which each language is used in a given region, the absence of detailed qualitative analysis that is ethnographically-based and connected to larger social theory leaves little room for interpretation of the data. It is for this reason that my paper gives an account of the LLs of Barcelona that utilizes a qualitative analysis. These issues will be explored further in §1.4 and §1.5.

1.4 Approaches to linguistic landscapes: A critique

One of the failures of many analyses of LL is the over-reliance on quantitative results at the expense of detailed qualitative analysis of semotically rich data rooted in ethnography. This is problematic for two reasons.

The first is that these analyses tend to be based on surveying in great detail a relatively small portion of the area under study. These areas are then implicitly or explicitly understood or defined as representative of a given area; however, given the heterogeneous nature of most cities in terms of, (a) its population: ethnic enclaves, inhabitants’ socio-economic status, political affiliation, and religious affiliation, and (b) purpose: different areas in a city serve different needs of the population, some being more residential and others more commercial, with significant heterogeneity even within these differently purposed areas. As such, it must be understood that the surveying of a small area of a city cannot be treated as the survey of an entire city, but instead, just that portion of the city. This is not to say that commonalities cannot be found between this portion
and the rest of the city, but rather that it must be underscored that a study surveying a half-kilometer section of two or three streets in a city should not be taken as being representative of that entire city.

Secondly, by focusing on quantifying results, many methodologies (e.g. Backhaus, 2007) simply count each use of a sign as a token, regardless of the size or prominence of that sign. The semiotic elements relevant to a sign’s relative prominence or impact upon a geospatial unit’s LL are comprised of much more than its mere existence. A small note on the side of a trashcan should hardly be represented as the same as a large, flashing neon sign. Variables relevant to a sign’s degree of prominence are not adequately accounted for. Important among these are: sign size, its location and its visibility, and also features such as font and color that may draw a person’s gaze to it. Additionally relevant is the local context; those signs immediately around it or what constitutes a ‘typical’ sign in the area. Numbers gained from such a simplistic algorithm as one-to-one counting hardly seems descriptive enough to accurately represent the patterns of language use in a given geospatial unit and hence are nearly meaningless and perhaps even a misleading oversimplification. This is not to say that quantification is an impossibility with respect to research in LL. Instead, it suggests that if quantified results are desired, then there must be a focus on developing a more complicated algorithm that can account for the myriad variables that are at play in how a person understands and processes language use around them.

Closely connected with the above point about a city’s heterogeneous nature is the focus of LL research on a narrowly-defined understanding of public space. Ben Rafael et
al. see public space as being constituted by areas such as the “center” or the “downtown” of a given city, which they argue serve as a meeting place for people within that city (2010:xiv). Although there is some degree of truth in the characterization of such areas as being regions wherein people from disparate areas of a given city meet and engage with one another, being exposed to the linguistic landscape along the way, it is highly problematic to exclusively or even predominately focus on these areas. If the goal is to understand how language is used within a certain setting (written, public language) within a certain area (often, defined in terms of a city or a neighborhood), then it is incumbent upon the researcher to account for the various types of public spaces, loosely defined, within that city. That is, by merely focusing on commercial cores of cities, the large portions of cities dedicated to residential or light-commercial use, which may make up a large chunk of an inhabitant’s exposure to public space, remain neglected and the ways in which language is used in those areas remain unaccounted for. Limiting the area of research within a city merely to those major streets wherein many businesses reside or one street simply accounts for language use within this one small region of the city. That is not to say that the results would not be informative and interesting, indeed they could, but the limited focus of the study should be foregrounded. With such a broad definition of what is considered to be a text, that is, the highly inclusive means by which the ‘linguistic’ object of study is defined: any written text, it is somewhat perplexing that such a limiting definition of what is to be considered the ‘landscape’ has been used for so long.
Additionally, by focusing on these central zones of cities, there is a focus on institutional – either private or public – use of language. As these areas of the city have limited space which is in much demand, the cost of living or having a business in these areas means that they may be largely controlled by both corporate and governmental interests, which would influence the type of language use permitted. Although agentive displays of resistance to how language is used in these circumstances may be found (for example in graffiti, explained in greater detail in §3.6), the ability for private individuals to impact the linguistic landscape of these areas may be minimal. By not focusing on residential streets and other less-frequented regions of the city, one risks not only gaining a distorted picture a given linguistic landscape, but also one tacitly accept the linguistic reality projected by various institutions, be they public or private, who have the funds to control space in these central arteries of the city. Thus, to truly account for how language is used, understood, and connects with other social, historical, and political processes, it is necessary that not only these central commercial regions be investigated, but also smaller, more residential neighborhoods wherein private individuals can take a stance, contest institutionally-defined norms, and modify their linguistic environment.

1.5 The frame-analytic approach to linguistic landscape

The frame-analytic approach to LL uses Goffman’s understanding of frames as a means by which we can group together different patterns of language use and understand them within their social, historical, and political contexts. Goffman (1974) defines frames as “organizational premises” which allow people to understand and contextualize
familiar situations (247). Frames are “situational resources deployed by social actors when faced with the question ‘What is it that’s going on here?’”, the question that Goffman poses in defining frames (Jaworski and Yeung, 2010:166). Blommaert connects Goffman’s understanding of frames with Gumperz’s concept of contextualization, stating that Goffman “assumed that people construct interpretive universes in which utterances are set and offered for interpretation” (2006:46). These “interpretive universes” should be understood as being socially available and relatively uniform within a given society.

As Coupland & Garrett understand them, these frames are “culturally or sub-culturally structured and structuring sense-making resources” (2010:15). Such a definition is informative because in its use of “structured” and “structuring”, it points to how frames are both connected to previous contexts and lasting social structures – the global context, but also that they are a means by which these structures and contextual understandings are reinforced and modified. As such, the local and the global context in which a text is embedded in share a bidirectional relationship, each influencing each other as well as the interpretation and the uptake by readers.

