Language and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century:

Nynorsk and Scots in Comparative Context[1]

Jens Johan Hyvik
University College of Southeast Norway
Robert McColl Millar
University of Aberdeen
Andrew G. Newby
University of Helsinki

Abstract

Analyses of nationalism in nineteenth-century Europe have demonstrated the importance of language in crystallising group identity. The century witnessed a continent-wide growth in the idea that language – especially regional linguistic differences from a hegemonic or imperial state language – could form the basis of a strong regional, or, latterly, national identity. This article explores the divergent trajectories which the language question took in Norway and Scotland during this period, and argues that differences in national identity, caused partly by the two nations' different constitutional histories, had a considerable impact on the development of Scots and Nynorsk in their respective national contexts.

> The Norwegians were in an almost unique position among Europeans in the 19th century, not fully independent, yet basically free to develop their own national identity (only the Scots were in a comparable situation at the time).
> John Myhill, 2006: 85

Analyses of nationalism in nineteenth-century Europe have demonstrated the importance of language in crystallising group identity (Anderson 2006: Ch. 5; Hroch 2000: 164; Hobsbawm 1992: 54; Smith 1991: 12; Fishman 1972). The century witnessed a continent-wide growth in the idea that language – especially regional linguistic differences from a hegemonic or imperial state language – could form the basis of a strong regional, or, latterly, national identity. In the case of Norway, the development of Landsmaal (later to be called Nynorsk) as a written language played a vital role in promoting a distinctive Norwegian national identity prior to achieving full independence in 1905 (Hoel 2009: 94-97).[2] Partly as a result of twentieth-century political and cultural debates around language maintenance or revival, Nynorsk has been set alongside Irish Gaelic in some valuable comparative studies (Nybø 2007; Haugland 1971). In this article, a comparison with Scotland – and the relationship between Scots and English (as opposed to Scottish Gaelic and English) – will contribute a different perspective to discussions of nineteenth-century nationalism in both Scotland and Norway (Watson 1992). The focus on Scots rather than Scottish Gaelic consciously removes some of the more contentious racial elements of nineteenth-century discourse in Britain, where Gaelic-speaking Celts were constructed as internal others to the vigorous, modernising Britons. This, in turn, focuses attention on class, culture and national identity formation within a constitutional union.[3]

Scots, albeit composed of different dialects, was the language of the majority, and even a source of national pride for some (Watson 1992: 98-9; Aitken 1990: 75; Trudgill 1997: 153; McClure 1984).[4] Yet it was not adopted in the same way in which Ivar Aasen would harness the rustic dialects of Norway. Despite the superficial similarities noted by Myhill, national 'questions' took different trajectories in Scotland and Norway during the nineteenth century. In this article, the comparison

is developed primarily as a means of exploring the Norwegian concept of Two Cultures, which emerged in the nineteenth century, and pondering why no similar cultural-linguistic schism emerged in Scotland. The foregrounding of Norway's peasant culture and language helped not only to win an internal battle for the *folk* against the social elite in Norway, it also helped to distinguish the nation from the external 'others' such as Denmark or Sweden. Even if, as has been suggested, the use of Scots in writing in the nineteenth century was employed to express *couthiness* (innate knowledge), *pawkiness* (native wit) and 'down to earth' ideologies, the language did not become a major component of an identity constructed to stress opposition to internal elites or external foreign influences until after World War I (Finlay 1994: 81-85).

Political Developments

Many key elements of Scottish national and civic society were well established before the union with England in the early eighteenth century. Indeed, the formation of Scotland as a 'nation' is often dated to the mid-eleventh century (Ferguson 1998: 19). This process of state-formation created persistent tension with England, but unlike Wales (which was absorbed by England in 1536-1543), Scotland retained its independence. When King James VI of Scotland succeeded Elizabeth Tudor to the English throne in 1603, there were some early plans for a full incorporating union, but despite James and his successors styling themselves as Kings of Great Britain, it was over a century before the creation of a British state (Ferguson 1977: 180-196).

The 1707 Acts of Union created the United Kingdom of Great Britain, based around a capital in London, overarching political structures and a single economic market, although Scotland retained its historic legal, educational and religious institutions. The Jacobite Rebellions of the eighteenth century were sustained partly by opposition to the union, and the final defeat of the Jacobites in 1746 paved the way for a more closely integrated state: communications and economic structures were developed with a unified Britain in mind; formerly hostile Highland guerrilla fighters and irregular soldiers were transformed into bulwarks

of the British Imperial army; and the clan-based society of Highland Scotland was emasculated through legislation and sanitised through romantic literature (Colley 1996).

A Danish-Norwegian regal union had already been forged in 1380, and in 1536 Norway was fully integrated into the Danish kingdom. In 1660 an absolutist monarchy was established. Nevertheless, from 1660 until the breakup of the union in 1814, Norway and Denmark existed, at least in a titular sense, as separate kingdoms. Despite these formalities, integration increased after 1660 and a uniform administrative apparatus was established (Albrechtsen et al 1997-1998).

This union was finally dissolved under the terms of the Treaty of Kiel in 1814, the loss of Norway forming a part of Denmark's punishment for its support of France during the Napoleonic Wars. After the declaration of a new constitution, and a brief period of independence in the summer of 1814, Norway was compelled to join a union with Sweden (Stråth 2005: 91-100). This union gave the Norwegians a considerable degree of internal autonomy. The two countries shared a king, and foreign affairs were largely administered by Sweden, but Norway retained its new constitution and Norwegians administered most internal affairs.

Meanwhile, it was generally accepted by the mid-nineteenth century that Scotland had received a huge boost to its economy and its self-image from participation in the British Empire. Religion played such a central role in Scotland's national identity that the Disruption – the schism in the established church in 1843 – demonstrates that while there was sufficient appetite for rebellion, such energies were expended in defending civic society institutions within the union and the empire. Any dilution of Scotland's distinctive role, it was thought, would deleteriously affect the empire and, by extension, the entire world (Newby 2012: 156).

A perception developed among some Scots, however, that their domestic affairs were being neglected by the parliament in London. This perception was an important stimulus in the formation of the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights (NAVSR), a body which demanded recognition of the distinctive Scottish contribution to Britain's greatness, but which had no trace of a separatist national

agenda (Punch 6 Dec. 1856; Morton 1999: 133-154). As the Irish Home Rule question developed as a serious threat to the union in the 1880s, Scots also began to demand a degree of autonomy over internal Scottish affairs. In 1885, partly as a reaction to this increasing pressure, a Scottish Office was established in Edinburgh, with a Scottish Secretary being part of a London government's Cabinet (Hanham 1965). The establishment of a Scottish Home Rule Association in 1886, despite its lack of a separatist philosophy, underlined the existence of a distinctive Scottish civil society and political life.

Unlike Scotland, nineteenth-century Norway had its own parliament. The class of civil servants inherited from the Dano-Norwegian union, however, dominated the government. Conflicts between the civil servants and the peasants gained strength in the 1830s over debates about local government, prompting the peasants to use the voting strength they had been granted by the 1814 constitution. In the second half of the century, an opposition to the civil servants and their regime was formed as an alliance between peasants and oppositional intellectuals. It seems clear that the very presence of the Storting helped to create a political culture that encouraged discussions of 'national' matters, including language. In 1884 the elitist 'civil servant state' fell and was replaced by a parliamentary system that ushered the newly formed Liberal Party (Venstre) into power (Seip 1974). The old elite founded the Conservative Party (Høyre), which soon broadened its electorate. In the years before 1905, when Norway gained full independence, the two parties competed for power, Høyre being generally more positive to the union than Venstre. By 1905, however, both parties agreed that the Norwegian-Swedish union needed to be dissolved.

In the Norwegian case, the nineteenth century was the period that established the foundations of the modern Norwegian state, whereas in the Scottish case there had already been a significant and sometimes traumatic alteration regarding state integration in the early eighteenth century. Despite the 'comparable situations' suggested by Myhill, this might imply two divergent trajectories. Norway's political autonomy was growing, whereas Scotland's – despite London's concessions in the 1880s – remained limited. (Myhill 2006: 85).

Region, Nation and Empire

The question of national, regional or ethnic identities was debated in all parts of Europe during the nineteenth century, especially in relation to exactly who, or what, groups of people, should make up a particular nation. Both Scotland and Norway developed their national identities within broadly unionist frameworks. It is important to consider that when examining the development of a national movement in Norway after 1814, for much of the nineteenth century Norwegians sought to renegotiate their position within the regal union, rather than seek outright independence. In Scotland, similarly, expressions of nationalism should be interpreted during the Victorian era as demands for equality with England within the union, and not as aspirations to a separate nation state.

