

Gaelic and Scots in Devolved Scotland¹

Atina L.K. Nihtinen

This article discusses the situation of the Gaelic and Scots languages in Scotland in the period after devolution.² Although Gaelic has benefited from considerable promotion and status, Gaelic-related issues have nevertheless remained at the margins of Scottish life. Scots on the other hand is either heard or spoken in one form or another by a large percentage of Scotland's population, but has remained marginal in the context of political decisions. This paper considers the sociolinguistic situation of the two languages against the background of recent language policy. It focuses on the reasons why progress for Gaelic has been much more substantial in terms of institutional support and provision while the case of Scots has not moved forward.

1. Decline and revitalisation

The decline of Gaelic and Scots

The language that has a claim to be the longest established in Scotland is Scottish Gaelic. Scottish Gaelic (Gàidhlig) is a Celtic language, closely related to Irish. By the eleventh century, Gaelic had spread throughout nearly all of what is now mainland Scotland and had become established as the language of the Scottish kingdom. The main events associated with the decline of Gaelic are connected to the internal split in Scottish society between Gaels and Lowlanders, a division

1 This article is partly based on my lecture "Attitudes to language and language policies in Scotland before and after devolution", given on St Andrews Day 30.11.2006 at the Renvall Institute as part of the British and Irish studies seminar "The Politics of Language". Following the election in May 2007, Scotland elected a new, nationalist government which raised expectations for language policy once again. This article will consider some of the issues presented in the lecture and add some new observations on latest developments. The writing of this article has been funded by Höijers fond, Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland.

2 Devolution is used to mean the transfer of powers from central government to national or regional units. The first Scottish Parliament elections were held in May 1999. In July 1999 the Scottish Parliament was re-convened in Edinburgh, for the first time since the Union of Parliaments in 1707. The Scottish Parliament has full legislative competence across a wide range of devolved subjects. The devolved Government for Scotland has responsibility for most issues of day-to-day concern to the people of Scotland, including health, education, justice, rural affairs, and transport. The current administration was formed after elections in May 2007. See <http://www.scotland.gov.uk>.

which was not originally clear-cut (Horsburgh 1994, 14, Nihtinen 2005, 120). The expansion of Scots began from around the twelfth century. As a consequence of language shift in the south and east of the country during the late Middle Ages, Gaelic became restricted largely to the north and west of the country (the Highlands or Gàidhealtachd) from the fourteenth century onwards (McLeod 2006b, 1). From the seventeenth century the history of Gaelic has been one of demographic decline in terms of speakers and language loss. Since the middle of the eighteenth century extensive, and sometimes forced, emigration and various repressive measures as well as general economic and cultural change have caused gradual decline. There are no monoglot speakers of Gaelic today and many younger speakers use English most of the time and in all domains. Gaelic is now in a weakened state with regard to both the number of speakers and intensity of use which makes its situation challenging. Many formerly Gaelic-speaking areas have become English-speaking. The 2001 census showed a total of 58 969 Gaelic speakers aged 3 and over in Scotland, a mere 1.2% of the national population. Some 7 094 persons claimed to have the ability to read or write Gaelic but not speak it, and a further 27 538 could understand Gaelic but not speak, read or write it (McLeod 2006b, 3).³

Scots is a Germanic language, closely related to English. The relationship between Scots and English is comparable to that between Scottish Gaelic and Irish, but defining Scots as a language from a contemporary point of view has been difficult for both linguistic and political reasons (see for example Leith 1983, 164 and McArthur 1998). Scots was, however, the dominant language and the language of state in pre-union Scotland. The main events associated with the decline of Scots are the Protestant reformation in Scotland (1560), the Union of the Crowns (1603) and the Union of the Parliaments (1707). The lack of a printed Scots Bible contributed to the decline and English came to be regarded as the language of religion. Later political developments also played an important role in the decline of Scots. After the Treaty of Union in 1707 Parliament was moved to London, but Scotland continued to exist as a separate civil society and retained many of the institutions of self-government, particularly its own church and educational and legal systems. A conscious process of rejection of Scots in favour of southern English came to dominate the literary and intellectual scene. The period of Scottish Enlightenment (1660-1843) was characterised by deliberate efforts to eradicate Scotticisms from writing and speech.

