

The Hebrew language Revival and Translation. An interview with Moshe Nahir

Albert Branchadell

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Departament de Filologia Catalana
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona). Spain

Durant el curs 2001-2002 el professor Moshe Nahir va fer una estada de recerca a la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, convidat pel Departament de Filologia Catalana, en el curs de la qual va concedir aquesta entrevista.

Moshe Nahir es va llicenciar l'any 1965 a la Universitat de Bar-Ilan (Israel), i l'any 1974 es va doctorar a la Universitat de Pittsburgh (EUA). Actualment és membre del Departament de Lingüística de la Universitat de Manitoba (Canadà), i les seves àrees de recerca són la sociolingüística i la planificació lingüística, l'adquisició de L2 i la metodologia d'ensenyament de L2, i l'hebreu modern.

Nahir ha editat els currículums per a l'ensenyament de l'hebreu a les escoles públiques de Manitoba i el llibre *Hebrew teaching and applied linguistics* (1989, 2a edició). També és autor de *Modern Hebrew* (1978) i, juntament amb W.M. Rivers, de *Teaching Hebrew: A practical guide* (1989). Ha publicat tres articles sobre sociolingüística a *Language Planning Newsletter*, *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *Language in Society* i diferents obres col·lectives, entre les quals hi ha les actes del Simposi Pompeu Fabra, editades per Joan A. Argenter i publicades per l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans.

Professor Nahir, you have been invited to this university as an expert in the Revival of Hebrew. What is «Language Revival» to begin with?

I define Language (or Speech) Revival as the attempt to turn a language with few or no surviving native speakers back into a normal means of communication in a community. The normalization of Hebrew, the only known successful case of Speech Revival, took about 25 years to accomplish. Between 1890-1914, the majority of Palestine's tiny Jewish community of 85,000 shifted from the use of Yiddish to that of Hebrew.

Could you summarize the factors at work in this unique process?

In a recent study I proposed a schematic explanation of this shift, which Fishman selected, along with the cases of Quebec's French and Catalan as «success stories» of «RLS» (Reversing Language Shift), from which «there is much to learn».

Two conditions, crucial to the Revival, and probably to any other future language revival, existed in Palestine when the revival was attempted: a revivable code, which the community considered itself related to its early users, existed and was accessible, and certain unique sociocultural forces, or factors, prevailed in the community. Written Hebrew had been used for centuries and thus available, so we should focus on the identification of the prevailing factors, which I call the *Communicative, Political, Religious/Educational and Literary* factors.

As for the Communicative Factor, we have to bear in mind that an acute communicative vacuum in the form of multilingualism prevailed in Palestine's urban Jewish community. Described as a «Babel Generation», it consisted of immigrants, speakers of East European languages, and local established communities, speakers of scores of languages. Nevertheless, the majority of the Jewish community lived in rural «settlements», which consisted almost exclusively of Yiddish speaking East European immigrants. For them the communicative factor was the least dominant.

So what about the other three factors?

Let us tackle the Political Factor first. Since a shift to Hebrew obviously also involved a shift away from Yiddish, the existing means of normal communication, the political factor had to be especially powerful to make up for the weakness in the communicative factor. Evidence shows the existence of a uniquely favorable attitude to Hebrew and a solidly unfavorable attitude to Yiddish. Intellectual leaders and educators contended that, with the emergence of European and Jewish nationalism in the late nineteenth century, Hebrew, the language of the Bible, which survived in written form for two millennia, was for the Jews their only possible national language. In fact for many in the Community, who viewed national Revival as their ultimate goal, the two revivals, of the language and of the nation, were indivisible. Concurrently many resented using Yiddish, which represented to them their people's exile from their homeland, persecutions and pogroms, while Yiddish was their dominant vernacular. Besides, many considered it as merely an «exile-language», a «Jewish-German Jargon», or a «vulgar» language, «unfit for use for matters of science».

This factor was considerably boosted in 1905 by a new, politically highly motivated immigration wave from Europe, the result of the formation in 1897 of the political Zionist movement, whose objective was the establishment of a Jewish national homeland, and renewed pogroms in Eastern Europe.