The modernist school of nationalism theory has been very influential in both Scotland and Norway, particularly in relation to its contention that 'nations do not make states and nationalism but the other way round' (Hobsbawm 1992: 10). In Norway it contributed to a more critical and constructuralist perspective on the formation of national identity and provided a framework for studying the national awakening of the nineteenth century. In Scotland, the orthodox narrative had promoted the idea that the creation of the British nation-state in 1707 deprived Scotland of any meaningful national identity. In a context where one state was supposed to align with one nation, Scotland was considered a deviant case (Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1992; Breuilly 1982; Smith 2000).[5] The development of a British state after 1707, with Catholic Europe as an oppositional other and a vested interest in furthering the British Empire, led to the Scots' apparent submersion of a national identity (Colley 1996). In embracing the label of 'North Britons', however, it has been argued that Scots demonstrated much more self-confidence in their Imperial role than the English, who wished to present England and Britain as synonymous, and erase all other identities (Wormald 2006: 176). A serious divergence of perceptions between England and Scotland developed, with the London-based commentariat interpreting Scottish self-identity as a sub-national and repressed ethnic consciousness beneath a dominant British Unionist

nationality (Daiches 1964; Nairn 1977).

This orthodoxy has been countered by the notion of 'unionist-nationalism', which has gained widespread acceptance in the study of Scottish national identity. Challenging the existing focus on the British state's administrative structures, Morton claims that the Westminster parliament was marginalised during the mid-nineteenth century, and that urban Scotland was effectively governed by a self-confident local bourgeoisie, with Scots maintaining concentric identities at national, union and imperial levels (Morton 2008: 130). Scottish society was thus composed of an urban ruling elite on the one hand, and the 'lower' classes – both urban and rural workers – on the other. The Empire affected both groups, and the values associated even with the lower classes were seen as valuable, forming a vital part of the Scottish autostereotype. It was, however, the middle- and upper classes that promoted this Scottish identity within a Unionist-Imperial framework.

The concept of unionist-nationalism after 1814 does not seem as relevant to Norwegian affairs as Scottish, at least in the political arena. Most elements of Norwegian political society agreed on limiting Swedish influence to a minimum, and the union was considered more bi-polar than concentric. A general sense of *loyalty* to the king, the union's ruler, probably existed, but there is scant evidence of genuine popular *enthusiasm* for the union as such. This said, the idea of Scandinavism gained ground in all the Scandinavian countries around 1850, emphasising the need for closer cooperation between them. Also many Norwegians, not least the students, were influenced by such ideas, but at the same time Scandinavism in Norway was viewed with scepticism, the fear being that the Norwegians would be exploited by the expansionist designs of Sweden and Denmark (Hemstad 2004).

The Scots had far higher stakes in, and more to gain from, their union than the Norwegians had from theirs – the major difference being the opportunities afforded by the British Empire. The term 'unionist-nationalist' would arguably be more appropriate in discussions of Norway's union with Denmark before 1814, although it is contentious whether identity during that era can properly be described as 'nationalist'. Still, numerous examples can be found of Norwegians struggling with concentric loyalties in the years before 1814 (Storsveen

1997; Lunden 1992; Burgess & Hyvik 2004). Moreover, Andersen and Neumann have recently argued that Norway formed an imperial 'semi-core', emphasising the political and cultural proximity to Copenhagen (Andersen 2014; Andersen & Neumann 2015).[6] Less apparent, in comparison with the Scottish case, is evidence that Norwegians – individually or as a nation – felt that they were playing a leading role in the operation of the Danish Empire.

If the union with Sweden can be considered bi-polar, and the former political union with Denmark concentric, it can be argued that in regard to cultural relations with Denmark concentric elements persisted after 1814. The Norwegian elite also kept its close ties to Denmark and Danish culture and towards the end of the nineteenth century it was argued from nationalist circles that Norway had to leave both unions – meaning the political union with Sweden and the cultural union with Denmark (Klippenberg 1998).

The extent to which a Norwegian national identity existed before 1814 has long been debated among historians, and this has often been a politicised debate about the interpretation of the past (Dahl 1990). The 1990s saw a new wave of research inspired by modernist and ethno-symbolist theory, much of which was connected to the multidisciplinary project 'Norwegian National Identity in the Nineteenth Century' (Sørensen 1998; Sørensen 2001; Neumann 2000). Øystein Sørensen, the project leader, located fourteen nation-building projects, each with its own characteristics. One of these projects was national romanticism, which was at its height in the 1840s and 1850s. It placed culture at the centre of defining and building a unique Norwegian identity. It is during this period that language became a central issue in Norwegian national and cultural discourse (Sørensen 1998: 28-30; Hyvik 2010; Falnes 1933).

Initially, the Norwegian elite supported national romanticism, although they attempted to justify the centrality of peasant identity by refining it according to concepts of higher culture. However, as Norwegian culture gradually became used as an argument against the political and cultural domination of the elite and civil servants, these groups retrenched in order to safeguard their own dominant position, finding protection in the concepts of *bildung*, traditional higher

culture, and a conservative version of Scandinavism (Seip 1974: I, 106-9). The traditional elite saw themselves as protectors of modernization and as leading Norway along the path of European modernity. In the period from around 1860 to 1884, both cultural and political ideals of popular empowerment were used in an increasingly vociferous opposition to the elite (Haugland 1971; Hyvik 2010; Stråth 2012). The concept of Two Cultures became the fulcrum of this argument on the cultural and national level (Hyvik 2016: 7-18). The argument resisted and increasingly attacked the cultural 'concentric' loyalty of the old elite to the old 'high' culture, and their 'foreignness' (that is, links to Denmark). In its place the opponents put the national, Norwegian culture as the basis of the Norwegian nation.

Language and National Identity in Scotland

In all discussions of Scottish national identity in the nineteenth century, contemporaries – in England and in Scotland, and among the Scottish diaspora in the British Empire – accepted that there was a distinctive Scottish vernacular, although it certainly suffered in the eighteenth century as a result of Enlightenment attitudes that suggested it was merely a corrupt form of 'Standard' English (Dossena 2005). In the context of unionist-nationalism in Scotland, the linguistic issue is more complex than in those territories basing their separate national identity on a shared language.

The Scottish form of Gaelic, which had been prevalent in the early middle-ages, had been in retreat for some time, and was largely restricted by the nineteenth century to the western Highlands and Islands and some migrant Gaelic-speaking communities in urban areas (Withers 1998: 199-229). Race and language were often equated, and the Highland / Lowland split within Scotland became ever more pronounced. The Highlanders were characterised, like the Irish, as lazy and unimprovable. The Lowlanders were constructed as typical Scots – hardworking and egalitarian – and their role in building the Empire was often attributed (as with Britain in general) to their supposed Viking ancestry (Newby 2013). The Gaelic language became linked with the memory of Jacobitism, and was simultaneously extirpated and

romanticised by the ruling or landed classes.

It can be argued that the position of Scots as a language was always tied closely to Scotland's constitutional status and, indeed, a sense of identity that was either expressed by Scots themselves or imposed from outside (Horsbroch 1999). From being the main government language until the beginning of the seventeenth century, Scots retained some currency until 1707, but was replaced by English among the middle- and upper classes. Nevertheless, McClure's argument that the 'rustic, homely, and jocular tone' of Scots Vernacular writing by the nineteenth century had effectively demoted it to the status of 'Halbsprache' requires some consideration (McClure 1981: 91). The work of Heinz Kloss, from which McClure derives the term, demonstrates how *dialectalisation* can lead to the development of an *Ausbaudialekt*, a dialect which is in some ways comparable in terms of its use to that of a *Vollsprache* (hence the term *Halbsprache*, which Kloss himself criticised for having too many negative connotations), with the caveat that it tends not to be used in official material or in high culture settings (Kloss 1978). In this it is very different from a *Normaldialekt*. In addition, Kloss contends that the term *kin tongue* could be used to refer to those situations where the dialectalised language is a close relative of the state language, with comprehensibility between one and the other being borderline possible, especially when speakers of the disparaged variety have gained some competence in the prestige variety, examples of which include Low German and Occitan (Kloss 1984: 73-77). It should be noted that Kloss intended his model to be dynamic. Just as an *Ausbausprache*, a language which is fully developed to be used in official, scientific and literary circles can become, in an era of mass literacy, an *Ausbaudialekt* (and, eventually, sometimes, a *Normaldialekt*), through the application of social, political and economic forces, an *Ausbaudialekt* can become an *Ausbausprache*. Nevertheless, the ongoing process of dialectalisation during this period is highly striking for Scots, probably as part of the Augustan preoccupation with propriety and appropriateness, thrown into contrast by the beginnings of the industrial revolution and the modern class system and class struggle.