The aspiration to conform to a southern standard of English was important for many educated Scots. The philosopher David Hume, for instance, was particularly

3 For comparison, in the 16th century probably 40 % or more of the population were Gaelic speakers. In 1951 the percentage of Gaelic speakers was 1.9 % and in 1991 1.3 % of the national population (see McLeod 2006b).

careful in his linguistic choices and his list of Scotticisms to be avoided in writing and polite society is a well-known example of the desire to eradicate ‘provincialisms’.

Nevertheless, the patterns of convergence and divergence between Scots and English are considered to be a result of complex developments and the view that Scots has always followed a path of increasing anglicisation has been questioned by modern scholarship. There are systematic differences between Scots and English in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, although variations in usages form a continuum and speech can be closer to one or the other of the two poles (see for example Macafee 1997).

Although more positive attitudes to Scots have developed during recent years, the main problem for the language has been the lack of linguistic awareness among the general population. Many Scottish people switch from Scottish English to Scots or Scots to Scottish English depending on the social situation. One of the barriers for wider recognition of Scots has been connected to the fact that many people in Scotland continue to support the view that Scots is an inferior speech form, which means that the gap between scholarly and lay perceptions of Scots remains. The existence of different meanings for the concept and definition of Scots has been a major obstacle in defining the number of Scots-speakers. There is no census data available, but the number of speakers has been estimated as c. 1.5 million, which makes Scots the largest minority language in the UK (GRO(S) report 1996).

Language policy after devolution

One of the striking facts regarding the place of both languages in Scottish political life has been their perceived marginality against a background of prevailing monolingualism. In Scottish national and regional government, broadcasting, print media and education, Scottish Standard English continues to be the language appropriate for formal use in speech and writing. However, a large percentage of the population has a passive understanding of Scots, although fewer actually use it, while Gaelic is spoken by a small minority but there is a reasonable interest in the language throughout the country.⁴

Language matters have been seen in Scotland as far less important than other concerns and the Scottish identity is based more on history and distinctive institutions than on language. Nevertheless, both Gaelic and Scots have been increasingly perceived as an essential part of Scottish cultural distinctiveness. In recent years their position relative to one another in Scottish life has been affected

4 It is worth noting that although very few people have learned the language to any significant degree of fluency, the number of learners has nonetheless increased considerably in recent years (McLeod 2001, 19).

by political change in the country, notably the re-opening of the Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh in July 1999.

An important event for both Gaelic and Scots was the UK's ratification in 2001 of the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*, which is intended to ensure a certain degree of institutional support for both languages. The UK government has bound itself to Parts II and III of the Charter in relation to Gaelic and only to part II in relation to Scots. Although this means that Scots can count on less support in comparison to Gaelic as a result of ratification, Scots activists have considered this event as one of the most important developments for the language, together with the establishment of the cross-party group on Scots in the Scottish Parliament.

Systematic, language-focused revitalization of Gaelic had begun by the late 1960s and during recent decades the language has come to benefit from greater status and institutional recognition than ever before. Gaelic has been supported in various ways, in education, media and public life. The language has been also monitored on a systematic basis and it has been possible to analyse its state in terms of demographics and patterns of language use. After a long and effective campaign by Gaelic language activists, the new recognition of Gaelic has now been protected in legislation. Formal recognition for Gaelic reached a new level with the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005 which recognised Gaelic as 'an official language of Scotland commanding equal respect to the English language'. The Act grants official status to the language for the first time. Bòrd na Gàidhlig, originally established in 2003, has now been given a variety of specified powers and responsibilities⁵. Bòrd na Gàidhlig may require any public body in Scotland to prepare a Gaelic language plan and also has powers to undertake strategic language planning for Gaelic on national level (see McLeod 2006a).

The general political approach to Scots after devolution has been in line with the (un)official policy of the United Kingdom 'applied to the language over all of the twentieth century and before that too' and which is 'characterized by unwillingness to recognize that a language called Scots exists' (Hance 2004, 36).

Closer examination of recent reports and statements in relation to both languages shows that Scots is perceived essentially as an addendum to Gaelic by the Scottish authorities and often appears to be an afterthought. In spite of its recognition (although this is arguably minimal) the practical steps taken in support have been limited, 'and generally focused on either its literary use or research into its decline, thus encouraging the "outside looking in" perception of Scots'.⁶ Implementation

5 See <http://www.bord-na-gaidhlig.org.uk>.

6 It is worth noting that at least some of the Scots language activists are trying to achieve a similar language policy for Scots as exists for Gaelic. At the present moment, it is not certain, however, how realistic these expectations are.

of language policy for Scots at all levels of government (Europe, United Kingdom, Scotland and local) has been ‘halfhearted, ill thought-out and buried in a swathe of other “cultural” issues’ (Millar 2006, 63).