The first application of frames to LL was in Kallen (2010). Kallen states that by using discursive frames, we can see the LL “as a confluence of systems, observable within a single visual field but operating with a certain degree of independence between elements” with each of these systems, or frames, as being a “separate answer” to Goffman’s question (42). In his analysis of the LL of Dublin, Kallen proposes that the LL should be understood as operating in five frames: the CIVIC FRAME, the
MARKETPLACE, PORTALS, the WALL, and the DETRITUS ZONE. These frames are not
universals, but instead are particular to Dublin and are formed by its relevant linguistic,
political, social, and historical trajectories. Coupland and Garrett (2010), looking at the
use of Welsh and Castilian in a Argentinian town, propose three salient frames
underlying public displays of bilingualism: the COLONIAL HISTORY FRAME, the REFLEXIVE
CULTURAL WELSHNESS FRAME, and the WELSH HERITAGE FRAME. Jaworski and Yeung
(2010) look at residential signage Hong Kong, and identify three relevant frames: the
INDEX FRAME, the SPECTACLE FRAME, and the BRAND FRAME. They connect these three
frames with the three major communicative functions of utterances proposed by Halliday
(1978): ideational, interpersonal, and textual.

The frame-analytic approach to LL was further refined in Coupland (2012), which
focuses on the use of Welsh and English in public displays in Wales. Coupland proposes
four frames within which public displays bilingualism in Wales are organized: the FRAME
OF NONAUTONOMOUS WELSH, the FRAME OF PARALLEL-TEXT BILINGUALISM, the FRAME OF
NATIONALIST RESISTANCE, the FRAME OF WELSH EXOTICISM, and the FRAME OF LACONIC
MULTICULTURAL CELEBRATION. These frames “stand in tension with each other, and
sometimes in blatant mutual opposition” (2). Within the context of LL and
multilingualism, we can understand frames as semiotic potential, each operating in a way
that indexes a set of interpretations or evaluations of political, social, and historical
processes which are operating in their the global or the local contexts of a text.

A frame-analytic approach to LL offers a number of advantages over more
traditional means by which LL was understood. Foremost among these is that by linking
to frame analysis, LL is connecting with an established tradition for understanding social organization and social thought amongst people. Rather than offering weak conclusions based on quantified results which are then weakly correlated to sociocultural trends within a city, frame analysis offers a means by which we can more strongly connect public language use with local understandings of the different symbolic values attached to languages and how those languages index larger political, social, and historical processes. An analysis that accounts for such “multiplicity in the [LL]”, Kallen argues, cannot be provided by quantitative analysis (46). By focusing on form (i.e. the language used) at the expense of content and context, we lose much, if not most, of the information encoded in a sign. As Coupland and Garrett (2010) note, such analyses “[tend] to sacrifice local contextual detail for ‘big-picture’ trends”. They argue that qualitative research, on the other hand, can pose questions whose focus goes beyond merely distribution and frequency, allowing us to “analyze landscapes in terms of how different meanings and value-systems have conspired to generate a landscape profile, and about what meanings people are likely to take from the linguistic landscape” (13). While detailed, ethnographically-based qualitative analysis is not particular to a frame-analytic account of LLs (c.f. Scollon and Scollon, 2003), such an account does offer a structured means to go about this type of analysis in a way that connects with social theory whose application goes beyond that of LL or sociolinguistics.
CHAPTER 2: SETTING AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Setting for the study: Barcelona

The region of study of this paper is Barcelona, the cultural, economic, and political capital of Catalonia. Barcelona, a city of 1.6 million people, is situated within a traditionally Catalan-speaking area that spans much of the western portion of the Mediterranean sea, extending southwards from the department of Pyrénées-Orientales in Southern France, through Catalonia and Valencia to Murcia, the Spanish autonomous community located to the northeast of Andalusia. Though positioned well within these boundaries, Barcelona is a multilingual city wherein speakers of both Catalan and Castilian dominate its linguistic ecology.

Both Castilian and Catalan serve as official languages in Barcelona. Castilian is the official language as recognized by the Spanish Constitution; however, the Constitution also stipulates that other Spanish languages have official status within regions in which they are spoken and that legislate that those languages be official. As Catalan is official in Catalonia, it has some level of de facto recognition at the state level; however, Castilian is the only official language of the Spanish state and the official status of regional official languages is territorially limited (Constitución Española, 1978:art. 3). At the regional level, Catalan is defined by Catalonia’s 2006 Statute of Autonomy as an official language (along with Castilian) and as Catalonia’s “own” language (llengua pròpia) and the “language of normal use” (Estatut d’Autonomia de Catalunya, 2006:art. 6).
As of 2008, 63.1% of the inhabitants of the province of Barcelona listed Castilian as their mother language, while 24.7% listed Catalan and 4.2% listed both. 1.8% listed Arabic and the remaining amount is comprised of other languages (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2008). Through immigration from Castilian-speaking regions of Spain and the Americas, as well as language shift, Castilian has come to predominate Catalan as a mother tongue in Barcelona (Pradilla, 2011).