In eighteenth-century Scotland, there had been an acceleration of cultural anglicisation, prompted in part by the constitutional assimilation after 1707, and the ideas of the Scottish Enlightenment. As a part of this integration, many Scots were increasingly inclined to anglicise their speech and manners more generally. To begin with, those were largely from an upper-middle-class background, although the linguistic transfer quickly had knock-on effects for members of the urban lower-middle classes. In both cases this transfer was exacerbated by high literacy levels in Standard English (and Standard English alone), a variety that, from the perspective of those classes, had particular associations with authority as representing the revealed word of God. David Hume's anonymously authored pamphlet on 'Scotticisms', written in 1752, was typical of the Enlightenment spirit, and was produced as a means of rectifying supposed errors in the speech and writing of Scottish people (Anon. [Hume] 1752; Jones 1997: 269). Although this is in some regards a local manifestation of a European attitude which purported to embrace modernity, the drive towards a standard linguistic form of English also helped to underpin a British creation myth – vital in the context of a relatively young nation – which promoted the idea of a common linguistic heritage for all of its component parts (Manning 2007: 51). The drive to erase 'provincial errors' within Britain was not limited to Scotland. In seeking to eliminate 'vulgar English, Scots and Irish', proponents hoped to develop a unified British identity, but may also have contributed to a class-focussed local version of 'Two Cultures' ([Anon.] 1826).

Despite attempts from the urban elites, particularly in Edinburgh, to eliminate 'vulgar Scotticisms', Scots remained the everyday language of people in all parts of non-Gaelic-speaking Scotland during the nineteenth century. In the late 1790s, ministers of the Established Church (Church of Scotland) in all parts of the country, sometimes replaced by schoolmasters or other authority figures, were asked to compile statistical information about their parishes and parishioners. Forms of Scots were in widespread use, recorded variously as 'broad Buchan', 'dialect… peculiar to North Britain', 'Scotch dialect', 'provincial dialect', and so on. (Sinclair 1973-1983: XII, 580; XIII, 566; III, 401). There were also regular judgements as to the place of such speech in

everyday life, rarely deviating from the idea that such rough linguistic practices required correction in the context of British integration and Imperial expansion (Sinclair 1973-1983: II, 114; IX, 226). The idea that forms of Scots could be relatively easily 'improved' by exposure to the higher English culture was a recurring theme in the ministers' writing, and more generally in the context of the Scottish Enlightenment (Sinclair 1973-1983: XVI, 592; XI, 370).

At times these views are more nuanced, as with the report from Bendochy, Perthshire, which noted the Greek, Latin or French provenance of some Scots words, and added that:

> The celebrated author of the Wealth of Nations observes, that people who live in the country have more intelligence than those in towns. Farming does not require many words, but much reflection and observation, and great exertion and industry. People that live in retirement are not so expert in their use of words as they that live in society are; but their tongues are better indexes of their hearts. They do not need to live on little traffic, which is a great enemy to truth and morals; and one not always a match for those arts of trade, by which towns-people sometimes take them in. (Sinclair 1973-1983: XII; 74-75)

Here many of the concerns of the age – Rousseau's concept of 'nature' and the economics of Adam Smith, for example – are mixed with, normally faulty, antiquarian analyses of language origin. It would have to be recognised, however, that Scots is validated not through its own occurrence, but only in so far as it relates to scholarly concerns. At any event it represents the association of Scots with past time; it is given little modern relevance.[7] And yet, the minister of Keithhall, twenty-five kilometres from Aberdeen, tacitly acknowledged that the Scots varieties formed a component of national identity, possibly even an element of identity which could be of some value, and foreshadowed some of the ideas of Professor John Stuart Blackie in the later nineteenth century: 'there is not a provincial dialect, in Britain, better understood on the Royal Exchange of London, than that of Aberdeenshire, if it is to be used without any affectation.' (Sinclair 1973-1983: II, 543).

By 1801, it seemed that 'progress' towards Standard English was being made rather swiftly, but despite these attempts at refinement, Scottish language remained distinctive (Edinburgh Magazine, Mar. 1801: 189; Didier 1822: 41). Although 1808 has been seen as a landmark date – marking the publication of a Scots Language dictionary by Jamieson – the language was being treated as much as a regional / historical curiosity as a living viable language, and was certainly not being considered as a possible platform on which to build a national agitation (Jamieson 1808: I, xix-lix). Indeed, Jamieson himself considered Scots as 'merely a corrupt dialect of English or Anglo-Saxon' until persuaded of its antiquarian value by the renowned Icelandic scholar, Grímur Thorkelin (Dossena 2003: 392). As the century progressed, theories about the origins of Scots fell into two broad camps, again often linked closely to broader debates over Scotland's status as a nation. Scots was most often dismissed as having entered Scotland through England, meaning it was simply a regional accent; on the other hand, it could be argued that Scots and English both arrived separately from the northern European mainland, and that both therefore had equal historical prestige.

Language and National Identity in Norway

Contemporaneously with these events, similar antiquarian, literary and semantic scholarship was taking place across the North Sea. The Old Norse language had been lost in Norway by the end of the sixteenth century, replaced by Danish as the common written language. Attitudes towards language standardization in Denmark-Norway in the eighteenth century were mostly conservative, focusing on the authority of classical literature in Danish and / or the higher, spoken language of the elite (Hyvik 2010: 71-74). It was, as with the case of Scots, common to deprecate the dialects as 'bastardised forms of standard Danish', (Skautrup 1953) and Norwegian linguistic elements were often considered, as the linguist Jacob Baden claimed in 1785, to be mere 'provincial errors' (Hyvik 2010: 72). The eighteenth century, however, brought a growing intellectual interest in dialects. Several dialect dictionaries were published on a regional basis. Most of those

who took part in this project were intellectuals, civil servants and in particular priests, who were strongly influenced by Enlightenment ideas and a general interest in topographic studies. Far from being perceived as a threat to the state, such activities were encouraged by the authorities in Copenhagen (Hyvik 2010: 106-107).

While Danish was the standard literate language in Norway, the dialect dictionaries also demonstrated an understanding of a Norwegian vernacular. This was most clearly expressed by Laurents Hallager in his *Norsk Ordsamling* (Collection of Norwegian Words) from 1802, which was an ambitious attempt to make a dialect dictionary for the whole of Norway, half a century before Aasen. Hallager argued linguistic elements of Norwegian dialects were unique compared to Danish and Swedish. He concluded that the Norwegian 'Bondemaal' (peasant language) had 'ikkun har manglet Dyrking ved Skrivter, for at blive et selvstændigt Sprog ligesaa vel som hine' (Hallager 2004: 34) (only lacked the nurture by writing, to become an independent language, as well as the others).

While some of the interest in the dialects can be classed as antiquarianism, in several cases it also contained a more practical and even patriotic element. Hallager, for example, stressed that knowledge of the dialects would strengthen the common written language as this would 'berige og fulstændiggjøre' (enrich and complete) it (Hallager 2004: 34). This was not a separatist programme, but nevertheless it placed great emphasis on Norway's national distinctiveness: Norwegian should become more important and visible, without superseding the common written language of Denmark-Norway. Similar ideas underpinned the inclusion of Norwegian words in the Royal Danish Society of Science dictionary, a tendency that became stronger in the years 1800-1814, than it had been when the first volume was published in 1793 (Hyvik 2010: 78-83, 154-156).

The end of the union with Denmark changed the parameters of intellectual thinking, and consequently ideas about linguistic development in Norway. Shortly after the breakup of the union, the idea was expressed that future linguistic development in Norway should follow an independent course. The more common position, however, was to change the name of the language, without actually changing

the linguistic standardisation (Sørensen 1997). The main argument was that Norway had as much right to the common written language as Denmark, as Norwegians for centuries had been integrated into, and participated in, the development of the language during the Dano-Norwegian union (Hyvik 2012b). In the 1830s, however, this position was challenged from two sides. Some – like the famous writer Henrik Wergeland – started a more serious attempt to reform the written language in a Norwegian direction, with a focus on orthographic changes. The other challenge came from a romanticist view that languages were in essence different and should not be mixed. The main advocate of this view was the historian Peter Andreas Munch, who in 1832 stated that it is better to write 'reent end fordærvet Dansk, der dog aldrig bliver norsk' (Munch 1970: 87) (pure than corrupted Danish, which never will become Norwegian).[8]

Ivar Aasen and the Language Struggle in Norway

Ivar Aasen (1813-1896) was born in Ørsta, Sunnmøre in the Western part of Norway. He was an autodidact, having received only the limited public school education of the day. His intellectual talent and skills were, however, considerable. He soon developed an interest in language, and in 1842 he received a scholarship from The Royal Norwegian Society of Science to study the Norwegian dialects. In 1848 he published his *Det norske Folkesprogs Grammatikk* (Grammar of the Norwegian Vernacular), which was followed by *Ordbog over det norske Folkesprog* (Dictionary of the Norwegian Vernacular) in 1850. In 1853 he published *Prøver af Landsmaalet i Norge* (Examples of the Vernacular in Norway) demonstrating how the new language could be used in written form. Aasen's works on the Norwegian language received huge acclaim, not least within the academic environment in Christiania, and in 1851 he received a scholarship from the Norwegian Parliament that was renewed for the rest of his life. However, it was not until 1858, in a spirited discussion following Aasmund Vinje's publication of the first newspaper in Nynorsk, *Dølen*, that Aasen openly stated his true intention of creating a written language for common use.[9] He continued developing Landsmaal until his death in 1896.