Differences in the attitudes of policy makers to Gaelic and Scots have also been visible in the symbolic use of Gaelic as opposed to Scots. The languages have been used differently for example in speeches of politicians and in the work of the Parliament from the very beginning.⁷ It was Gaelic, and not Scots, that was used briefly but symbolically at the otherwise English language ceremonial opening of the new Parliament in Edinburgh.⁸ The position of Gaelic in the Parliament has been essentially symbolic rather than substantive (McLeod 2001, 6). Nevertheless, in comparison to Scots, Gaelic has been considered as both a serious issue by the government and a convincing symbol with historical and indeed contemporary importance. Recently the National Conversation document was published in full in English and Gaelic, with summaries in a number of minority languages, but Scots was not included⁹. In connection with parliamentary elections in May 2007 the SNP manifesto was published in Gaelic and a variety of other languages, but not Scots.

One obvious difference between the contemporary situations of the two languages is that Gaelic is promoted, institutionalized and supported both as a national and cultural issue and as an endangered minority language. Scots is usually supported with regard to its role as a national cultural asset, but even this has not been visible in governmental language policy.

Political commitment to Scots has been either virtually non-existent or minimal (see Nihtinen 2006). The UK government’s ratification of Part II of the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* has not led to any progress in the case for Scots as a minority language and no progress has come from the Scottish government either. At the present moment the new nationalist government is ‘looking forward to exploring opportunities for achieving the widest possible benefits in this area.’¹⁰ However, so far there has been very little evidence that the government will enhance the situation of Scots in any serious or substantial manner.

7 See Scottish Parliament Corporate Body Language Policy, November 2004. <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/vli/language/lang-pol.htm>.

8 Scots was, however, also present in the ceremony. Sheena Wellington sang one of Robert Burns’s best-known songs ‘A man’s man for a’ that’.

9 See <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/a-national-conversation/Translated-Summaries>, October 2007.

10 Response of Linda Fabiani, Minister for Europe, External Affairs and Culture, to Scots language activist Colin Wilson, 9 October 2007 (information received in a written form from Colin Wilson, October 2007).

Implications of differences in status and institutional support

The positions of both Gaelic and Scots in Scotland have become increasingly contradictory, although in different ways. In spite of the positive developments and concrete measures introduced for Gaelic, it is not clear what the practical impact of the Gaelic Language Act will be, because attitudes to Gaelic in Scotland vary greatly, ranging from interest and support to prejudice or indifference. Various public bodies are now preparing their formal Gaelic language plans. In spite of significant public support for the language, measured in terms of governmental financing and favourable attitudes among the general Scottish population, the position of the language has continued to weaken and effective strategies are needed if the language shift in favour of English is to be reversed (McLeod 2006b, 1). Surveys have shown that Gaelic is being used less and less frequently in home and community life even in the traditionally strong Gaelic-speaking areas (See MacKinnon 2006; NicAoidh 2006).

At a national level, discourse about Gaelic often has had little to do with the language *per se*, as a medium of expression and communication, but rather with concepts such as ‘Gaelic language and culture’ and ‘raising the profile’. In Gaelic arts events and cultural tourism Gaelic tends to be used ‘only ritualistically or tokenistically’ (McLeod 2001, 23-24).

However, institutional support for Gaelic has led to visible results. The growth of Gaelic-medium education, the increasing number of adult learners of Gaelic and with their potentially greater role in language revitalization (see MacCaluim 2006) and developing job opportunities both in the Gaelic-speaking areas and elsewhere can be seen as some of the developments which make the future for Gaelic more optimistic.

Unlike Gaelic, Scots has been largely excluded from political life in Scotland after devolution. As a result of this, the market value of Scots is extremely low as the language continues to be seen as a dialect or, at best, a low-status language and it is often associated with class issues or regional differences.

On the other hand, Scots has been enjoying increasing academic attention (albeit paradoxically under the label of ‘English’). Extensive work has been done on Scots dictionaries (Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue (DOST), Scottish National Dictionary (SND)). Research on Gaelic has also grown considerably in recent years, although, as a result of the fact that education in Scotland leaves the majority of the population ignorant of the language, great gaps remain (McLeod & Smith 2007). There is an ongoing inter-university project on a historical dictionary of the Scottish Gaelic language (Faclair na Gàidhlig), which will be of great benefit to the Gaelic language community in Scotland and elsewhere.¹¹

¹¹ Dictionaries of this kind have not previously been available for Scottish Gaelic.