2.2 Socio-historical background

Castilian has a long history of official use in Catalonia (and hence in Barcelona). Castilian came to be an official language in Catalonia following the death of Martí l’Humà in 1410 when the Crown of Aragon, of which Catalonia was a part, passed into the hands of Castilian-speaking members of the royal family. This Castilian-language dominance was solidified with the dynastic union between the Crown of Aragon and the Crown of Castile in 1469 (Bauzà, 2000; Pradilla, 2011). The nineteenth century saw a boom in the production of Catalan-language literature as Barcelona grew to be an important economic power due to its early industrialization relative to much of the rest of Spain. During the Second Spanish Republic (1931-1939), Catalonia passed its first Statute of Autonomy, which defined Catalan as its sole official language. Catalan came to be used as a language of state and of education. Despite this, Castilian remained the official language of the Republic. Following Francisco Franco’s defeat of the Second Spanish Republic and the establishment of Franco’s dictatorship of the country, Catalan was relegated to the private sphere, being banned from governmental, education, or other
public use (Vila, 2011). Following Franco’s death in 1975, the passing of the Spanish Constitution in 1978, and the passing of the Statue of Autonomy of Catalonia in 1979, Catalan slowly began to regain the institutional and public use that it had before Franco’s ascendancy of power in Spain (Pradilla, 2011).

2.3 Methodology

Data for this study was collected in July and August of 2013 and over 2,500 pictures were taken. Pictures were taken in the following districts: Ciutat Vella, Eixample, Gràcia, Horta-Guinardó, Sant Andreu, Sants-Montjuïc, Sarrià-Sant Gervasi, and Sant Martí, accounting for all of the districts of Barcelona except for Les Corts and Nou Barris. Each of these areas was surveyed on foot and pictures were taken to serve as exemplars for the types of signs found (in terms of language, message, and context) within that area. In addition to this, following traditional LL methodology, all instances of signs for .25km lengths of three streets in three different districts of Barcelona were photographed. This was done to ensure that an accurate representation of the types of signs was gathered for analysis. These three streets are: Carrer de València in Eixample, Carrer d’Astúries in Gràcia, and Carrer de la Riera Alta in Ciutat Vella. These streets, though not among the largest streets in the city or in each district, were all major streets. Although they were still very residential, they also had a significant degree of commercial enterprise such that there were many signs of differing type, both private and public, institutional and not. A map of the districts of Barcelona can be found below in Figure 1.
These pictures were then grouped according to language used as well as the content of their message. I then coded these pictures as to which of the four frames I propose that they belong: the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, the FRAME OF NORMALIZED SEMIAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, the FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA, and the FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE. These frames each encapsulate sets of discourses surrounding language, language policy, identity, and politics and are reflective of different conceptualizations of bilingualism in Barcelona and how or if it should be
expressed in public. Their identification came about as a result of the coordination of these sets of discourses with patterns of public language use.

i. The FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN: This frame reflects an ideology of public Castilian monolingualism.

ii. The FRAME OF NORMALIZED SEMIAUTONOMOUS CATALAN: This frame reflects an ideology wherein Catalan is the appropriate language for public use in Catalonia, but which does not explicitly reject the public use of Castilian.

iii. The FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA: Within this frame, Catalan and Castilian are conceptualized as not existing in competition with one another, with each being a resource and a part of the city’s multilingualism.

iv. The FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE: This frame reflects an ideology that advocates for Catalan monolingualism within Catalan-speaking territories. Signs produced under this frame are (a) those that exclusively and explicitly advocate Catalan monolingualism and index linguistic secession and (b) those that show acts of linguistic vandalism and make visible the defacement of Castilian in its attenuated role in contemporary local politics. Such acts of linguistic transgression foreground newer forms of representations, meanings, and messages now mobilized through Catalan.

In the following chapter, I will give an outline of each of these frames, providing examples of signs that are a product of them. Each section will include detailed, ethnographic analysis indicating the socio-historical and political processes that conspire to create that frame, as well as an explication of the ways the examples fit within them.
CHAPTER 3: A FRAME-THEORETIC ANALYSIS OF BARCELONA’S LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE

3.1 Frames in Barcelona: An overview

A frame-theoretic account of LL sees an LL as “an ensemble of multiple systems within the same visual field and not as a single system” (Kallen, 2010:46). An LL’s multiplicity is, then, accounted for by multiple frames, each covering different conceptual territory, though operating within shared physical and social space. This paper will look at the LL of Barcelona within the context of four frames, or organizational premises, that exist in tension with one another with respect to what sort of relationship towards bilingualism in Barcelona that they index. These understandings are connected to larger socio-political and historical processes existing in the geospatial area of Barcelona. These four frames are the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, the FRAME OF NORMALIZED SEMIAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, the FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA, and the FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE. Though in this paper, only four frames are analyzed, that is not to say that these four frames exhaust the possibilities of bilingual language use, rather that they are the most salient and relevant to the context of Catalan and Castilian in Barcelona.

As Barcelona is not just a bilingual city, but also a multilingual one, with speakers coming from non-indigenous or immigrant backgrounds, there is also something to be said with regard to how Catalan and Castilian interact with immigrant and global languages and their presence in Barcelona. Indeed, the data for this paper included signs
not only in Catalan and Castilian, but also English, Arabic, Urdu, and French, among other languages. Within Catalonia, there are significant non-Spanish speaking immigrant populations coming from Morocco, Romania, the UK, and Ukraine. 300 languages are spoken in Catalonia (Pradilla, 2011). Many of these languages are spoken in Barcelona, where there is a relatively high immigrant population.

Such language use is also interesting and forms an important part of Barcelona’s linguistic landscape; however, for the purposes of this study, the focus has been limited to understanding the relationship between Catalan and Castilian, the two official languages of the area. These two languages form the most significant portion of the public language use in Barcelona (Comajoan and Long, 2012; Solé and Romaní, 1997). Use of these languages, whether a sign be monolingual or bilingual, necessarily takes a stance with respect to bilingualism in Barcelona. These frames are agentive performances and thus are also products of individuals in addition to being products of larger social contexts. This will be particularly evident in §3.6, when the FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE is discussed and the actions by some to deface signs, transforming their meaning and shifting the frame in which it would be understood by an observer.