The Religious/Educational Factor is not less powerful. For some two millennia, a fundamental cornerstone of Jewish law required all Jewish males to participate in daily religious services and to regularly study the Bible, its commentaries, and other religious texts. Consequently, the study of Hebrew texts was basic to all males' education, resulting in their solid, if passive mastery of the language. In fact, most females were also familiar with Hebrew ritual-related terminologies. As a result, Hebrew was kept in constant if partial use, so its corpus was available for revival; religious, philosophical, legal, liturgical and poetic works kept on being

produced and read by large segments of the community; and the survival of the phonology of Hebrew was secured, albeit in different varieties in the respective speech communities. Further, there is evidence that the study of the Bible reinforced for Jewish youngsters a special relationship with the land of the Bible and its language. Finally, a byproduct of universal religious education was the status of Hebrew as a *lingua franca* among Jews everywhere. Thus, when the Revival was attempted, most Jews were ready to transform their passive, written Hebrew into an all-purpose, «normal» language.

What happened when many young Jews in Europe in recent centuries rejected religion?

The rejection you mention had little effect on this factor, as it was usually accompanied by the adoption of either the «enlightenment» (the creation of non-religious, liberal, «enlightened» literature) or by Jewish nationalism. Both called for the acquisition of Hebrew, already a symbol of Jewish national aspirations. Thus, Hebrew as a «living written language» was never abandoned.

OK. Now I am wondering what the Literary Factor might be...

A combination of a solid knowledge of written Hebrew and a growing secular outlook on life by some Jews in 19th century Eastern Europe, led to the development of a considerable volume of secular, liberal literature, known as the «Haskala [Enlightenment] Literature». It began in the mid-eighteenth century with the publication of a Hebrew periodical, followed by numerous novels. This transformed Hebrew into a means of articulating not only religious but all types of communications gaining almost full legitimacy as a national literature, with readers scattered throughout Europe. Hebrew was now adopted for other types of texts —journalism, news commentaries, literary criticism, reviews, popular science, essays, reference books, dictionaries, etc.— aptly labeled a «communication infrastructure».

When the first Hebrew daily was established in 1895, the range of topics and time pressure involved in production forced the editors to further adjust the language to the demands of modern life. The language now began to be «corrupted» and received the vitality typical of a modern language. The corpus of written Hebrew just prior to the Revival was now adequate for the task. But as with the previous factor, this had a status implication as well —the very use of the language for reading by its would-be speakers also contributed to their ability to acquire it in spoken form when the time came.

What were the actual steps in the shift to Hebrew?

Crucial as the above «factors» were to the success of the Hebrew Revival, they do not explain what actually brought about the shift from Yiddish to Hebrew, which, prior to the Revival, was still only a written language. Now the critical, beha-

viourally based question is why Yiddish speakers would speak Hebrew to others in the community when everybody's native language was Yiddish, which would obviously best serve their communicative needs. I will try to answer this question schematically, suggesting that with the above factors at work in the background, the shift consisted of four consecutive steps, partially overlapping and not necessarily conscious.

We might call Step One «Instilling Desired Language Attitudes in the Children». Contemporary documents show the strength of favorable feelings of children and their teachers towards Hebrew, and the low status of the vernacular, Yiddish. These powerful feelings were very soon adopted by students and teachers in more and more schools. For example, a former student recalled how in 1891 his teacher in the very first class established the status of Hebrew vis-à-vis that of Yiddish: «[it was] Hebrew in Hebrew, that is, forget Yiddish which we spoke at home». In another school a visitor found a teacher «implanting the Hebrew spirit in the hearts of the little ones». With such attitudes children knew that Hebrew was the prestigious language and that communicating in it would constitute a potent reinforcement. It was time to acquire the code.