As noted above, the cultural strength of the Dano-Norwegian union persisted even after its demise. The civil servants that became the leaders of the Norwegian state had been educated in Denmark (Norway's first university was established only in 1811), had attained their positions prior to 1814, moved easily in Danish social circles, and many had Danish – or German – names and family roots. Their ideal of government and culture stemmed largely from their background in the old regime, and they used the written language of the union, Danish (Schnitler 1911). While the political union had ended in 1814, cultural ties endured, which set the context for both the theory of Two Cultures and Aasen's project for language revival based on the vernacular. The theory of Two Cultures had roots in the differences between estates and classes from the eighteenth century. It considered the Norwegian elite to be foreign ('European', or 'Danish'), representing a different, elite culture, and lacking the legitimacy of the original Norwegian people. On the other side were the people, mainly the peasant population, who were considered representatives of the national roots of the people and its culture. The two cultures were distinctive and fundamentally separated by a schism (*kløft*) in Norwegian society (Hyvik 2016).

In *Varsko* (1846), Ludvig Kristensen Daa described two distinct cultures in the Norwegian countryside, the peasants on one side and the elite on the other, the former living in 'ægte norsk' (original Norwegian) ways and latter in 'halv udenlands' (half-foreign). However, Daa believed that the two could be integrated, the peasants contributing national attitudes and practical skills, and the elite culture contributing towards the common good (Daa 1846). Some years later in 1857, Ole Vig, a teacher and popular agitator, also noted the existence of a schism in Norwegian society (Sørensen 2001: 345). Just as the supposed values of the Lowland peasantry were a vital element in the maintenance of the Scottish stereotype, Daa was proactive in attempting to have similar Norwegian peasant values accepted as a component of national identity.

From the 1860s the idea of Two Cultures gained strength. The conflict was more about culture – and national identity understood in terms of culture – than ethnicity and race. There was always an opening for national integration between the two cultures, but as Ivar

Aasen claimed, it had to be the elite that integrated into the original nation, and not the other way around (Hyvik 2010: 300).

Aasen became one of the most vocal proponents of the Two Cultures theory. He saw his linguistic project in the light of the cultural emancipation of the Norwegian people, who mostly were peasants living in the countryside. In *Minningar fraa Maalstriden um hausten 1858* (Recollections from the Language debate of Autumn 1858), printed in *Dølen* in 1859, Aasen wrote:

> The farmers make up the largest part of that nation, and when it has been determined that the farmers are the country's original people and that their language is the country's original language, the proper or national language has thereby also been determined; it is that which belongs to the country and the people. (Aasen 1999)

A central point in Aasen's writings at the time was that the civil servants were foreign, while the peasants were national. Aasen argued for the priority of the national culture and language over an elite culture and language that was considered 'foreign'. By propelling their own language into literate (and literary) use, he challenged the hegemony of the old elite and their culture and language. The struggle to conquer the language and conquer the culture (or nation) therefore went hand in hand.[10]

In the 1860s the Two Cultures issue entered the debates of the student association in Christiania. A new generation of activists now developed, reinforcing Two Cultures discourse as well as Aasen's language project. Rather than being purely a linguistic issue, this was a programme for the future of Norway, and for the cultural emancipation of the Norwegian peasantry (Haugland 1971: 198; Hyvik 2010: 374). In turn it impinged on the political field. As Kjell Haugland has pointed out, it is difficult in this period to differentiate strictly between cultural and political nationalism in Norway (Haugland 1980: 21).

Throughout the century the theory of Two Cultures both reflected and prompted political and cultural debates. Most of the time it was closely linked to progress for the New Norwegian language as

a functioning national standardised language. In his book, *Den ny-norske Sprog- og Nationalitetsbevægelse* (The Nynorsk Language and Nationality Movement), published in 1877, Arne Garborg claimed that the struggle was not between two cultures but two nations. Aasen had in several ways preceded Garborg's argument, but it was developed by Garborg and his book became an important ideological work in the Nynorsk Movement (Garborg 1877; Neumann 2001).

It is worth noticing that this struggle played on a divide between the urban and rural areas of Norway. The Nynorsk movement got most of its supporters from the southern, western, and north-western coastal areas and from the inland of the country, while the traditional elite held its position in the towns. However, in principle, both the language divide and the Two Cultures schism – in particular from its supporters' position – were considered of national importance for the whole of Norway. These cultural divides seem less fundamental than the ones that existed between Highlanders and Lowlanders in Scotland, which, while geographically circumscribed, were much more based on ideas of race and ethnicity and the use of ethnically discrete language varieties.[11] In Norway ideas of race had been a part of the historians P.A. Munch and Rudolf Keyser's so-called immigration theory from the 1830s. The theory attempted to distinguish the Norwegian population from the other Nordic peoples, but was abandoned in the 1860s. Towards 1900 race again became a point of interest, as some scientists argued that the Norwegian population was divided into two races, *kortskaller* in the western part and *langskaller* in the eastern parts (Kyllingstad 2004). The race issue around 1900, however, was influenced by international anthropological race-theory and did not use the theory of Two Cultures in its arguments. Whereas the former concentrated on alleged regional racial differences between ordinary Norwegians, the latter focussed on the divide between a foreign elite and a national popular culture.

The elite's attempts to contain or harness the implications of Aasen's work also suggest that a socio-political language revival in Norway was not inevitable. In the years after 1814, civil servants constantly struggled to reconcile the liberal ideals of the constitution with their own political and cultural hegemony. As they were challenged from

below, their answer was to withdraw, defending their hegemony and prompting accusations of undermining the democratic ideals of the 1814 Constitution (Karlsrud 1970: 70-74; Nielsen 1886: 1). Ideas which had developed during the Enlightenment, promoted the study of dialects and vernacular as part of a topographic tradition, but on the other hand, they also equated an adherence to regional vernacular as an anti-modern, irrational tendency that could challenge the very basis of state formation (Oakes 2001: 92-93). When Aasen's intentions became clear in the 1850s the elite turned away from him and his project. As Aasen's former supporter Peter Andreas Munch stated in 1853, the introduction of an 'virkelig fællesnorsk Skriftsprog' (real Norwegian common written language) would imply that the nation had degenerated to the level of culture in which 'Almuen i vore meest afsides Bygder befiner sig' (commoners in our most remote countryside exist) and deviate from 'den fælles-europæiske Udviklingsgang' (the common European path of development) (Knudsen 1923, 101-102).

Aasen's project was also challenged from another side. Starting in the 1840s Knud Knudsen had developed his project for linguistic reform of the Dano-Norwegian language based on the so-called 'cultivated speech' of the elite and in the cities. For some time many saw Knudsen's and Aasen's ideas as cogs in a larger reform movement. Conflict between their supporters grew, however, and in particular Aasen's young followers in the 1860s attacked Knudsen, who in his 1867 book *Det norske målstræv* (The Norwegian Language Struggle) made the distinctions clear. Here he also argued against the theory of Two Cultures and wrote that it was 'almuen og byfolket *tilsammen*, som utgør det norske folk. *Derfor bør målstrævet ta hensyn til begges vel'* (Knudsen 1867: 235) (commoners and inhabitants of the cities *together* that make the Norwegian people. Therefore the language struggle must take the welfare of both into consideration).