3.2 Frame of Nonautonomous Catalan

The FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN reflects an ideology of Castilian monolingualism within the public space of Barcelona. Within this frame, Castilian is seen as the only legitimate public language, while bilingualism and Catalan are relegated to private use. This frame connects with Coupland’s (2011) FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS
WELSH, though it differs in a number of important respects due to the different past and present understandings of bilingualism in Wales and Catalonia.

In terms of signs, this frame is represented through monolingual Castilian signs, as was previously mandated by law in Franco-era Spain. This includes older signs as well as contemporary state governmental signs and some private signs. All of these signs reflect an ideological stance with respect to Castilian, Catalan, and their mutual use.

Figure 2:

![Sign](image)

Castilian: Ministry of Housing | National Institute of Housing | This house receives the benefits of the law of June 15, 1954

The picture in Figure 2 depicts a sign found in Eixample that was placed by the Spanish Ministry of Housing in 1954 during Franco’s dictatorship in Spain (1939-1975). The language of the sign is entirely in Castilian, linking it to a monolingual Castilian

---

4 This was not the only instance of this sign; it was found relatively frequently.
understanding of public language use in Barcelona. In addition to the language use, the symbol to the left of the text is the then seal of the National Institute of Housing. What makes this seal interesting is that it is comprised of the seal of the the Spanish Phalanx of the Assemblies of the National Syndicalist Offensive, generally known as the Falange, the Fascist Party of Spain of which Franco was a part, with a house and the initials “I.N.V.” superimposed upon it. Francoist Spain is much denigrated among many sectors of modern Spain as an era of backwardness and, within the context of Spanish minority languages and cultures, a period of intolerance towards regional differences in Spain. The motto of Francoist Spain, *Una, Grande y Libre* – “One, Great, and Free” emphasizes the importance of erasing Spanish (including linguistic) heterogeneity to this political regime. Viewed within this political and historical context, the link between the seal and the language choice is striking and evocative and it makes clear how those persons and institutions involved in the production of this sign conceptualized bilingualism in Barcelona – a conceptualization that is broadcast and clear to those who view it. This frame is, thus, linked to past suppression of the Catalan language, culture, and people. Other instances of Spanish monolingualism, while perhaps not including semiotic elements that so clearly call to mind this era, still index this period through their shared linguistic practice of Castilian monolingualism.

Similar to the sign in Figure 2, the lower sign in Figure 3 is also an example of a governmental (public) sign that is a remnant of linguistic policies of past (though still relevant) political regimes. This sign, entirely in Castilian, is an example of an old street sign. These signs are relatively uncommon in much of Barcelona, though not rare in
some areas, particularly in the Ciutat Vella district (where this sign was found). When these signs have not been replaced, they have merely been left up and are found in conjunction with a modern monolingual Catalan sign.

This example is interesting for a number of reasons. First, it shows that the Catalan names of streets were entirely obliterated and that Catalan’s stake as the territorial language of Catalonia was disputed. The contrasts somewhat with examples demonstrating what Coupland termed the frame of nonautonomous Welsh. Within this frame, spellings of Welsh names were anglicized, reflecting the dominant language, English’s, “circumscription” of the Welsh language (9). While examples in both frames demonstrate the effects of hegemonic state languages on regional minority languages, the impact on Catalan has been even greater, with the Catalan name being erased entirely and being replaced with a Castilian translation (c.f. the upper sign in Figure 3, in monolingual Catalan). This serves to sever the link between the Catalan language and the territory of Barcelona. Thus, within this frame, the territorial claim that Catalan has as the (public) language of Catalan-speaking areas is disputed and Castilian, as the official language of the Spanish state, instead, holds this claim.

Additionally, this example demonstrates the sedimentation of signs produced under different frames of bilingualism, each accounting for a different historical period and its respective linguistic policy. This sedimentation will be discussed in greater detail in §3.6.
Figure 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Castilian: (lower sign)</th>
<th>Catalan: (upper sign)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRITO 3º</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} DISTRICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRIO 2º</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} NEIGHBORHOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLE</td>
<td>STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE LA DUDA</td>
<td>OF DOUBT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: (The wrought iron sign)

Castilian: AÑO 1849, YEAR 1849
Governmental signs are not the only ones examples that fit within the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN. Figure 4 shows the example of an explicitly-dated private sign indicating when a building was constructed. The Castilian monolingualism of this sign implies that at the time this sign was created, during an earlier incarnation of the Kingdom of Spain, Castilian was understood to be appropriate language for use in public contexts, at least within the context of public signage. Thus we see that signs produced under and understood within this frame are not only a result of government-enforced linguistic policies, but also as a result of private individuals responding to social norms and practices with respect to their contemporary understanding of linguistic appropriateness.