Despite the increasing institutionalization of the Gaelic movement in Scotland, the various Gaelic organizations have had very little specialist training or experience in applied linguistics or language planning (McLeod 2001, 23). Discussions in Scottish public life about language policy matters in general have been often conducted at a very superficial level. Although the existing institutions for Gaelic are inadequate, those for Scots are nonexistent.

In the case of Gaelic, the lack of translators and other experts on Gaelic is a significant issue which means that this is an area in which developments need to go further. The question of language standardization in the context of Scottish Gaelic has not attracted much attention among scholars nor provoked much controversy within the Gaelic community (McLeod 2006c, 1). It is, however, one of the issues which is becoming increasingly more important as a result of the growing presence of Gaelic in education and public life.

2. Reasons for differences in developments for Gaelic and Scots

Gaelic, Scots and nationalism

In the not so distant past, the Scots language was at times perceived to be a 'nationalist' question and representatives of the different political parties took rather different stances on it (see for example Horsburgh 2002, Nihtinen 2005). Horsburgh (2002, 38) has stated that 'the Labour party is at best suspicious of supporters of the Scots language' and that the Conservative party has 'always been suspicious of a language which is supported by the SNP'. Perhaps surprisingly the SNP and the SNP-government have not shown any particular concern about the Scots language to date. Some scholars and Scots language activists have supported the view that one of the reasons for lack of progress in the case of Scots is political. The argument has been that Gaelic is considered to be a safer recipient of support, because of its very low demographic base and the fact that it has always had a different position in public life in Scotland in comparison to the position of Irish and Welsh in their respective countries. The parallel with Ulster Scots makes the lack of progress for Scots in Scotland seem even more clearly a political issue, because Ulster Scots has been supported largely on the account of its value as a symbol of British Unionism.

This raises the question of what is the explanation for this approach from the SNP? Why has the situation for Gaelic been moving forward while virtually nothing has happened for Scots? There seems to be no single explanation for this, but it is a result of a combination of different factors. First, this can be interpreted as an expression of lack of interest in the issue of Scots among key people in the party. Secondly, it can be argued that because Scots is considered parochial and merely a

regional manifestation of English in the public mind, it can be seen as an issue this SNP government would wish to steer clear of.

The relationship between Scots and Scottish Gaelic is a central question in Scottish history and in terms of history, both languages can be seen as equally 'national'. The issue of language as a symbol of national authenticity had some significance in nationalist politics during the inter-war period, but the politics of language failed to attract public sympathy. The dark years of economic repression also saw a remarkable literary revival led by Hugh MacDiarmid. His vision of a nation born again through adoption and use of the old Scots tongue was close to the classic European nineteenth-century nationalism and therefore had little chance of success in Scotland at that time. It had very little impact on popular consciousness during at a time when class had become a dominant issue.

Historically, nationalism in Scotland has been very different from the European nineteenth century nationalism. Hostility to the 1707 Union with England has always coexisted with a significant support for that Union. Conventionally, Scottish nationalism has been described as having failed for much of the nineteenth century because after the Union between Scotland and England in 1707, Scotland ceased to have a meaningful identity of its own. This view has been challenged in recent years because it ignores the dynamic sense of nationality present within civil society in Scotland (see for example Morton 1998). The nineteenth century in Scotland was a period of political assimilation but at the same time the Scottish national identity did not vanish but adapted itself to new circumstances (Devine 2006, 287).

Scottish nationalism gained its political organizational identity with the formation of the Scottish Home Rule Association (SHRA) in 1918, the National Party of Scotland in 1928 and the SNP in 1934¹². When nationalism strengthened in the late 1960s and mid-1970s it was driven by economic discontent. Against this background it is not surprising that although the growing interest in Gaelic has been associated with the rise of the SNP from the late 1960s and both Gaelic and Scots are connected to perceptions of Scottish identity and distinctiveness, language has not been an issue of greater significance.

The link between support for Scots and nationalism has been weak, despite the fact that nationalist support has been strong among the Scots language activists. In a similar fashion, the link between support for Gaelic and nationalism has been weak, while nationalist support has been relatively strong among Gaelic language activists (McLeod 2001, 8).