The next step might be termed «Acquisition of the Code by the Children». The school-teachers recognized that using Hebrew as the language of instruction was a condition for the shift. Numerous logistic and linguistic barriers existed —severe shortages of qualified Hebrew-speaking teachers, texts, teaching materials, and Hebrew terms for modern concepts such as newspaper, match, flowers, office and train and for the various school subjects. But the greatest difficulty was teaching students in a language they did not know. Therefore, pre-school «preparatories» were established where, prior to entry into first grade, children would devote one or two years to total «immersion» in Hebrew. These preparatories proved to be highly effective, their graduates, an educator later recalled, «becoming the most effective vehicle for spreading Hebrew speech.»

The schools played a similarly critical role. Just a few years after the first school introduced Hebrew as the language of instruction, a teacher visiting it in 1891 found that Hebrew had become the dominant spoken language. This was reflected in the dramatic rise in the number of Hebrew schools in the settlements, which in the 1903-1913 decade grew from 17 to 60, including kindergartens, elementary and secondary schools, teacher-colleges, a vocational school and an art school. Teachers' efforts in giving their students the code, combined with highly motivated students' efforts to acquire it, proved a decisive success. Children now spoke Hebrew as a second language in their schools.

I guess that their next task was now to transfer the use of Hebrew into the streets and their homes.

Right so. We might call Step Three «The Transfer of Hebrew, Now a Second Language, out of the Schools». This step was by far the most difficult to accomplish, but the most critical as well. Evidence shows that the children realized, if subconsciously, that while Yiddish would produce more effective communication,

speaking Hebrew, even if inadequate, would yield a more powerful social reward. It would also make them participants in the national Revival. As it would be behaviorally expected, the children chose Hebrew.

The first phase of this step was the development of a «children's tongue» for use with peers. This also led to a «children-to-adults» direction in language acquisition, typical of immigrants' language behavior universally. Children often forced their parents to learn Hebrew by taking evening classes. Thus the «mother-child language» was created. This and the consequent growth in the number of Hebrew speakers eventually resulted in the formation of social «islands» of young people in which Hebrew was spoken, though still as a second language. Their number grew while the fourth step was already well on its way.

And here we come to Step Four...

Step Four is «Hebrew as a First Language is Used by the Newly Born». At this point the children, who were instilled with the desired language attitudes, acquired the code and then transferred Hebrew out of the schools, all within one or two decades, have grown up, married, and had their own children. With the Political Factor still at work, the language attitudes instilled in these young adults in Step One were still prevailing. Therefore, the language they spoke in their homes with their newly born was Hebrew, even though for the parents this was mostly still a second language. To the new generation, however, Hebrew was now a native language in all respects. For several years now, Hebrew was considered the language of the young, which explains the surprise when a physician in one of the settlements announced that he would deliver a lecture in Hebrew. The public was used to hearing school-children chatter in Hebrew; they did not expect a learned physician to use it.

When the number of new families having Hebrew speaking children grew to make up a significantly large group of native speakers of Hebrew, it may be said that the community has finally shifted from Yiddish to Hebrew, and that Hebrew speech has been «revived». Obviously this point cannot be precisely demarcated, but it was undoubtedly reached some time prior to the 1916 Palestine census, when 40 percent of the country's Jewish population (34,000 of 85,000 aged two and over) declared Hebrew as their «only or first language». In fact, among the young in the settlements and in the new town of Tel-Aviv (1909) 75 percent claimed Hebrew as their first language. According to a statistician of the Revival, by 1914 the future of Hebrew was guaranteed since it had become the younger generation's major language.

I conclude from your account that no planning agency was involved in the process.

It should be noted that though no planning agency was significantly active in the process, several bodies indirectly, often unintentionally somewhat accelerated the process. The Hebrew Language Committee, though inactive for half of the

Revival period, contributed with its lexical work, searching for or creating terminologies, thus facilitating communication in the language and making its acquisition more feasible. The Hebrew Teachers' Association, established half way through the shift, through its professional-improvement activities, had some effect on the quality of teaching and thus the effectiveness of some of the above steps. Finally, the labor movement, which emerged close to the completion of the Revival, organized adult language courses throughout the country, thus also accelerating the acquisition of the language and the eventual full Yiddish-Hebrew shift.