This frame, though very much connected with past regimes of enforced Castilian monolingualism, has reflexes in modern signs, particularly those that are produced by the Spanish government. This indicates that this frame is not just a residue of these past regimes, but is also part of currently existing policies that point towards an understanding of public Castilian monolingualism. This can be seen in Figure 5, which shows the sign outside a state lottery building. As it is run by the Spanish government, the only language used is Castilian. Thus, at some level, Spain continues to challenge the claim that the Catalan language has some degree of territoriality in Spanish Catalan-speaking regions in general, and Barcelona specifically.
3.3 Frame of Semiautonomous Normalized Catalan

The FRAME OF SEMIAUTONOMOUS NORMALIZED CATALAN reflects an ideology wherein Catalan is the appropriate language for public use in Catalonia, but which does not explicitly reject the public use of Castilian by others. This is connected with the process of LINGUISTIC NORMALIZATION, which the Catalan government embarked upon following the passage of the Linguistic Normalization Act in 1983. The meaning of NORMALIZATION with respect to Catalan language policy refers to the government of Catalonia’s efforts to reintroduce Catalan as a language of public communication following its repression during the period of Franco’s dictatorship. The Linguistic Normalization Act guaranteed persons the right to use Catalan in public and private, both in private enterprise and in their dealings with regional governmental institutions (Llei de
Normalització Lingüística a Catalunya, 1983:art. 2). This process of promotion of the Catalan language continues to the present day (see Boix-Fuster et al., 2011 and Gifreu, 2011). The 2006 Statue of Autonomy of Catalonia stipulates that a person has the right to communicate with private businesses in the language of their choice, Catalan or Castilian (Estatut d’Autonomia, 2006). The Language Policy Act of 1998 requires that public companies of the Catalan government and public or private entities providing public service must use Catalan on their signs and that all businesses must use at least (though not necessarily exclusively) Catalan on all permanent signs which list services offered (Llei 1/1998 de 7 de Gener, de Política Lingüística, 1998:art. 32); however, this law is not strictly followed (Comajoan and Long, 2012). Previous studies into Barcelona’s LL (e.g. Grosso, 2008; Comajoan and Long, 2012) have demonstrated that monolingual Castilian signs constitute a significant percentage of public signage.

Signs that reflect the understanding of bilingualism inherent to this frame are written in monolingual Catalan, reflecting an ideology that connects the public use of this language with the goals of linguistic normalization in revitalizing Catalan and increasing the number of domains in which it is used. Signs produced under this frame include (a) regional governmental signs from the post-Franco period and (b) the signs of many businesses.

This frame does not directly correspond with a frame proposed by Coupland (2012), given the difference between the sociolinguistic contexts in Wales and Catalonia, particularly with respect to the vitality of the language. While in Catalonia, 97.4% of the population reports understanding Catalan, only 20.5% of the Welsh population speaks
Welsh (Coupland and Aldridge, 2009). Similarities and differences between the sociolinguistic context of Welsh and Catalan and its effect on the relevant frames will be discussed in §4.2.

This frame has similarities with Coupland’s FRAME OF PARALLEL-TEXT BILINGUALISM, which “builds on the ideological premise that Welsh is not only a fully autonomous code but a code that focuses national identity for all Welsh people” (9). Both frames are linked to the status planning of the respective minority language; however, within the FRAME OF SEMIAUTONOMOUS NORMALIZED CATALAN, bilingualism is not the end goal (nor is it explicitly something which is worked against), rather public use of Catalan alone is.

Figure 6:

Catalan (lower sign): SIMÓ OLLER STREET Castilian (upper sign): EXIT
Figures 6 and 7 show us examples of public signs that are in monolingual Catalan. As Catalan is used in them, it suggests that Catalan is seen as an official language of the area, connecting to ideas about territoriality and language. This can be seen as directly opposing the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, wherein Catalan is a language that is inappropriate for public use.

In Figure 6, we see a contrast between two frames. The monolingual Catalan sign reflects the FRAME OF NORMALIZED SEMIAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, while the monolingual Castilian sign behind it expresses the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN. The Catalan-language sign is a recent one, while the Castilian-language street sign is the historical
residue of a municipal government that used Castilian as the sole language of public communication. The semiotics of this example clearly show the layering and sedimentation of these frames as the Catalan-language sign, overlaps slightly on top of the worn, older-style Castilian-language sign. This literal layering, though not complete obliteration, exemplifies the shifting between frames for conceptualizing the nature of bilingualism in Barcelona over time by various institutions. Figure 7 provides an additional example of a governmental sign that has monolingual Catalan text.

Figure 8:

![Figure 8](image)

Catalan:
Aicra DISSENY  
joieria  rellotgeria  taller propi

Aicra DESIGNS
jewelers  watches  handmade

This frame is reflected also in private signs that are exclusively in Catalan, as shown in Figure 8. This use of Catalan is an integral part of the program towards
LINGUISTIC NORMALIZATION in Catalonia, though one which is performed by individual actors on the form of corporations or unaffiliated persons. This sign shows the private use of monolingual Catalan signage within the context of a small, local business that is unaffiliated with any larger institutions. This highlights the individual nature of language on display. Much of a geographical area’s LL is determined by the actions of individual actors whose linguistic choices mark and color their environment. These actions, however, are constrained by larger social pressures. According to Cenoz and Gorter (2006), the relationship between sociolinguistic context and LL is bidirectional. While the LL “reflects the relative power and status of the different languages in a specific sociolinguistic context”, at the same time the LL “contributes to the construction of the sociolinguistic context” as a sign’s language use can influence people’s “perception of the status of the different languages and even affect their own linguistic behavior” (67-68).

3.4 Frame of Bilingual Catalonia

The FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA is linked with discourses that promote relative harmony between Catalan and Castilian. Within this frame, Catalan and Castilian are conceptualized not as existing in competition with one another, but rather as serving complementary purposes, each language being the preferred linguistic resource of different groups of people.

At different levels, both Catalan and Castilian hold official status in Barcelona and that there are significant numbers of people who speak either language as a mother
tongue. Additionally, levels of bilingualism are relatively high, with much of the population speaking both Catalan and Castilian. Within this frame, the response to these linguistic realities is, rather than to pit one language against another, to actively embrace the multilingualism that exists. This frame is reflected in the signs of many businesses as well as some governmental signs.