Even though Nynorsk never became Norway's main language, it has had a considerable influence on Norwegian politics. There were close ties between the political liberal movement (from 1884 the Liberal Party, Venstre), and the movement in support of Nynorsk. A year after the Venstre government came to power in 1884, it gave Nynorsk official status alongside the traditional written language. This

was followed up by the introduction of Nynorsk in schools in 1892. As an ideological point of reference, forming a narrative of the historical conflict between peasants and elite and the peasants' gradual rise to power, the theory of Two Cultures was also present in the agitation from the opposition in the struggle against the conservative regime.[12] This effort was countered from the conservative side, which claimed that the theory had no roots in reality.

The future seemed promising for Nynorsk advocates in late nineteenth century Norway. But not least in the cities the traditional language held firm (Hoel, 2011), and even though the Nynorsk movement had some momentum early in the twentieth century, bokmaal later strengthened its position, and gained the upper hand.[13] In short, there was no linguistic, Nynorsk, revolution. From the 1917 until the 1960s, the thought of merging the two Norwegian written languages into one (samnorsk) also had considerable support. Gradually however, the situation entered deadlock, Bokmål being the majority and Nynorsk being the minority written language, while the idea of samnorsk was marginalized.

Nynorsk served its purpose as a rallying point for the movement for popular empowerment on the cultural level, but as it became successful in placing itself in the centre of national discourse, it also became controversial and met resistance. It gained strength from the rise of national romanticism and nationalism, but it never reached a hegemonic position inside the national movement.

Scotland and the Scots Language Question in the Nineteenth Century:

In contrasting the case of Nynorsk with that of Scots it is essential to examine the role of individuals in gathering, organising and promoting the Scots dialects, and to ask why there was no nineteenth-century Scottish equivalent of Ivar Aasen. While works by men such as Aasen and Garborg became increasingly influential in the development of nationhood in Norway, the Scots language neither prompted a class-based assertion of a cultural divide, nor bolstered separatist nationalism.

The drive towards spoken linguistic conformity had continued apace, especially from urban centres, in the hope that the adoption of 'the English of England' would complete Scotland's transformation towards modernity (Kay 1993: 112). It is clear that despite the interest in a sanitised form of tartan Highland identity, and even a renewed literary interest in Gaelic, the urban middle-classes of Edinburgh were perceived as accelerating the process of anglicisation in Scotland. And yet, the place of Scots language in everyday national life was not reduced to any great extent.

In the last quarter of the eighteenth century, moreover, an attempt to use Scots in literature – in particular, poetry – had made itself felt in Scotland and, eventually, throughout the English-speaking world: the vernacular revival. This is, of course, a convenient name: the actual writers involved, at least until the time of Burns, influenced each other but did not necessarily think of themselves as a 'school'. Nevertheless, certain traits were regularly apparent in the output. Although sometimes urban-based, its proponents tended to take a view of a rural everyman as a central truth-bringer; since many of its best products were either comical or satirical, wit was particularly prized. Most saliently, perhaps, most of its output was constructed in such a way that Scottish pronunciations were often represented with the use of an apostrophe or other typographical devices, rather than the historical orthography (which some at least knew through the reading of Scottish medieval and renaissance literature). This new style of representation had the advantage of helping non-Scots speaking readers to make connections with English cognates; this also had the side effect, however, of making Scots look like deviant English.

The movement (at least in cultural and historical terms) had its most celebrated figurehead in the person of Robert Burns. Although genuinely coming from a relatively humble background and having only limited formal education, he was well read and, despite having only limited sucess with any career he attempted, had considerable experience at most levels of rural and urban life throughout central and southern Scotland. He was a man of great subtlety, and understood (although he may not have liked it) that developing the image of an 'unlettered ploughboy' would sell well among the middle classes of the

great towns and cities (who were, ironically, themselves beginning to abandon the national vernacular, as noted above).

While not in any way detracting from Burns' considerable ability as a poet, there can be little doubt that his projected image and origin in agricultural life caught the beginning of what could be seen as a presiding zeitgeist. As central Scotland switched to heavy industrialisation in this period, the proletarianisation of the formerly 'independent' peasantry, the fear of 'King Mob' and the denigration of the newly developing urban vernaculars led to the crystallisation in the minds of many middle class opinion formers that the loss of the old, rural, folkways was regrettable. What survived of them – such as the 'natural genius' they perceived in Burns – was to be celebrated and, indeed, feted. Many of Burns' followers continued and developed this tradition, bringing with it a great deal of sentimentality. Burns himself could be a sentimentalist, as can be seen in his celebrated 'To a Mouse', but this tendency was normally vitiated by his unflinching portrayal of the realities of rural poverty. The literary users of Scots in the nineteenth century were not as accurate, often because their experience of Scottish rural life was primarily seen through the preconceptions, perceptions (and prejudices, perhaps) of middle class observers. Even if this was not the case, however, they certainly had an awareness of what sold. By the end of the century this sentimental focus had led to the saccharine sensibilities of the *kailyard* school, where comic characters, the 'worthies' of a village or small town, were given licence to speak in a *couthy* or *pawky* way to their 'betters'.

Similar ideas about the use of the vernacular were also abroad in non-fiction texts, such as the second *Statistical Account of Scotland*. In Monkland, Lanarkshire, it was noted that 'the true Lowlanders in this district speak with great plainness the patois of the country, but they have a few expressions scarcely intelligible to their neighbours.' (Sinclair 1834-1845; VII: 655-656) In various other instances, the observer commented with apparent warmth at the charming turns of phrase of heard in the parish. (Sinclair 1834-1845; V: 679, V: 525, IV, 87). Many of these comments are intended to be humorous, albeit regularly in a rather condescending way (although witticisms of this sort are still recounted by Scots speakers either about their neighbours

or, indeed, themselves). But inherent in the often positive portrayal of the peasantry is an ideologically honed belief in their inherent simplicity, natural common sense and conservatism. At its heart is the use of Scots, in a sense not dissimilar to (although ironically the opposite of) attitudes expressed in the previous century. In a Scotland whose population was rapidly being urbanised, commentators of this sort painted Scots into a rural and idealised corner.

As the Church of Scotland ministers (and other qualified commentators) compiled their reports for the second *Statistical Account*, their collective perception was that English had 'made progress', and that therefore Scots was gradually being replaced by a form considered more acceptable (Sinclair 1834-1845; VIII: 365). And yet, in the sense of being a national language, and one which could form the basis of a national movement, or at least a strong component of national identity, it is clear that Scots vernacular retained a great deal of its distinctiveness. It could also help to define the cultural and national boundaries between England and Scotland. The minister of Kelso, in the Scottish Borders, emphasised, and contextualised, this phenomenon in very clear terms in the 1840s:

> In truth, in all that respects language, the natives of this district [Kelso] may be said to be *Scotorum Scotissimi*. Though at the distance of only five miles from England, they speak the Scottish tongue in the most Doric of its forms; nor does there appear to be any prospect of a speedy improvement in this particular. It would indeed seem, that, in proportion as the two countries approach their respective confines, the Scotch and Anglian tongues, instead of gradually losing each its distinctive character so as, at the point of junction, to interblend and coalesce in a common dialect, assume each its harshest and most intractable form; as if for the purpose of keeping their respective *marches* clear and distinct. (Sinclair 1834-1845; III: 323)

Several prominent advocates of Scots did emerge in the nineteenth century. One possible candidate for the mantle of a Scots Aasen might be Robert Nicoll, who was born in January 1813, only a few months

after Aasen, to a poor rural family in Perthshire. (Sinclair 1834-1845; X: 432). One of Nicoll's early biographers rhapsodised that 'he was one of the many illustrious Scotchmen who have risen to adorn the lot of toil, and reflect honour on the class from which they have sprung – the laborious, hard-working peasantry of their land.' (Smiles 1861: 399). It can again be noted that, in respect of the Scottish peasantry, the Scots-speaking Lowlanders were valued far more than the Gaelic-speaking Highlanders, and that values such as hard work and practicality – which formed the bedrock of the Scottish autostereotype – were embodied in the peasant society from which Nicoll emerged. Like Aasen, Nicoll was an autodidact, encouraged to read by his mother. He eventually left the countryside to work in Perth. In the political excitement which surrounded the extension of the male franchise in 1832, Nicoll seems to have flourished in the urban clubs and debating societies, and established a circulating library in Dundee. However, it was as a politically active journalist, and as a poet, that Nicoll made his name during a short life, which ended, aged 23, in 1837.