Israeli scholars like Gideon Toury have discussed the role of translation in the *Haskala*, the Hebrew Enlightenment movement. According to Toury, «*Haskala* [...] could see that there was virtually no chance of catching up with the civilized world without a major investment in translation», for translation was one way «of demonstrating the existence of the new culture». Now, what was the impact of translation on the Hebrew language Revival?

The major translation activity which impacted the Hebrew language Revival actually took place not during but centuries prior to its initiation. Translation policies during the Revival itself, even when such policies existed, had a relatively minor effect on the corpus of the language. This is because the revivers of the language did not create the language they succeeded to revive. They used an existing language which, admittedly, still needed a considerable codification effort before it would become fully adequate as a spoken language, particularly in the modern lexical domain, yet the major bulk of the code, on all levels, was there, ready to be restored as a vernacular and a national, «all-purpose» language.

The bulk of this code, albeit with a somewhat limited vocabulary, but with a full-bodied grammatical framework, already existed in biblical times, its lexicon then greatly expanded during the «Mishnaic» period, in the centuries just before and after the turn of the first millennium. With few interruptions, a flow of translations into Hebrew ever since the demise of spoken Hebrew early in the first millennium was directly responsible for the creation and addition of countless new lexical items as well as some new morphological and grammatical features, thus bringing about a massive further expansion of the language. In this long period two «waves» of translation activity stand out, one in the middle ages, much of it carried out by the five-generation-lineage of the Tibbon family in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Spain, and the other in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (the «*Haskala*» period) first in Germany and then in Eastern Europe.

Translation activity was further intensified as modern Hebrew literature, the last phase prior to the onset of the Revival, was growing in volume and maturing linguistically. Concurrently, larger numbers of modern-minded Jews began to take interest in the secular aspects of life, including literature. And increasingly many were no longer content with the output of Hebrew authors, and demand for translations of Europe's literary works was augmenting rapidly. Since the Hebrew lexicon was not fully equipped for this, translators, mostly literary figures in their own right, were forced to resort to loan translations and to word coining of their own, in

addition to the inevitable borrowings. One outstanding contemporary literary figure was Mendele (his pen-name), who, early in his literary life, translated popular-science texts. His three translated books, published in 1882 and 1883, together with his lexical creativity as part of his later writing, are universally recognized as having made a highly significant contribution to the Hebrew lexicon. By this point, Hebrew has actually become a «living written language», used both in traditional literature and in other types of texts —journalism, literary criticism, popular science, essays, reference books, dictionaries, etc.—, all of which Harshav described as a «communication infrastructure», which actually constituted the mark of a spoken language, even though the Revival of Hebrew Speech was yet to be initiated and implemented.

The way the initiation and implementation of Hebrew as an actual vernacular were carried out has been discussed before. But it ought to be noted that no policy on translation existed at least during the first half of the Revival period simply because the only relevant agency, the Hebrew Language Committee, having been formed in 1890, disbanded a few months later, to be regrouped only in 1903. Nevertheless, this short-lived Committee's declared policies, combined with the fact that most of its members continued to be involved in Revival-related issues and various codification activities, including writing and translating, can serve as indicators of their preferences, particularly since almost all of them joined the new Committee when it was recreated in 1903. As it turned out, the policies of both committees were almost identical.

The section in the Committee's statement on its policies regarding the use of translations or foreign languages read that «if needed» (i.e., if no Hebrew words or roots have been found for an object or concept), words would be borrowed from Arabic, «which is very close to Hebrew in its nature, roots and grammar.» Obviously this policy reveals a restrictive attitude to borrowing.