12 The SNP has always done proportionately well among all social classes but at no time there has been direct correspondence between support for Scottish independence and support for the SNP.

No political party has had a viable policy for Scots, but the opinions of SNP politicians have been usually the most favourable to both languages.¹³ Its closeness to English and the widely held perception of the dialectised nature of Scots today has made it harder to use a notional Scots language as a focus of cultural nationalism. Gaelic has had high profile organizations connecting the language with the wider culture for a long time, but the fact that very few of the Scottish population speak the language today has rendered it largely irrelevant as a focus of national political identity. In a British context the language that offers close parallels to other examples of cultural nationalism in Europe is Welsh, which is spoken by one-fifth of the Welsh population, and has been closely wrapped up with nationalist sensibilities for the past century and more. Unlike for Welsh, a large, active and effective language movement demanding change has not been present for Scots (Millar 2006, 83).¹⁴

Language revitalization efforts in Scotland have had little connection to the nationalist cause and neither of the two languages has been connected to nationalism in an exclusive manner.

‘From dialect to language’

Towards the end of the twentieth century, the global minority movement increased its activity in language revitalization and many languages were brought to public notice, such as the Sami languages, Meänkieli in Sweden and Kven in Norway. During a symposium on language and politics in Scotland and Ulster, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (2002, 247-250) compared Scots to Meänkieli on the grounds that both represent developments ‘from dialect to language’. While there are some similarities between the two cases, there are also significant differences (Nihtinen, research in progress). Meänkieli was restored in Sweden in the late twentieth century, in connection to the existence of two different minority populations of Finnish origin. The language received protection under Part III of the *European Charter* and has been successfully promoted at a regional level.

Nevertheless, it is a language with very low demographic base, restricted to a small geographical region and recognized as part of recognition of two different ethnic minorities. Meänkieli completely lacks the national and cultural dimension that Scots has as an essential part of Scottish history and heritage. From the point of view of language policy, however, Meänkieli has the advantage of being just a

13 The explanation for this could be that the SNP heartland (until 2007) was the north-east of Scotland where the presence of Doric and pride in local culture are particularly visible. Local varieties are often perceived to be more clearly defined entities than the concept of Scots and connected to the vernacular tradition of a particular locality.

14 The reason for different developments may be found in the fact that Scotland retained its own institutions of self-government after 1707 (as discussed earlier in this article) whereas Wales was largely robbed of its organs of statehood.

‘simple’ case of language emancipation while it has been possible to claim that the concept of Scots is an ambiguous one, for example for the purposes of a Census question. Moreover, Scots encompasses regional varieties, for instance the Shetland dialect, which can look for separate revitalization and standardization.

The matter of regions

While interest in Gaelic has an increasingly wide geographical base (see for example Oliver 2006), the increasing popularity of Scots has been on a regional level, and especially in areas where attitudes towards it have traditionally been more positive. Shetland for example is one of the places where enthusiasm for the dialect has been clearly visible in recent years and dialect promotion has been particularly active.

Nevertheless, local realities may differ significantly from issues within larger scale contexts. The speakers of the Shetland dialect (or Shetlandic) are counted as Scots speakers from a mainland point of view (for example in the GRO(S) report 1996), while most Shetlanders have traditionally seen their dialect as something different from mainland Scots (Nihtinen, research in progress). One of the declared aims of the dialect group Shetland ForWirlds is ‘adding our voice to the national campaign’.¹⁵ At the same time, there are efforts to Shetlandise books in Scots and people occasionally talk about the Scotticisation of the dialect in negative terms. If ever there is a serious attempt to introduce a standard in Shetland, and at the moment this does not seem likely, mainland Scots may indeed contain elements, which cannot be absorbed or shared.¹⁶ Dialect promotion locally can, however, benefit from the campaign for Scots on a national level.

Going round in circles

Given its current complex meaning, or even lack of, definition among academics, it is not unexpected that Scots does not have a clear definition in the public mind or indeed that defining Scots has been the main problem from the point of view of language policy. The academic debate over the linguistic status of Scots has illustrated well the ‘diffuse’ nature of the language (Macafee 2000, 33; Mc Pake & Arthur 2006, 159).