Nicoll's poetry, written in Scots and 'springing so directly from the mother-bosom of Scotland', came to public attention while he was relatively young, and in time he earned the nickname of the 'Second Burns' (Simmons 2007: 356). Although the contemporary enthusiasm for Walter Scott no doubt allowed Scottish literature to receive a fair hearing in broad literary circles, Nicoll's writing seemed to indicate that there was more to Scots than simply a glimpse into a bygone age. His political activity – he was associated with the Chartist movement and helped to found the radical *Leeds Times* in the 1830s – demonstrates that his interests lay more in class issues than overt nationalism, but it is not inconceivable that strands of labour, language and land agitations could have been intertwined as they did, more concertedly, in the 1880s (Newby 2007: 85-116). It is important to remember that for Aasen language revival represented a social class struggle on behalf of the peasant population – as seen in his Two Cultures theory – and nationalism (Walton 1991: 11). It is impossible to speculate about the extent to which language would have played a role in Nicoll's future writings and activism, and there is no evidence to suggest he had the energy or desire to use language in the same manner as Aasen, but

Nicoll's brief life and career indicated at least that it was possible to promote Scots as a living and relevant language.

Another close contemporary of Aasen who might have assumed a similar mantle as a linguistic father for the Scottish nation, was the University of Edinburgh's colourful Professor of Greek, John Stuart Blackie (1809-1895) (Wallace 2006). The two men were by no means comparable in terms of family background or education – Blackie's middle-class, university-educated early life contrasting considerably with Aasen – but both were able to approach the issue of language from scientific and cultural perspectives, and were prepared to follow European currents in aligning language with national identity. Although Blackie is perhaps best known for his advocacy of the Gaelic language, and for supporting the struggle for crofters' rights, he was also convinced of the importance of Scots as an element of national identity (Newby 2010: 28). Blackie operated very much within a unionist-nationalist paradigm, a member of the urban middle-class striving to ensure that Scotland's contribution to the union and the Empire was sufficiently celebrated, and highlighting the distinctive 'Scotch tongue' was an important part of this. His classical background informed his opinions – he enthusiastically supported the value of Scots 'Doric' by highlighting the 'musical' qualities of the Greek dialect to which it alluded (Punch 18 Jan. 1862). The distinctive language, or languages, of the Scots, argued Blackie, were a part of the nation's essence, and contributed to the development and maintenance of the Empire no less than other 'Scotch' qualities, like hard work, humour, egalitarianism and an emphasis on practical education (Leeds Mercury 19 Feb. 1890). Despite the minimal threat to Scotland's constitutional status posed by 'nationalists' of Blackie's type, he was vilified by the London press as seeking to return Scotland to its pre-1707 dark ages (e.g. Punch 6 Dec. 1856).

Blackie was also prepared to engage in a Two Cultures discourse in the sense that he defied contemporary attitudes that relegated Scotland's 'native languages' to a subservient position to 'Standard English' (Aberdeen Journal 7 Nov. 1864). Therefore, it is possible to identify two cultures in Scottish nationalism, and furthermore it can be argued that Scots could have led to a stronger basis for a truly national

language than Gaelic, in the sense of a greater geographical spread (including, of course, the Empire). The context in which Blackie was promoting Scots and Gaelic was very much the post-1850s growth in quasi-nationalist movements in Scotland, such as the NAVSR, which sought not separation from England, or an end to the union, but a clear recognition of the place and distinctive contribution of Scotland and Scots within the union, and, more widely, the British Empire (Scotsman 6 Jul. 1860). Interest in the Scots language was given further impetus by the widespread commemoration of the centenary of Robert Burns' birth, in January 1859 (John Bull and Britannia 29 Jan. 1859). In many cases, however, the London press dismissed this as sentimental nationalism, with no practical application to the modern world, and simply bracketed it with the increased Scottish interest in national history and national heroes, such as Wallace and Bruce. For the English, all of these cultural phenomena seemed to indicate that Scotland was 'going backwards' (Aberdeen Journal 10 Dec. 1856).

Conclusion

It is important to acknowledge the ability of determined individuals, or small groups, to shape their nation's history and society. Hugh MacDiarmid in the 1920s complained that, 'the development of the Landsmaal movement in Norway – as of the Provençal movement – was coterie work. No coterie of sufficient calibre has yet emerged in Scotland' (Corbett 1999: 131). There were deeper reasons than mere serendipity, however, as to why Scotland did not produce an 'Aasen' figure in the nineteenth century. Both Scotland and Norway had the potential in the nineteenth century to develop vernacular dialects as a part of their respective national identities, but these languages were employed in different ways.

The cultural relationship in the nineteenth century between Nynorsk and the standard written language ('Danish') in Norway are comparable with the relationship between 'standard' English and varieties of Scots in Scotland. Unlike attitudes towards the Gaelic speakers, however, the equation of dialects of Scots with low culture did not seem to indicate that those who used such dialects were irredeemably unimprovable,

largely because of the thrifty peasant stereotype associated with it. Indeed, the north-east and south-west of the country, possibly the two areas most strongly identified with Scots, were also areas of relatively rich farmland, and demonstrably able to participate in, or even drive, the agricultural improvements which formed another element of the Scottish Enlightenment. The fact that Scots and English are very near relatives, that the former had become *dialectalised* under the latter and that many monolingual speakers perceived Scots as a 'deviant' form of their own language must have acted as both an advantage and disadvantage in relation to the survival of Scots and the social and cultural prestige of its speakers. This paradox would have become particularly marked as discrete urban varieties of Scots developed in the course of the nineteenth century.

In Norway, Nynorsk's development contributed to a movement that successfully framed a national identity oppositional to Danish or Swedish culture, and went on to achieve political independence from the Swedish monarchy. The struggle for Nynorsk and adoption of the Two Cultures theory formed a cultural foundation for the process leading up to the introduction of a parliamentarian system and particularly the formation of Venstre. The absence of an equivalent to the Storting clearly militated against a similar development in Scotland. In Scotland, the linguistic elements did contribute towards maintaining a distinctive identity, but firmly within a unionist framework. The relationship of Scots to class and national interests highlights the difficulties in building a national programme within Scotland, but there is no doubt that some of the perceived virtues connected to Scots – the hardiness, practicality and honesty of the rural lowlands – were appropriated to demonstrate Scotland's unique and vital contribution to the British Empire. Therefore, Scots and Norwegian national interests had different needs for their languages, and used them accordingly.

It was the imperial context that more than anything else set Scotland and Norway on different trajectories when it came to the place of vernacular language in nationalist agitation. In Norway, Nynorsk formed the basis of a national movement that not only stressed Norway's position as a distinct nation, but also promoted the 'folk' over the ruling elite as representative of the essence of the

nation. Øystein Rian has called Norway a 'Nordic Ireland', drawing on a similarity in religious traditions and establishment of a foreign elite (Rian 2008: 15). Together with their 'foreignness' and 'Danish' language, the Norwegian elite symbolized old colonial structures and cultural dependence. The theory of Two Cultures put their national legitimacy into question. The theory of Two Cultures, as well as the Nynorsk-movement might therefore be looked upon as a post-colonial movement, aiming to free the nation from old colonial structures and influence (Hyvik 2016).

In Scotland, Scots was taken as an element of an overall aspect of the non-Gaelic peasantry of Scotland, and formed a part of the Scottish autostereotype. This, in turn, fed into a strong internal belief that Scots were not only an equal part of the union and the imperial project with England, but that they (including via Scots in London) were effectively running the whole enterprise. The virtues of the peasantry were adopted as national virtues. Poets such as Burns were lionised, and although in everyday life Scots might have been perceived as 'vulgar' among Scotland's urban elite (or as part of an imagined past), those arguing for Scotland's recognition as a separate national entity within Britain used it later in the century as part of the 'democratic' ethos brought by Scots to the Empire (Hroch 2000: 25-39).

Endnotes

[1] This article developed from Volda University College's Strategic University Project, 'Cultural Perspectives Between Civil Servants and Peasants, ca. 1660-1870.' The authors wish to acknowledge the financial support of the Norwegian Research Council. Much of Jens Johan Hyvik's research for this article was undertaken while working at Volda University College in the period 2008-2012.
[2] This article will primarily use the term 'Nynorsk', unless in direct quotations. Originally, however, the new Norwegian language that was constructed by Ivar Aasen was originally called by several names, including '(det norske) folkesprog', 'folkemaalet', 'landsmaal', etc. The term 'Nynorsk' was much in use from around 1900 and became official in 1929.
[3] Arne Kruse has recently used the Norwegian-Scots comparison to problematize the apparent absence of promotion for Scots in contemporary Scottish

nationalism (Kruse 2016).

[4] Peter Trudgill argues Scots, together with Plattdeutsch and Provençal, are languages 'which have become dialects'. Aitken states that, depending upon the sample, Scots can differ from Standard English 'much more than the Nynorsk does from the Bokmål'. Kruse asserts that 'linguistically, the different between Danish and Norwegian can in very broad terms be said to be similar to that between Standard English and (Broad) Scots' (Kruse 2016: 252).