The new Language Committee was formed in 1903 by the newly established Hebrew Teachers Union, to avoid the confusion created by individual teachers coining new words as they needed them. As part of its policy the Committee, too, totally rejected lexical borrowing. This policy, however, proved in time to be a virtual failure, with numerous words borrowed from other languages, often from Arabic, German and French and in recent decades mostly from English. These borrowings frequently resulted from translations, literary as well as other, notably in science and technology. In the Committee's actual lexical work it is apparent that it was much more willing to approve terminologies in certain lexical areas than in others. Where more words were available from old Hebrew sources, e.g., in the «arithmetic» area, it would refuse to allow borrowings, while in areas where the sources were incapable of providing the necessary terms, e.g., in «gymnastics», the Committee, not unlike the current Hebrew Language Academy, would use not only new creations but loan-translations and borrowings as well.

When the Committee made its final decisions on a given lexical area, it would publish the approved terms in lists (or even dictionaries). In the lists, translations in French and German, the contemporary local languages of wider communication, were given next to each Hebrew term, with a notation indicating which type

of five sources the word was drawn from: (Talmud and Midrash; Post-Talmudic literature; a non-Committee new term; a word drawn from past literature, with a new meaning designated by the Committee; a word created by the Committee).

Many words on the lists were created not by the Committee but by the «public», mostly writers and influential public figures, including political leaders. Technical terms were frequently created by their potential users —construction engineers, auto mechanics, librarians, and office workers, etc.—, who routinely needed the terms in their work. All terms were brought before the Committee's Sub-Committees, which included professionals or trade representatives, and then the Committee's plenary, for discussion and approval. The highest priority was always given to words drawn from older periods of Hebrew.

Michael Cronin once noticed that minority languages like Irish Gaelic have a paradoxical relationship with translation: «As languages operating in a multilingual world with vastly accelerated information flows from dominant languages, they must translate continually in order to retain their viability and relevance as living languages. Yet, translation itself may in fact endanger the very specificity of those languages that practice it, particularly in situations of diglossia». Hebrew is not undergoing diglossia, but with respect to «dominant» languages like English is a minority language none the less. In what ways is English-Hebrew translation affecting the «very specificity» of Hebrew nowadays?

I agree with Cronin on the theoretical level. The very practice of translation in minority languages causes the endangerment of their specificity, though these two phenomena are not necessarily equal in their effect on a given language. However, if the future independent existence of Hebrew is threatened, in my view it is not because of its «minority» status. Hebrew in Israel is currently not in a «minority language» situation as this is generally understood. It is spoken by the very large majority of the population in the country, and for virtually all functions. If Hebrew were to be considered a minority language compared with English, and admittedly a case can be made to support this, a review of at least the working definition of «minority language» is required. Otherwise, *all* languages other than English should be described as minority languages. They all suffer from the effects of English being the world's «international» language of wider communication which, further, serves as the language of a society which exports much of its culture and which is thus «dominant» linguistically as well. Therefore, the loss of specificity of Hebrew as a result of the dominance of English ought to be viewed as being equal to that of other languages. I believe that this would certainly be in line with any current definition of «minority languages».

Like many other languages, Hebrew has been borrowing considerably from English, probably even more than some other languages, due to relatively close contacts with the U.S., the world's major English speaking society, and its Jewish community. However, while many in Israel are indeed concerned about the possible loss of the «identity» of the Hebrew language, with few, virtually insignificant

exceptions, this borrowing is currently strictly lexical. A view of languages that have lost their specificity will indicate that this has occurred only where borrowing involved a considerable measure of borrowing on other linguistic levels, particularly the grammatical level. I therefore do not expect borrowing from any source, including the vibrant translation activity that has been going on in Hebrew and the borrowing that results, to threaten the specificity, or identity, of the Hebrew language.

Finally, it should also be noted that translations into Hebrew are certainly not made exclusively from English. Works in many languages are regularly being translated into Hebrew. Though it can be expected that they constitute a source and cause of some borrowing in Hebrew, the type of borrowing and the relatively small amount of borrowing resulting from this source should minimize English-Hebrew translation as a threat to the «specificity» of current Modern Hebrew.

You said that Hebrew «is spoken by the very large majority of the population in the country, and for virtually all functions». But still, Israel is a multilingual society, where Hebrew is the mother tongue for only half of the population. Israeli Arabs, who make up a fifth of the population, have Arabic as their mother tongue, and Arabic is considered to be Israel's second official language. Now, what is the state of Hebrew-Arabic translation?