This frame roughly corresponds to Coupland’s FRAME OF PARALLEL-TEXT BILINGUALISM in which Welsh is conceptualized as “Everyone’s Language” but which “envisages Welsh people exercising ‘choice’ between the use of Welsh and English within a ‘truly bilingual Wales’” (9). However, as noted, Coupland’s conception of this frame also shares similarities with the FRAME OF SEMIAUTONOMOUS CATALAN.

In Figure 9, we see an example of a private sign written in both Catalan and Castilian. Though the word closed is written only in Catalan, the rest of the content, addressed to former clients of the bar, was written identically in both languages. Here we see that despite the fact that the written messages were similar enough to each other that any competent speaker of one language who had had minimal exposure to the other would have been able to understand it, both languages, rather than one or the other, were chosen. Such a choice suggests that the author saw each language as being complementary to the other and each being representative of one particular linguistic sector of Barcelona, suggesting that they embraced the multilingual nature of their former patrons. As the sign was for a business which had closed, rather than one which is presently operating, and thus who had no need to attempt to entice clients speaking both languages, it suggests a deeper connection to multilingualism at an ideological level,
operating within the FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA.

Figure 9:

Catalan: TANCAT
Catalan: AGRAİ%M A TOTS ELS NOSTRES AMICS I CLIENTS AQUETS [sic] 60 ANYS DE CARINYO I FIDELITAT

-----------------

Castilian: AGRADECEMOS A TODOS NUESTROS AMIGOS Y CLIENTES ESTOS 60 AÑOS DE CARIÑO Y FIDELIDAD

CLOSED

WE THANK ALL OF OUR FRIENDS AND CLIENTS FOR 60 YEARS OF
AFFECTION AND LOYALTY.

-----------------

WE THANK ALL OF OUR FRIENDS AND CLIENTS FOR 60 YEARS OF
AFFECTION AND LOYALTY
In Figure 10 we see a very striking example of the linguistic reflex of the conception of bilingualism relevant to FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA. The signs of this moved bar seem to show sedimentation of different frames, the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN to which Catalan and bilingual signs were added. The sum effect is that both Castilian and Catalan are used in such a way that each language is quite

La clave de sol (Castilian) and la clau de sol (Catalan) literally mean “the clef of sol” (G), but an accurate English translation would be “the treble clef”.

This could be both Castilian and Catalan, however given that it is on a sign that is otherwise in Castilian, it should be understood as Castilian.
evenly accounted for, reflecting the FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA. Although the messages in each language are not word-for-word identical, both Castilian and Catalan are used to advertise the business showing that both languages are used when communicating with customers (i.e. Castilian: *Nueva Dirección* and Catalan: *Nova Adreça*, “New address”). Furthermore, both languages are used by the business to brand itself (i.e. the bar’s name is given in Castilian *La Clave de Sol* and in Catalan: *La Clau de Sol*), showing that the owner sees her business and community as being part of a bilingual society.

Figure 11:
In Figure 11, we see a map from Sants Estació, a train station in the Sants-Montjuïc district of Barcelona. This map was put out by ADIF, a Spanish-state-run company that manages its railway infrastructure. In this example, company adopted the use of both the state and regional language. As the location of this map is in a region where Catalan has regional-official status it has *de facto* state-level official status. In this example, despite the fact that *Mapa Costa Brava* “Costa Brava Map” is written in the exact same way in both Catalan and Castilian, there is a concerted effort to make sure that both languages are accounted for. Unlike other examples, this one suggests a rather corporate, policy-driven use of bilingualism leading to a superfluous message that borders on comical. Despite this, it is still reflective of an (enforced or not) conceptualization of bilingualism that is consistent with the FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA.

### 3.5 Frame of Catalan Resistance

Within the FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE, Barcelona is conceptualized as a Catalan city and Catalan is understood as the only acceptable means of communication, public or otherwise, within the area. It reflects an ideology that advocates for Catalan monolingualism as both a goal and a means by which Castilian-language and Spanish hegemony can be resisted. Catalan is portrayed as an essential cultural feature of Barcelona and something that connects it to the larger Catalan-speaking world, the *Països*
Catalans\textsuperscript{7}. The FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE shares many similarities with Coupland’s FRAME OF NATIONALIST RESISTANCE, in which displays “‘shout out’ demands about linguistic ownership, entitlement, and obligation, continuing the tradition of language activism in Wales” (13). Such signs are acts of resistance (and sometimes transgression) that aim to counter English-language hegemony in Wales. The FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE is also linked to Scollon and Scollon’s concept of “transgressive semiotics” which refers to text “transgressively written… against the expectation or in violation of a public expectation” (2003:147).

Signs that reflect the conceptualization of bilingualism relevant to this frame include (a) those that exclusively advocate Catalan monolingualism which index linguistic secession and (b) those that show acts of linguistic vandalism that and make visible the defacement of Spanish in its attenuated role in contemporary local politics. In so doing, an individual reframes the inscription and make explicit her rejection of the ideological constellation encapsulated within a certain frame. Such acts of linguistic transgression foreground newer forms of representations, meanings, and messages now mobilized through Catalan.

Included in (b) is graffiti, something that is insufficiently accounted for in LL literature. It is hoped that this paper will be able to offer more insight into how it can be understood as a process of linguistic erasure or, more importantly, transformation.

\textsuperscript{7} Països Catalans means “Catalan Countries” in Catalan and refers to all those territories wherein Catalan speakers traditionally have lived. It comprises regions of Spain: the Autonomous Communities of Catalonia, Valencia, and the Balearic Islands, la Franja in Aragon, and el Carxe in Murcia, of France: Catalunya del Nord, of Italy: the city of l’Alguer, and Andorra.
Graffiti shows on-the-ground-level contestation of institutionalized understandings of what is and is not a valid mode of linguistic expression. It shows the agency of various residents who decide to have some degree of control over the linguistic environment that surrounds them.