[5] It could also be argued that the United Kingdom in general, as well as its other constituent parts, might have been a 'deviant case' in relation to the idea of 'one state = one nation'. Scotland (along with parts of Ulster) was, however, the only part of the islands where, along with a Celtic language, a Germanic variety which had at least begun the process of Ausbau was found along with English.

[6] Moreover, Glenthøj notes a rumour that Denmark was considering rebranding Norway as 'North Denmark', which from a comparative Scottish perspective is particularly fascinating (Glenthøj 2012: 89; Andersen and Neumann 2015: 24).

[7] A rather less positive expression of similar attitudes can be found in the report for Symington in Lanarkshire: 'As a specimen of the spirit and eloquence of those times [ie of the schisms within Presbyterianism of the eighteenth century], the following prayer, for the established minister of the place, is kept in remembrance, as uttered by one of the preachers on the green, after a discourse, in which he and his brethren were represented in the blackest colours: – "Thou knowest that the silly snivelling body is not worthy even to keep a door in thy house. Cut him down as a cumberer of the ground; tear him up, root and branch, and cast the wild rotten stump out of thy vineyard. Thresh him, Lord, and dinna spare! O Thresh him tightly, with the flail of thy wrath, and mak' a strae wisp o him to stap the mouth of hell!"' (Sinclair 1973-83;VII: 597-98, Millar 2013: 82)

[8] Munch, in the same 1832 article, played with the idea of making an independent, Norwegian language.

[9] In 1852 Aasen had tested his audience with hints about creating a new standard language. The reactions came immediately, and Aasen made 'a tactical retreat' (Walton 1996: 429).

[10] Aasen's own concept of culture was complicated and not least intended to counter attacks from the elite that Nynorsk could not be a language of culture. He therefore used a narrow definition of culture (as *bildung* and spiritual values) and generally spoke in terms other than 'national'.

[11] The linguistic difference between Landsmaal and Riksmaal is also much less than between Scots / English and Gaelic.

[12] For example in the historian Ernst Sars, that had close ties to the Liberal party at this time, in his pamphlet *Historisk Indledning til Grundloven* (Kristiania, 1882).

[13] In 1910 about 13% of the pupils in the primary schools in Norway learned Nynorsk, and by 1940 the number had reached about 33%. Thereafter it fell to about 15 % by 2000. Grepstad 2005. fig 8.2. (Accessed: 14 April 2016).

References

Newspapers
Aberdeen Journal
Edinburgh Magazine
*Leeds Mercur*y
John Bull & Britannia
Punch
Scotsman
Tait's Edinburgh Magazine

Internet Resources:
Grepstad, O. (2005). *Nynorsk Faktabok 2005*
http://www.aasentunet.no/filestore/Ivar_Aasen-tunet/Sprk/ Sprkfakta_pdf/NynorskfaktabokA4.pdf (Accessed: 5 April 2016).

Published Sources:
Aasen, I. (1853). *Prøver af Landsmaalet i Norge.* Christiania: C. C. Werner.

Aasen, I. (1999). 'Recollections from the Language Debate of Autumn 1858', in Burgess, P. J. (ed.) *Ivar Aasen's Logic of Nation. Toward a Philosophy of Culture.* Volda: Høgskulen i Volda, pp. 137-158 [The book includes a translation of *Recollections* into English].

Aitken, A. (1990). '"The Good Old Scots Tongue": Does Scots have an Identity?', in Haugen, E., McClure, J.D. and Thomson, D. (eds.), *Minority Languages Today*, ed. (2nd Ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, pp. 72-90.

Albrechtsen, E. et al (1997-1998). *Danmark-Norge 1380-1814* (4

vols). Oslo: Akademisk Forlag.

Andersen M. Skumsrud (2014). 'Hva var Norge i det danske imperiet? – Skottland og Norge som semi-sentra', *Internasjonal Politikk* 66:3, pp. 367-87.

Andersen M. Skumsrud and Neumann, I. (2015). 'The Danish Empire and Norway's Place Therein', *Scandinavica* 54:1, pp. 10-29.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (New Edition). London: Verso.

[Anon.] (1826). 'Provincial Scotch Vulgarities', in *The Vulgarities of Speech Corrected: with elegant expressions for Provincial and Vulgar English, Scots and Irish; for the use of those who are unacquainted with grammar.* London: James Bulcock, pp. 222-243.

[Anon.] [D. Hume] (1752). *Scotticisms* [Edinburgh?: n.p.].

Burgess, P. and Hyvik, J.J. (2004). 'Ambivalent Patriotism: Jacob Aall and Dano-Norwegian Identity before 1814', *Nations and Nationalism* 10, pp. 619-638.

Colley, L. (1996). *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. London: Vintage.

Corbett, J. (1999). *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation: A History of Literary Translation into Scots*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Daa, L. (1846). *Varsko formedelst den offentlige Stemning og Redegjørelse i Anledning af ellevte ordentlige Storthing.* Kristiania: Chr. Shibsted.

Dahl, O. (1990). *Norsk historieforskning i det 19. og 20.* Århundre. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Daiches, D. (1964). *The Paradox of Scottish Culture: The Eighteenth-Century Experience.* London: Oxford UP.

Didier, F. (1822). *Franklin's Letters to his Kinsfolk, written during the years 1818, '19 & '20, from Edinburgh, London, the Highlands of Scotland and Ireland.* 2 Vols. Philadelphia: J. Maxwell.

Dossena, M. (2003). 'Scots', in Deumert, A. and Vandenbussche, W. (eds.), *German Standardizations: Past to Present.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 383-404.

Dossena, M. (2005). *Scotticisms in grammar and vocabulary: like runes upon a standin stane?* Edinburgh: John Donald.

Falnes, O. (1933). *National Romanticism in Norway*. New York: Columbia UP.

Ferguson, W. (1977). *Scotland's Relations with England: A Survey to 1707*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Ferguson, W. (1998). *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: An Historic Quest*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.

Finlay, R. (1994). *Independent and Free: Scottish Politics and the Origins of the Scottish National Party 1918-1954*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1972). *Language and Nationalism. Two Integrative Essays*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Garborg, A. (1877). *Den ny-norske Sprog- og Nationalitetsbevægelse*. Kristiania: Cammermeyer.

Glenthøj, R. (2012). *Skilsmissen – Dansk og norsk identitet før og efter 1814*. Aarhus: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.

Hallager, L. (2004). *Norsk Ordsamling. Med Innleiing av Lars S. Vikør*. New Edition. Bergen: Vigmostad & Bjørke.

Hanham, H.J. (1965). 'The Creation of the Scottish Office, 1881-1887', *Juridical Review*, 10, pp. 205-244.

Haugland, K. (1971). *Målpolitiske dokument 1864-1885. Ei folkerørsle blir til*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Haugland, K. (1980). 'An Outline of Norwegian Cultural Nationalism in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century', in Mitchison, R. (ed.) *The Roots of Nationalism: Studies in Northern Europe*. Edinburgh: John Donald, pp. 21-29.

Hemstad, R. (2004). 'Nordisk samklang med politiske dissonanser : skandinavisme og skandinavisk samarbeid på 1800-tallet', in Engman, M. and Sandstrøm, Å. (eds.), *Det nya Norden efter Napoleon. 25:e Nordiska historikermötet 4-8 augusti 2004*. Stockholm: Stockholms Universitet.

Hobsbawm, E. (1992). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Revised Edition). Cambridge, Cambridge UP.

Hoel, O. (2011). *Mål og modernisering 1868-1940: norsk målreising II*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Horsbroch, D. (1999). '*Nostra Vulgari Lingua*: Scots as a European

Language 1500-1700', *Scottish Language*, 18, pp. 1-16.

Hroch, M. (2000). *Social Conditions of National Revival in Europe* (New Edition). New York: Columbia UP.

Hyvik, J.J. (2010). *Språk og nasjon 1739-1868*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Hyvik, J.J. (2012a). '"Det klinger vel noget radikalt" – Språkprogram i tre faser', in Bagge, S., Collet, J. and Kjus, A. (eds.), *P.A. Munch. Historiker og nasjonsbygger*. Oslo: Dreyers Forlag, pp. 152-175.

Hyvik J.J. (2012b). 'Embetsmannselitens posisjonering – universitetets skriv om det norske språket og lovforslag om ettertrykk i 1815', in Døssland, A., Kjelland, A., Krøvel H. and Sinderud, M. B. (eds.), *Frå Volda til verda. Fjerne og nære kulturmøte. Historiestudiet i Volda 40 år*. Trondheim: Akademika, pp. 271-86

Hyvik, J.J. (2016). *Tokulturlæra i Norsk Historie*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Jamieson, J. (1808). 'A dissertation on the origin of the Scottish language', in Jamieson, J. (ed.), *An Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, pp. 1-46.