15 See for instance <http://www.scotslanguage.com>; section on Shetland.

16 The Shetland dialect is particularly distinctive as a result of the legacy of Norn, which survived in a fragmentary form until the nineteenth century. Its influence is still obvious in place names, vocabulary, expressions and pronunciation. Records of later Norn suggest relatively close connections with both the dialects of western and south-western Norway and the dialects of the Faeroes and Iceland (see for example Barnes 1998, Millar 2007). Shetland was part of Scandinavia until 1469 and it is perceived as culturally connected to both Scandinavia and Scotland.

Traditionally Scots has been mostly used in literature, especially poetry, and in culture and the arts more generally. It is only in very recent times that initiatives intended to revive the use of Scots in new areas has developed. In addition, conceptual disputes within the language movement have tended to hinder progress in relation to language planning.

The lack of the inclusion of Scots in certain decisions has been obvious in several instances.¹⁷ This has led to kind of chain reaction—caution about the use of Scots in formal contexts has led to its exclusion which in turn has prevented the use of Scots vocabulary in new settings.

Scots has been perceived as a dying language for at least two centuries (Aitken, 1984). On the other hand, it has been argued that if Scots is defined based on phonological and syntactic characteristics ‘also comprising localized Lowland English varieties and allowing a lexical turnover, Scots can be characterized as ‘one of the “healthiest” traditional dialects’ (see views quoted in Hagan 2002, 85).

Opinions on the contemporary state of Scots vary significantly—while some scholars and activists see the language as endangered, others hold the opinion that Scots is not under threat (McLeod & Smith 2007, 21-30) and that it is and will continue to be present in Scottish culture, literature and society. This view is justified to an extent by the fact that even Scottish Standard English carries an element of Scots and that Scots is an essential part of Scotland’s heritage. Numerous Scots words and phrases enjoy a covert prestige which is likely to preserve them for many future generations. Indeed, estimates of the actual state of the language depend largely on how it is defined.

More importantly, however, as a consequence of the variety of opinions about the state of Scots, views on how the language could be promoted are very diverse (see Nihtinen 2006).

Respectable cause, paid campaigners and attention from the government

Gaelic has had the advantage of being considered both a national and a distinct language in a Scottish context while the perceptions of Scots and Scottish Standard English have been problematical at all levels: political, academic, in language activism and in public opinion. Scots is often connected to class issues in the public mind while the most widespread attitude towards Gaelic has been ‘one of mild support, a support often expressed in rather hazy and romanticized terms’ (McLeod 2001, 9). At the political level attitudes to Gaelic have been particularly favourable and there has been consensus on its importance for Scottish culture. In addition, Gaelic has been perceived as an endangered language which needs urgent support. Nearly all MSPs and all non-MSP respondents in a survey carried out in 2005

17 For example the issue of multilingual signposting in the Scottish Parliament has been seen as problematical.

supported the view that ‘Gaelic should not be allowed to die out’ and that ‘support should be given’ (Nihtinen 2006).

As a consequence, Gaelic has been seen as a respectable cause for historical, cultural and indeed contemporary reasons. Opinions as to whether Scots is endangered or not have varied to a significant extent among academics and debates surrounding Scots have continued to ‘go round in circles’. Where politicians have expressed positive attitudes towards Scots this has been done not because the language is perceived as endangered but connected to issues such as self-esteem, confidence or general support of linguistic diversity.

Another explanation for the success of Gaelic in comparison to Scots may be found in the pre-existing different support for the two languages. Ministers for Gaelic have been appointed since devolution and Gaelic has a language parliamentary officer, language board and paid campaigners. None of these exist for Scots. Because the Gaelic community has been successful in recent years in gaining access to broadcasting and funds, it has been far more effective in disseminating the Gaelic point of view (Horsburgh 2002, 22). In the promotion of Scots many activities have been largely based on voluntary efforts of individuals and groups who have worked for the cause in their spare time or with small resources. Moreover, there have been individual politicians with a particular commitment to Gaelic although their motivation may have been diverse (McLeod 2001, 7-10). Similar commitment has not been present for Scots.