Figure 12:

In Figure 12, we see the constellation of features that are relevant to and reflective of the frame of Catalan resistance. The text, in form, is a transgressive one, being graffiti written on the outside of a local restaurant. The three symbols written below the text are, from left to right, the Estelada: an unofficial flag used by Catalan separatists, the hammer and sickle, suggesting anticapitalist sentiments, and a clenched fist within the
The Venus symbol: a symbol for the women’s liberation movement. These three symbols place the movement within a sphere of radical politics that challenges norms of political, economic, and gender organization. The text itself, written entirely in Catalan, references two of these movements. *Arran* refers to a feminist, socialist, and Catalan-separatist youth organization that is a part of the *Esquerra Independentista* (Independent Left) movement, a far-left separatist political movement. Its name, *arran*, meaning ‘level with’ in English, is meant to indicate that the youth are equal members of Catalan society. In saying “Neither France, nor Spain, nor European Union: Catalan Countries” the text explicitly advocates a language-based political organization that join together those regions wherein Catalan has traditionally been spoken into a single political unit, separate from not only the states which currently claim sovereignty over this territory, but also the larger confederation of the European Union.

In Figures 13 and 14, we see an explicit defacement of two signs that were originally written in Castilian. The first, in figure 13, is a rare example of a carved street sign, written only in Castilian. Because it was engraved into marble, this sign could not merely be changed and replaced with a Catalan-language sign as was done in the rest of that neighborhood and indeed in most\(^8\) of Barcelona. The relative age of this inscription is apparent by the location of an electrical cord and another sign that cover up much of it. In this sign, the word *calle*, Castilian for “street”, is crossed out, showing an explicit rejection of the public use of Castilian. Such examples give a clearer, more forceful rejection of the public use Castilian, than would the sign’s removal or erasure. Where a

\(^8\) This is true with the exception of the Ciutat Vella (See Figure 3 and its explanation), where we see both old and new signs side-by-side.
more significant defacement that rendered the Castilian unrecognizable would allow an individual to exercise control over their linguistic environment by removing texts reflective of certain ideologies present in the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN, it would not allow them to then turn the sign into a message which expresses the opposite sentiment. These possibilities are exploited by individuals and show a creative manipulation of their environment.

Figure 13:

Castilian: *Calle de Zaragoza, Zaragoza Street*
Figure 14:

Catalan modified to seem less like Castilian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASA</th>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>VALENCIA° = Castilian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALÈNCIA</td>
<td>VALENCIA</td>
<td>VALÈNCIA = Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A BARCELONA</td>
<td>IN BARCELONA</td>
<td>DESDE = Castilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESDE 1927</td>
<td>SINCE 1927</td>
<td>DES DE = Catalan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

° In Castilian, diacritics are not required if a word is written in all capital letters. Valencia is written as València when it is not entirely capitalized, when entirely capitalized it may be written as VALENCIA or as VALÈNCIA
In Figure 14, this manipulation goes one step further by not only rejecting Castilian and its influence on Catalan, but also providing an alternative, an autonomous Catalan, through that rejection. This sign is written in Catalan, though in a nonstandard orthography that shows the strong influence of Castilian orthographic norms. The sign has then been defaced through the insertion of text that transforms it into Catalan written in standard orthography. In this example, we see that the grave accent mark, one not used in Castilian, but which is used in Catalan has been put over the word *Valencia* to transform it from what looks like the Castilian word, *VALENCIA*, to the Catalan word, *VALÈNCIA*. In addition to this, *desde* – which is how the same word is written in Castilian – has been transformed to the standard orthography Catalan form, *des de*, by inserting a | between the s and d, and thus indicating that there is (or should be) a space between the letters. In this example, not only is the rejection of Castilian and its influence on Catalan made explicit, but also its rejection in favor an autonomous Catalan that lacks such an influence. Within the frame of Catalan resistance, individuals express agency through transgressive acts such as these, wherein those individuals manipulate and transform the LL that surrounds them, altering the ideologies that it is reflecting and reproducing.
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

4.1 Sedimentation and linguistic landscape

Following Lewis (1979) and Schein (1997), Coupland argues that “a cultural landscape is agentively and cumulatively produced. Language display contributes to these processes when particular languages, and languages displayed in particular relationships to each other, are sedimented into public spaces, differently over time” (3). This sedimentation was alluded to in Chapter 3 and can be understood quite clearly by examining a number of the examples given, particularly those in Figures 3, 4, 6, 10, 13, and 14.

One of the ways that this sedimentation occurs is through the coordination of multiple signs, each produced and producing different understandings of bilingualism (i.e. within different frames). The coordination of these signs is generally the result of the accretion of historical layers and their coordination tends to be relatively unconscious. For example, the two signs seen in Figure 3 (§3.2), one monolingual Catalan, the other monolingual Castilian, are the result of different policies with regards to language use on governmental signage. Another way this sedimentation occurs is through conscious layering of linguistic signs that connect to different frames. This is seen in Figures 10, 13, and 14. In Figure 10, a business’ linguistic history is visible through the layering of different signs, some in Catalan, some in Castilian, and some in both. This layering produces an effect of its own whereby the frame of bilingual Catalonia is expressed not so much through bilingual signs as the layering process itself. Figures 13 and 14 also
show this conscious layering whereby individuals added a layer to a previously existing sign and through this act, these signs have markedly different ideological orientations, moving them from one frame into another, though only slightly disturbing their semantic content. As Coupland puts it, “a visible record of policy-driven language-ideological shift is therefore available in public signage” (7). In this way, research into LL, at least within a frame-analytic framework allows a researcher to investigate different layers of linguistic ideologies, as if like an archaeologist, paying attention not only to the layers themselves, but to each object’s provenance and its relationship to both its material and sociocultural context.