Jones, C. (1997). 'Phonology', in Jones, C. (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, pp. 267-334.

Karlsrud, G. (1970). 'Skandinavisme og Norskhet i det norske Studentersamfund 1866/67'. M.A. Dissertation: University of Oslo.

Kay, B. (1993). *Scots: The Mither Tongue* (New Ed.), Darvel: Alloway Publishing.

Klippenberg, M. (1998). 'Ut or unionane? Den frilynde ungdomsrørsla i framvekstårene', in Sørensen, Ø. (ed.) *Jakten på det norske. Perspektiver på utviklingen av en norsk nasjonal identitet på 1800-tallet*. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal, pp. 357-370.

Kloss, H. (1978). *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800*. 2nd ed. Dusseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.

Kloss, H. (1984). 'Interlingual communication: danger and chance for the smaller tongues', *Scottish Studies*, 4, pp. 73-7.

Knudsen, K. (1867). *Det norske målstræv*. Kristiania: A.W. Brøgger.

Knudsen, T. (1923). *P.A. Munch og samtidens norske sprogstrev*. Kristiania: Gyldendal.

Kruse, A. (2016). 'Scots: The Role of Language in Civic Nationalism',

in Barstad, G.E., Hjelde, A., Kvam, S., Parianou, A. and Todd, J. (eds.), *Language and Nation: Crossroads and Connections*. Münster: Waxmann, pp. 241-264.

Kyllingstad, J. (2004). *Kortskaller og langskaller. Fysisk antropoligi i Norge og striden om det nordiske herremennesket*. Oslo: Spartacus Forlag.

Lunden, K. (1992). *Norsk grålysning: Norsk nasjonalisme 1770-1814 på allmenn bakgrunn*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Manning, S. (2007). 'Post-Union Scotland and the Scottish Idiom of Britishness', in Brown, I., Clancy, T., Manning, S. and Pittock, M. (eds.), *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature: Enlightenment, Empire and Britain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, pp. 45-56.

McClure, J.D. (1981). 'The Synthesisers of Scots', in E. Haugen, J.D. McClure & D. Thomson (eds.), *Minority Languages Today*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, pp. 91-99.

McClure, J.D. (1984). 'Lowland Scots: An Ambivalent National Tongue', *Multilingua*, 3, pp. 143-151.

Millar, R. McColl. (2000). 'Covert and Overt Language Attitudes to the Scots Tongue expressed in the *Statistical accounts of Scotland*', in Kastovsky, D. and Mettinger, A (eds.), *The History of English in a Social Context: a contribution to Historical Sociolinguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 169-198.

Millar, R. McColl. (2003). 'Blind attachment to inveterate custom'. Language Use, Language Attitude and the Rhetoric of Improvement in the first *Statistical Account*, in Dossena, M. and Jones, C. (eds.), *Insights into Late Modern English*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 311-30.

Millar, R. McColl. (2013). '"To bring my language near to the language of men?" Dialect and Dialect Use in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries: Some Observations ', in Kirk, J.M. and Macleod I. (eds.), *Scots: Studies in its Literature and Language*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 71-85.

Morton, G. (1999). *Unionist Nationalism: Governing Urban Scotland, 1830-1860*. East Linton: Tuckwell.

Morton, G. (2008). 'Scotland is Britain: The Union and Unionist-Nationalism, 1807-1907', *Journal of Irish and Scottish Studies*, 1, pp. 127-141.

Munch, P.A. (1970). 'Norsk Sprogreformation', in E. Hanssen (ed.) *Om norsk språkhistorie*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Myhill, J. (2006). *Language, Religion and National Identity in Europe and the Middle East: A Historical Study*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nairn, T. (1977). *The Break-Up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism*. London: New Left Books.

Neumann, I (2000). 'State and Nation in the Nineteenth Century: Recent Research on the Norwegian Case', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 25, pp. 239-260.

Neumann, I (2001). 'Garborgs folkelige nasjonalisme', in *Localmotives: Nettmagasin for samtidskunst og –kultur*. Digital Version via http://www.localmotives.com/hoved/tema/nr_6/neumann.html (Accessed: 6 April 2016).

Newby, A.G. (2007). *Ireland, Radicalism and the Scottish Highlands, c. 1870-1912*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.

Newby, A.G. (2010). 'Land and the "Crofter Question" in Nineteenth-Century Scotland', *International Review of Scottish Studies*, 35, pp. 7-36.

Newby, A.G. (2012). '"A Mere Geographical Expression"?: Scotland and Scottish Identity, c. 1890-1914', in Augusteijn, J. and Storm, E. (eds.), *Region and State in Nineteenth Century Europe: Nation-Building, Regional Identities and Separatism.* Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, pp. 149-168.

Newby, A.G. (2013). '"One Valhalla of the Free": Scandinavia, Britain and Northern Identity in the Mid-Nineteenth Century', in Harvard, J. and Stadius, P. (eds.), *Communicating the North: Media Structures and Images in the Making of the Nordic Region*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 147-169.

Nielsen, Y. (1886). *Er der i Norge et Folk eller to Folk, en Kultur eller to Kulturer? Indledningsforedrag ved en Diskussion i Studentersamfundet den 16. Oktober 1886*. Christiania: R. Hviid.

Nybø, B.N. (2007). *Eit Nynorsk "gaeltacht" på Vestlandet? Irsk og Nynorsk i eit Språkdødperspektiv*. Volda: Høgskulen i Volda.

Oakes, L. (2001). *Language and National Identity: Comparing France and Sweden*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Rian, Ø. (2008). 'Gamle og nye perspektiv på dansketida', *Fortid*, 5:2, 12-18.

Sars, E. (1882). *Historisk Indledning til Grundloven*, Kristiania: Folkeskriftselskabet.

Schnitler, C. (1911). *Slegten frå 1814. Studier over norsk embedsmandskultur i klassicismens tidsalder 1814-1840*. Kristiania: Aschehoug & Company.

Seip, J. (1974-1981). *Utsikt over Norges historie.* 2 Vols. Oslo: Gyldendal.

Skautrup, P. (1953). *Det danske sprogs historie. Tredie bind – Fra Holbergs komedier til H.C. Andersens Eventyr*. København: Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab.

Simmons, J. (2007). *Factory lives: four nineteenth-century working class autobiographies*. Toronto: Broadview Press.

Smith, A.D. (1991). *National Identity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Storsveen, O. (1997). *Norsk Patriotisme før 1814*. Oslo: NFR.

Stråth, B. (2005). *Union och Demokrati: De Förenade rikena Sverige-Norge 1814-1905*. Oslo & Stockholm: Nya Doxa.

Stråth, B. (2012). 'Nordic Modernity: Origins, Trajectories, Perspectives', in Árnason, J.P. and Wittrock B., *Nordic Paths to Modernity*. New York: Berhahn Books.

Sørensen, Ø. (1997). 'What's in a name? The Name of the Written Language of Norway', in Sørensen, Ø and Stråth, B. (eds.), *The Cultural Construction of Norden*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Sørensen, Ø. (1998). *Jakten på det norske. Perspektiver på utviklingen av en norsk nasjonal identitet på 1800-tallet*. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.

Sørensen, Ø. (2001). 'Kampen om Norges sjel 1770-1905', *Norsk Idehistorie* vol. III. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Trudgill, P. (1997). 'Norwegian as a Normal Language', in Røyneland U. (ed.), *Language Contact and Language Conflict*. Volda: Ivar Aasen Institute, pp. 151-158.

Wallace, S. (2006). *John Stuart Blackie: Scottish Scholar and Patriot*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.

Watson, H. (1992). 'Scots and Nynorsk: Minority Languages', in Blom, G., Graves, P., Kruse, A. and Thorup Thomsen, B. (eds.), *Minority*

Languages: The Scandinavian Experience. Oslo: Nordic Language Secretariat, pp. 93-118.

Walton, S. (1991). 'Ivar Aasen – klassereisar eller målreisar?', in *Eigenproduksjon*, 43/91, pp. 1-22.

Walton, S. (1996). *Ivar Aasens Kropp.* Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Withers, C. (1998). *Urban Highlanders: Highland-Lowland Migration and Urban Gaelic Culture, 1700-1900.* East Linton: Tuckwell.

Wormald, J. (2005). 'Confidence and Perplexity: The Seventeenth Century', in Wormald J. (ed.) *Scotland: A History.* Oxford: Oxford UP, pp. 143-76.