

The speakers are native speakers of a variety which does not have the status of a language. Moreover they are residents of a place where it is spoken by a minority of the population. As expressed by some of the responses they can gain no material or social advantage by associating themselves with this variety. So they are adopting some strategies or other to disassociate themselves from the language by recurrently linking it with the older generation.

These responses point out to the fact that a language or a language variety is not a static entity but it is a dynamic process which is constantly constructed, reproduced or erased depending on a host of non-linguistic ideological stances.

Language Ideology of the Linguists

There are many works (c.f., Blackledge, 2008; Charles, 1996; Jaffe, 1999; Haviland, 2003; Lippi-green, 1994; Ricento, 2000) which currently explore the impact of language ideology among individuals, ethnic and social groups, communities, in language policy and in the history of language politics. However, among the various application of the concept of ideology in the field of linguistics, a most significant and interesting area is the analysis of how ideology of the linguist themselves and that of the major linguistic thoughts has affected the history and development of linguistics. Linguists have always claimed to attempt an objective neutral outlook towards language, denouncing the common notions such as standard language is any way more pure or correct than the other varieties or those prescriptive doctrines about how language should be used. Instead, we have claimed to attempt to look into language from the impassionate, neutral and objective eyes of a scientist. However, researchers in language ideology have questioned this very assumption. Exploration of the role of ideology influencing linguists and linguistic analysis constitutes the first section of *Ideologies of Language*, entitled 'Linguistic Ideologies'.

In this section Taylor's paper (1990) entitled *Which is to be Master? the Institutionalised Authority of the Science of Language* investigates the so called scientific attitude of the descriptive linguists through ages and concludes that the descriptivism is a mask to promote dominant institutional language ideologies, that it still analyses the standard varieties and ignores the non-standards just like the earlier prescriptive linguists did . Joseph (1990) in his *Ideologizing Sassure: Bloomfield's and Chomsky's readings of the Cours de linguistique generale* contrasts Bloomfield's and Chomsky's reading of Sassure and shows that both have suppressed and highlighted parts of Sassure's contentions in order to either support their own ideological framework or distancing from their framework from Sassure . Cameron's paper (1990), *Demythologizing sociolinguistics: Why language does not reflect society* argues that Sociolinguists, being influenced by the ideology of mainstream linguistics and that of quantification and scientificness associated with it, have failed to give proper sociologically based explanation of relation between social factors and linguistic patterns as it never sided with ideology of the sociologists.

One of the most effective analyses of language ideology in the sphere of linguistic studies is done by Milroy (2001). In his analysis of standard language ideology, he showed that language ideology as a 'commonsense notion' does not affect only the common people but that linguists in spite of their attempts to objective analysis of in unravelling the 'science of language' are that they are very much affected by the 'standard language culture' and this is reflected in their work. And these ideologies in turn create general and technical understanding of language and linguistics. Therefore, studies in linguistics are in fact coloured by dominant ideologies even though it claims otherwise. Quoting Joseph and Taylor (1990, p. 2) he warns that '... any enterprise which claims to be non-ideological and value-neutral, but which covertly remains ideological and value-laden is more dangerous for its deceptive subtlety'. He argues that

everyone, almost without any exception agrees to the concept of standard language ideology. He suggests that languages are more defined by the ideology rather than their internal structure.

In conclusion, it can be said that the development of the concept of ideology in the sphere of linguistics has opened a fundamentally new perspective to the study of language, which can project language less as static object of study or even as a social artefact but more as a human activity or a human process. This will undoubtedly enrich our understanding of language for time to come. Language ideology or ideology of language is bound to continue to develop not just as a tool of linguistic analysis or a framework but also as the subject matter of analysis itself.

References

- Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London New York: Verso.
- Bakir, M. 1986. Sex Differences in Approximation to the Standard Arabic. *Anthropological Linguistics* , 28 (1).
- Bambi B. Schieffelin, P. V. (Ed.). 1992. *Pragmatics (Special issue on Language Ideologies)* , 2 (3).
- Blackledge, A. 2008. Monolingual Ideologies in Multilingual States: Language, Hegemony and Social Justice in Western Liberal Democracies. *Sociolinguistic Studies* , 1 (2), 25-45.
- Cameron, D. 1990. Denythingologising Sociolinguistics: Why language does not reflect society. In J. E. Joseph, & T. E. Taylor, *Ideologies of Language* (pp. 79-93). London and New York: Routledge.
- Chaklader, S. 1990. Language Policy and Reformation of India's Federal Structure: The Case of West Bengal, In B. Weinstein, & B. Weinstein (Ed.), *Language Policy and Political Development* (pp. 87-107). Ablex: Norwood, New Jersey.
- Charles, B. 1996. Conflict, Languages Ideologies and Privileged Areas of Discursive Authority in Warao Dispute Mediation, In C. L. Briggs, *Disorderly Discourses: Narrative, Conflict and Inequality*. London / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chatterji, S. K. 1963. *Languages and Literatures of Modern India*. Calcutta: Bengali Publishers.
- Eagleton, T. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.
- Gal, S., & Irvine, J. 1995. The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference. *Social Research* , 62 (4), 967-1001.
- Haviland, J. B. 2003. Ideologies of Language: Some Reflections on Languages and US Law. *American Anthropologist* , 105 (4), 764-774.
- Jaffe, A. 1999. *Ideologies in action: Language politics in Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Joseph, J. E. 1990. Ideologizing Sussure: Bloomfield's and Chomsky's Readings of the Cours de linguistique generale. In J. E. Joseph, & T. J. Taylor, *Ideologies of Language* (pp. 51-78). London and New York: Routledge.
- Joseph, J. E., & Taylor, T. A. (1990). *Ideologies of language*. London: Routledge.
- Joseph, J. E., & Taylor, T. A. (1990). Ideology, science and language. In J. E. Joseph, & T. T. A, *Ideologies of Language* (pp. 1-6). London and New York: Routledge.
- Kroskrity, P. 2004. Language Ideologies. In D. A. (ed), *A companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 496-517). Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.
- Labov, W. 1972. The Social motivations of a Sound Change. In W. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (pp. 1-42). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lippi-green, R. 1994. Accent, stand languages ideology and discriminatory pretext in the courts. *Language in Society* , 23 (2), 163-198.
- Milroy, J. 2001. Language Idologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* , 5 (4), 530-555.

- Ricento, T. (. (2000). *Ideology, Politics and Language Politics: Focus on English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rumsey, A. 1990. Wording, Meaning and Linguistic Ideology. *American Anthropologist* , 92, 346-361.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (1998). *Language Ideology: Practice and Theory*. New York Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, M. 1979. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In P. R. Clyne, & W. F. Hanks, *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Taylor, T. J. 1990. Which is to be master? The institutionlization of authority in the science of language . In J. E. Joseph, & T. J. Taylor, *Idiologies of Language* (pp. 9-26). London, New York: Routeledge.
- Trudgill, P. 1972. Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in urban British English. *Language in Society* , 1, 179-195.
- Woolard. 1998. Language Ideology as a field of Inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, P. V. Kroskrity, B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Krosky (Eds.), *Language Ideology: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3-47). New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, K., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* , 23, 55-82.