4.2 Similarities and differences between the cases of Welsh and Catalan

The similarities noted in this paper between how bilingualism is conceptualized in Wales and in Barcelona, raises the question of what might account for both these similarities and the differences between these two areas. As was previously noted, frames are “sense-making resources” (Coupland and Garrett, 15) that help us to “construct interpretive universes in which utterances are set and offered for interpretation” (Blommaert, 46). These frames are contingent upon and arise from the social, political, and historical contexts relevant to the LL in each of these settings. These include, among other factors, the relative vitality of the languages with respect to one another, the extent to which those languages serve as means by which individuals construct their own and others’ identities, power differences between speakers of the different languages, and the appropriation and marginalization by institutions of particular languages. By accounting
for similarities between Catalan and Welsh with respect to these factors, we can move towards an understanding of how these factors conspire to structure the frames relevant to how bilingualism is conceptualized in different communities.

Historically, both Catalan and Welsh are languages that have a long written tradition. Each language is closely tied with identity, particularly with respect to the Catalan. Catalan (see Strubell and Boix-Fuster, 2011) and Welsh (see Coupland and Aldridge, 2009) are cases of minority language revitalization that have been relatively successful, all told. Each holds some level of official status in its respective country and each has relatively vigorous use for official functions, including public signage. It should be noted that this is in the face of two hegemonic, global languages, Castilian and English, respectively, making such a feat all the more surprising. One notable difference is that, while Catalan is spoken by 84.7% of Catalonia (Pradilla), Welsh is only spoken by 20.5% of Wales (Coupland and Aldridge). Additionally, Welsh speakers are largely concentrated in one political unit, Wales, while the territoriality of the Catalan language (see footnote 7, pg. 43) extends well beyond Catalonia’s (and Spain’s) boundaries, with around 1/3 of its speakers living in other polities. To understand how these similarities have structured each area’s conceptualization of bilingualism, I will focus on the frames proposed in this paper and in Coupland’s.

With respect to the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS CATALAN and the FRAME OF NONAUTONOMOUS WELSH, both Catalan and Welsh went through periods of time where they lacked official status and when official functions were conducted using the state language (i.e. Castilian and English). This historical similarity impacts the LL by leaving
the historical residue of past (and present) political regimes in which the limited status enjoyed by these minority languages is reflected by either their lack of representation (in the case of Catalan) or by the way which their representation was constrained by the hegemonic language (in the case of Welsh).

With respect to the FRAME OF SEMIAUTONOMOUS NORMALIZED CATALAN, the FRAME OF BILINGUAL CATALONIA, and the FRAME OF PARALLEL-TEXT BILINGUALISM, the differences between Barcelona and Wales not only indicate differences in the social context of each language, but also internal differences between the relevant languages. Catalan, which has a significantly higher percentage of speakers and an even higher percentage of the population that understands the language. As Catalan and Castilian are both Western Romance languages that have been in constant contact with one another since their birth, they share enough similarities, both in form and in orthographic representation that minimal exposure to one by a speaker of another will allow that speaker to understand the other language with a reasonable degree of accuracy, particularly when the language is written. This means that even monolingual Catalan signs are unlikely to cause significant confusion by persons who only speak Castilian.

This is not the case Welsh, which, as a Celtic language, is so different from English that monolingual Welsh signs will likely not be understood at all by monolingual English speakers. Taking this into consideration, it can be argued that the presence of strictly monolingual signs and the existence of a frame in which such an understanding of how public language displays should be understood is a result of both Catalan’s relatively high percentage of speakers and its similarity to Castilian. This allows an opening for both a
(mainstream) ideology supporting use of monolingual Catalan signs as well as one advocating for bilingual signs. With respect to Wales, out of practical concerns, the only possibility within a discourse that does not invoke resistance is for bilingual signs. Both the difference between Welsh and English and the fact that it is spoken by only slightly over one-fifth of the population both may help to account for the FRAME OF WELSH EXOTICISM. Catalan, being a language spoken by most of the population as well as one that is clearly closely related to Castilian, does not allow for such exotification.

Both Welsh and Catalan exist within the same, larger cultural sphere – Europe, where similar discourses surrounding nationalism and the ideal of the nation-state circulate amongst different groups, often regional minorities who feel slighted by Europe’s present political borders and who may find kinship with each other. One could thus posit that both the FRAME OF CATALAN RESISTANCE and the FRAME OF NATIONALIST RESISTANCE are part of a larger frame relevant to all situations in Europe where minority languages are present. Such a frame, which I will tentatively call the FRAME OF NATIONALIST RESISTANCE’, fits within Goffman’s understanding of frames, as he understood these as being recursive or nesting, one or a set inside another.

4.3 Conclusion

The goals of this paper are twofold, one micro and one macro. While these goals are distinct, the methods I have used to meet them are intertwined. In terms of the micro goal, I have attempted to account for the LL of Barcelona, explaining the patterns of public language use while taking into account their contextual social and political
histories. Indeed, the conflict and tension of an LL is a recapitulation of the conflict and tension in that society. Barcelona’s LL has been shaped and colored by different and conflicting processes and it is because of the heterogeneous nature of the society in which Barcelona’s LL was produced that such heterogeneity is seen in its LL. This brings me to my second, macro goal. In this paper, I have tried to show that the study of public displays is a necessary part of sociolinguistic research and that LL as a methodology can provide us with robust and informative results with regards to how languages are used in a given area. In particular, I have argued that utilizing Goffman’s frame theory can provide us with a means by which we can account for an LL’s heterogeneity and links our analysis of LL with an established tradition of sociological analysis.
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