It seems to me that apart from the question about Hebrew-Arabic, Arabic-Hebrew translations, much of this question is actually trying to clarify my answer to your previous question. I will therefore respond to it first.

First, the term *multilingual society* usually refers to societies in which several different segments communicate by means of different languages (e.g., Montreal). This, in my view, is not the case in Israel, where with some minor exceptions everybody speaks either Hebrew, in the Jewish majority, or Arabic, in the Arab minority (where many also speak Hebrew as an L2). There are, of course, those who speak languages as L2 and immigrant languages, but that does not necessarily make a society multilingual.

Second, in Israel, Hebrew is not «the mother tongue for only half of the population». Spolsky and Shohamy in a recent publication wrongly «rounded up» their own figures from «sixty percent» («only 60% of the Jewish population were born in Israel») to «half of the population» («for about half of the Jewish population Hebrew is not the mother tongue»), whereas rounding it up to «two thirds» would have been more correct. Further, even if this statistics is correct (they do not indicate their source!), they erroneously fail to include in «native speakers» the countless young, middle-aged, and older people who were not «born» in Israel but arrived at ages one through five or even older and speak Hebrew as a native language in every respect.

As to Arabic, it is Israel's second official language, alongside Hebrew. Accordingly, official government and Knesset documents are being routinely translated into Arabic, and Arabic speakers have a right for translation in courts where the proceedings are conducted in Hebrew. Arabic serves as the language of instruction in the Arab community's schools, where Standard, «Classical» Arabic is also

taught, and it is one of the immigrant languages for a segment of the Jewish community. Because Hebrew is a compulsory subject in all schools, including in the Arab school system, and because it is the country's majority language, most Arabs acquire it, with many having native or near-native proficiency. On the other hand, many students in the Jewish school system take Arabic as a subject, but few acquire in it more than a basic proficiency.

Regarding the translation of literature, though I am not familiar with the issue as closely as I would like to, I believe that much Hebrew literature is translated into Arabic, either by Jewish or Arab translators. My observation is that Arabic-Hebrew translation is even more widespread. In fact, it is not limited to the translation of works by Israeli Arabs. A number of titles written by authors in Arabic speaking countries, such as Egypt and Jordan, have been translated into Hebrew, usually by Israeli translators.

I thank you for your clarifying remarks on the sociolinguistic makeup of Israel. Let us come now to our final question. At the beginning of this interview you mentioned that, according to Fishman (1991), Catalan is one of the «success stories» of «RLS» (Reversing Language Shift). From your point of view, what is there to learn from the Catalan case, as compared to the Hebrew one?

In order to compare Catalan and Hebrew we need first to note that the two RLS cases took place in very different periods, with numerous related implications. The Catalan case has been taking place now for almost three decades since the redemocratization of Spain, following the death of Franco. The Hebrew case, on the other hand, occurred over about two and a half decades a century ago, when the restoration of Hebrew as a vernacular took place.

The two cases, though successful, were different in a number of rather significant ways. They also had similar experiences and have shared similar processes, some more consequential than others. Due to space limitation here I will discuss briefly one of each of these groups, the one that in my view has been the most outstanding and that has had the most impact, positive or negative, on the respective cases.

Viewed as attempts by the respective language planning agencies at seeking certain Language Planning Goals, the two cases have involved altogether different goals. It seems that the major Language Planning Goal sought vis-à-vis Catalan has been «Language Normalization» (a goal not listed in my 1984 list but scheduled to be added in a forthcoming revision; it may be defined as the attempts to cause a language to be used in all spheres in a speech community thereby reducing diglossia), attempting to maximize the number of social areas where Catalan is used on a regular basis. Another «Language Planning Goal», albeit of a more «minor» status, is that of «Language Spread», i.e., the attempt to increase the Catalan-speaking share of the community. In the case of Hebrew, which, unlike Catalan, was not spoken at all (at least not as a native language) before the onset of the RSL efforts in 1890, the major Language Planning Goal was Language Revival («Standardization» being a «minor» goal). From the language perspective

this meant the renewed use of the Hebrew language as a vernacular and as a national, «all purpose» language, while from the users', or the community's perspective this involved a shift from the use of one language, Yiddish, to that of Hebrew.