List of abbreviations

DOST	A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue, 12 vols.
MSP	Member of the Scottish Parliament
SND	The Scottish National Dictionary, 10 vols.
SNP	Scottish National Party

Bibliography

- Aitken, A. J. 1984. ‘Scots and English in Scotland.’ In P. Trudgill (ed.) *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 517-532.
- Barnes, M. 1998. *Norn Language of Orkney and Shetland*. Lerwick: Shetland Times.
- Devine, T. M. 2006. *The Scottish Nation 1700-2007*. Penguin Books Ltd.
- GRO(S) *A Report on the Scots Language Research* carried out by the General Register Office for Scotland, Edinburgh, 1996.
- Hagan, A. 2002. *Urban Scots Dialect Writing*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Hance, M. 2004. ‘Inching Forward—The Development of Language Policy in Devolved Scotland.’ In *Dialect. Two Days Conference & Public Debate on the Development of the Shetland Dialect*. Shetland Arts Trust, 35-37.
- Horsburgh, D. 1994. *Gaelic and Scots in Grampian*. Aberdeen: Celtic Society.

- Horsburgh, D. 2002. 'The Scots Language: An Historical and Political Assessment.' *Studia Indogermanica Lodziensia*, Vol. IV. Lodz, 21-42.
- Leith, D. 1983. *A Social history of English*. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul.
- Macafee, C.I. 1997. 'Ongoing Change in Modern Scots: The Social Dimension.' In C. Jones (ed.) *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 514-548.
- Macafee, C.I. 2000. 'The Demography of Scots: The Lessons of the Census Campaign.' *Scottish Language* 19, 1-44.
- MacCaluim, A. 2006. 'Air iomall an iomail? Luchd-ionnsachaidh na Gàidhlig ann an ath-thilleadh gluasad cànan.' In W. McLeod (ed.) *Revitalizing Gaelic in Scotland. Policy, Planning and Public Discourse*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press, 185-198.
- McArthur, T. 1998. *The English Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKinnon, K. 2006. 'The Western Isles Language Plan: Gaelic to English language shift 1972-2001' In W. McLeod (ed.) *Revitalizing Gaelic in Scotland. Policy, Planning and Public Discourse*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press, 49-72.
- McLeod, W. 2001. 'Gaelic in the New Scotland: Politics, Rhetoric and Public Discourse', *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* (July 2001), (available on the Internet <http://www.ecmi.de/jemie/download/JEMIE02MacLeod10-07-01.pdf>).
- McLeod, W. 2006a. 'Securing the Status of Gaelic? The Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005', *Scottish Affairs* 57, 19-38.
- McLeod, W. 2006b. 'Gaelic in Contemporary Scotland: Contradictions, Challenges and Strategies', available from <http://www.arts.ed.ac.uk/celtic/poileasaidh/MCLEODCATALAN2.pdf>.
- McLeod, W. 2006c. 'Scottish Gaelic: An Emerging Standard?' Paper presented to the Sociolinguistics Symposium 16, University of Limerick, July 2006.
- McLeod, W. & J. Smith 2007. 'Resistance to Monolinguality: The Languages of Scotland since 1918' In I. Brown et al. (eds.) *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature III*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 21-30.
- McPake, J. & J. Arthur 2006. 'Scots in Contemporary Social and Educational Context' *Language, Culture and curriculum* 19:2, 155-170.
- Millar, R. M. 2006. "'Burying Alive": Unfocused Governmental Language Policy and Scots.' *Language Policy* 5, 63-86.
- Millar, R. M. 2007. *Northern and Insular Scots*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Morton, G. 1998. *Unionist Nationalism: Governing Urban Scotland, 1830-1860*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press Ltd.
- NicAoidh, M. 2006. 'Pròiseact Plana Cànan nan Eilean Siar: A' chiad ìre—rannsachadh air suidheachadh na Gàidhlig anns na h-Eileanan Siar'. In W. McLeod (ed.) *Revitalizing Gaelic in Scotland. Policy, Planning and Public Discourse*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press, 73-86.
- Nihtinen, A. 2005. 'Scotland's Linguistic Past and Present: Paradoxes and Consequences'. *Studia Celtica Fennica* 2, 118-137.
- Nihtinen, A. 2006. 'Towards a More Complex Language Identity? An Investigation of Opinions on Scots in a Sample of Policy Makers and Others'. *Studia Celtica Fennica* 3, 34-56.
- Oliver, J. 2006. 'Where is Gaelic? Revitalisation, Language, Culture and Identity'. In W. McLeod (ed.) *Revitalising Gaelic in Scotland. Policy, Planning and Public Discourse*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press, 185-198.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2002. 'Ireland, Scotland, Education and Linguistic Human Rights: Some International Comparisons.' In J. M. Kirk and D. P. O'Baoill (eds.) *Language Planning in Education. Linguistic Issues in Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, and Scotland*. Belfast: Queen's University, 221-266.