As to the most apparent similarity between the Catalan and the Hebrew cases, this involves a «factor» which, in my view, has contributed the most to the success of both cases, and the absence of which would have resulted, in either of them, in utter failure of the respective language planning attempts. This factor, then, is the strong, mostly politically motivated favorable attitudes and convictions which have been prevalent in the respective communities about the symbolic value and the critical significance of their old, national languages and the pivotal role they should and could play in their national revival, which to many was their ultimate goal. There is much evidence indicating that at least a majority of Catalan speakers, including most of Catalonia's political and intellectual leaders, have viewed Catalan and its use as indispensable in Catalonia's social life and its well being. Similarly, it has been shown that one of the major factors that were prevalent in pre-Israel Palestine during the Hebrew Revival period was the Political Factor, wherein most members of the community viewed the language Revival as indivisible from, and a condition for, a national Revival in Palestine, the community's ancient homeland. Furthermore, according to my schematic analysis of the seemingly inexplicable shift of Palestine's Jewish community from the use of then-dominant Yiddish to that of Hebrew, the first of four steps involved in the shift consisted of instilling in the community's children the desired attitudes to Hebrew. This was relatively easily accomplished given the prevalent attitudes towards the language in the community at large.

The strength of this factor was obviously different in the two cases, due to vastly different histories and, as a result, different circumstances and conditions. So was the source of the emotions and the ideology they derived from or were related to. The evidence also points to differences in the strengths and extent of the attitudes and commitment to the target language *within* each of the two communities. Nevertheless, what seems to be undeniable is that in each case this ideological factor, in whatever variety or degree of strength, and probably unlike all other relevant factors, was the only one which can be said to have been an absolute prerequisite for success.

I believe that an in-depth study of all factors that prevailed in these two cases could not only lead to a better understanding of their respective struggles and eventual successes but also throw some more light on relevant issues in language planning generally. Such an analysis should also highlight what seems to me to be one of the Catalan case's greatest contributions to language planning. I noted earlier that little or no language planning as it is commonly defined, and even less «status planning», took place during the Revival of Hebrew. Therefore, it is obvious that institutional coercion was not needed and indeed none was exercised. In the case of Catalan, on the other hand, several language planning agencies have been clearly involved. This put the Catalan LP agencies in a unique position to show that RLS can be successful even where relevant coercion is kept to a bare minimum and true Liberalism is still alive and well. As you have shown in a 1999 paper, the Catalan

case can serve as a model for future language planners to show that successful language planning is possible in a liberal democracy. Though equally successful, and though there may be much to gain from the study of the Hebrew Revival, this is, in my view, a significant contribution by those in charge of the Normalization and Spread of Catalan to the understanding of language planning and the ways in which it can be achieved.

References

- BRANCHADELL, Albert (1999). «Language policy in Catalonia: making liberalism 2 come true». *Language and Communication* 19: 289-303.
- FISHMAN, Joshua A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- HARSHAV, Benjamin (1993). *Language in time of revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- NAHIR, Moshe (1974). «The Acceptance of the Lexical Work of the Hebrew Language Academy». *Hebrew Studies* 15: 50-52.
- (1983). «Sociocultural factors in the revival of Hebrew». *Language Problems and Language Planning* 7: 263-284.
- (1984). «Language planning goals: A classification». *Language Problems and Language Planning* 8: 294-327.
- (1998). «Micro Language planning and the revival of Hebrew: A schematic framework». *Language in Society* 27: 335-357.
- SPOLSKY, Bernard; SHOHAMY, Elana [n.d.]. «National Profiles of Languages in Education: Israel Language Policy». Available at the Language Policy Research Center website: <<http://www.biu.ac.il/hu/lprc>>.